



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2009

No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 4, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON-LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Chaplain Cherita Potter, National Chaplain, American Legion Auxiliary, Seaside, Oregon, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we thank You for this day and the opportunities it presents to us.

Fill us with a renewed spirit, never to waver when the way is hard. Prepare each of us with open hearts and broadened minds to face the many challenges set before us.

Direct our thoughts and emotions so that we may exhibit fair judgment and the practice of good core values.

May the principles of justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty be ever preserved for a happy and secure America.

Open our eyes to the needs of others. Make us sensitive to the issues of poverty, racial, sexual, and age discrimination, war and peace, pollution and our environment.

Help us to recognize and grasp the opportunities for service, that each one of us might make a difference.

God, we thank You for this great Nation and the service men and women who defend and protect our freedoms. Help us to know how to best honor and support them. Fill them with strength and courage to endure.

May Your blessings be with those suffering from the ravages of war and our duty to them be ever on our minds.

We are comforted by Your presence as we pray for a peaceful Nation.

In Your Name we pray, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

WELCOMING CHAPLAIN CHERITA POTTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I'd like to first welcome my father, K.C. Wu, to the House gallery.

It is also my distinct pleasure and honor to welcome our guest chaplain for today, Ms. Cherita Potter.

Ms. Potter is the national chaplain for the American Legion Auxiliary and one of my constituents in Oregon. She is also an active member of Community Presbyterian Church in Cannon Beach, Oregon, where she participates in Vacation Bible School, choir and Bible study.

Ms. Potter has served in a number of leadership roles at both the State and national levels of the American Legion Auxiliary, and I would like to thank her personally for her ongoing service to our Nation's veterans.

She is joined today by her husband, Toby, a retired Navy Seabee.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Potter for her service to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to persons in the gallery.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to her left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2927

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 26, 2009, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at 10:49 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE GORDON BROWN, PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Majority Floor Services Chief, Mr. Barry Sullivan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN);

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON);

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH); and

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);
The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD);

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD);

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB);

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN);

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. KAUFMAN);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL);
The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORCKER);

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON);

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH);
The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO); and

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Heng Chee Chan, Ambassador of the Republic of Singapore.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

At 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m., the Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Prime Minister BROWN. Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, I come to this great capital of this great Na-

tion, an America renewed under a new President, to say that America's faith in the future has been, is, and always will be an inspiration to me and to the whole world.

Two centuries ago, your creation of America was the boldest possible affirmation of faith in the future. It's a future you have not just believed in but a future you have built with your own hands.

On the 20th of January, you, the American people, wrote the latest chapter in the American story, with a transition of dignity, in which both sides of the aisle should take great pride. And on that day, billions of people truly looked to Washington, D.C., as a shining city upon the hill, lighting up the whole of the world.

Let me thank President Obama for his leadership, for his friendship and for giving the whole world renewed hope in itself.

And I know you will allow me to single out for special mention today one of your most distinguished Senators, known in every continent and a great friend. Northern Ireland today is at peace, more Americans have health care, children around the world are going to school, and for all those things, we owe a great debt to the life and courage of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

Today, having talked to him last night, I want to announce, awarded by Her Majesty the Queen on behalf of the British people, an honorary knighthood for Sir EDWARD KENNEDY.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, I come in friendship to renew, for new times, our special relationship that is founded on our shared history, our shared values and, I believe, our shared futures.

I grew up in the 1960s as America, led by President Kennedy, looked to the heavens and saw not the endless void of the unknown but a new frontier to dare to discover and to explore. People said it couldn't be done but America did it.

And 20 years later, in the 1980s, America, led by President Reagan, refused to accept the fate of millions trapped behind the Iron Curtain and insisted, instead, that the peoples of Eastern Europe be allowed to join the ranks of nations which live safe, strong, and free. People said it would never happen in our lifetime, but it did, and the Berlin Wall was torn down brick by brick.

So, early in my life, I came to understand that America is not just the indispensable Nation; you are the irrepressible Nation.

Throughout your history, America has led insurrections in the human imagination. You've summoned revolutionary times through your belief that there is no such thing as an impossible endeavor, and it's never possible to come here without having your faith in the future renewed.

Now, I want to thank you on behalf of the British people because throughout the whole century, the American

people stood liberty's ground, not just in one world war but in two. And I want you to know that we will never forget the sacrifice and the service of the American soldiers who gave their lives for people whose names they never knew and whose faces they never saw, yet people who have lived in freedom thanks to the bravery and valor of the Americans who gave that last full measure of devotion.

Cemetery after cemetery across Europe honors the memory of American soldiers, resting row upon row, often alongside comrades-in-arms from Britain. And there is no battlefield of liberty on which there is not a piece of land that is marked out as American, and there is no day of remembrance within Britain that is not also a commemoration of American courage and sacrifice far from home.

In the hardest days of the last century, faith in the future kept America alive, and I tell you that America kept faith in the future alive for all the world.

And let me do a tribute to the soldiers, yours and ours, who today fight side by side in the plains of Afghanistan, the streets of Iraq, just as their forefathers fought side by side in the sands of Tunisia, the beaches of Normandy, and then on the bridges over the Rhine.

Almost every family in Britain has a tie that binds them to America. So I want you to know that whenever a young American soldier or marine or sailor or airman is killed in conflict, anywhere in the world, we the people of Britain grieve with you. We know that your loss is our loss, your family's sorrow is our family's sorrow, and your Nation's determination is our nation's determination that they shall not have died in vain.

And after that terrible September morning, when your homeland was attacked, the Coldstream Guards at Buckingham Palace played the "Star Spangled Banner," our own British tribute, as we wept for our friends in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

And let me, therefore, promise you our continued support to ensure that there is no hiding place for terrorists, no safe haven for terrorism. You should be proud that in the years after 2001, that while terrorists may destroy buildings and even, tragically, lives, they have not, and will not ever, destroy the American spirit.

So let it be said of the friendship between our two countries that it is in times of trial, true; in the face of fear, faithful; and amidst the storms of change, constant.

And let it be said of our friendship also, formed and forged over two tumultuous centuries, a friendship tested in war, strengthened in peace, that it has not just endured but is renewed each generation to better serve our shared values and fulfill the hopes and dreams of the day, not alliances of convenience. It is a partnership of purpose.

Alliances can wither or be destroyed, but partnerships of purpose are indestructible. Friendships can be shaken, but our friendship is unshakable. Treaties can be broken, but our partnership is unbreakable. And I know that there is no power on Earth that can ever drive us apart.

We will work tirelessly with you as partners for peace in the Middle East; for a two-state solution, proposed by President Clinton and driven forward by President Bush, that provides for nothing less than a secure Israel, safe within its borders, existing side by side with a viable Palestinian state.

And we will work tirelessly with you to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation and reduce the stockpile of nuclear weapons. And our shared message to Iran, it is simple: We are ready for you to rejoin the international community, but first, you must cease your threats and suspend your nuclear program.

Past Prime Ministers have traveled to this Capitol Building in the times of war to talk of war. I come now to talk of new and different battles we must also fight together, to speak of a global economy in crisis and a planet imperiled.

These are new priorities for our new times, and let us be honest. Tonight too many parents, after they put their children to bed, will speak of their worries about losing their jobs or the need to sell the house. Too many will share stories of friends or neighbors already packing up their homes. Too many will talk of a local store or business that has already gone to the wall.

For me, this global recession is not to be measured just in statistics or in graphs or on a balance sheet. Instead, I see one individual with one set of dreams and fears, then another and then another, each with their own stars to reach for, each part of a family, each at the heart of a community, now in need of help and hope. And when banks have failed and markets have faltered, we the representatives of the people have to be the people's last line of defense.

That's why for me there is no financial orthodoxy so entrenched, there's no conventional thinking so ingrained, there's no special interest so strong that it should ever stand in the way of the change that hardworking families now need.

We have learned through this world downturn that markets should be free, but markets should never be values-free. We have learned that the risks people take should never be separated from the responsibilities that they must meet. And if perhaps some once thought it beyond our power to shape the global markets to meet the needs of the people, we now know that that is our duty. We cannot and must not stand aside.

In our families and workplaces and in our places of worship, we celebrate men and women of integrity, who work hard, treat people fairly, take responsi-

bility, look out for others, and if these are the principles we live by in our families and neighborhoods, they should also be the principles that guide and govern our economic life.

And the world has learned that what makes for the good society also now makes for the good economy, too. My father was a minister of the church, and I have learned again what I was taught by him: that wealth should help more than the wealthy; that good fortune should serve more than the fortunate; and that riches must enrich not just some of our communities but all of our communities. And these enduring values are, in my view, the values we need for these new times.

We tend to think of the sweep of destiny as stretching across many months and years before culminating in decisive moments that we call history. But sometimes the reality is that defining moments of history come suddenly and without warning, and the task of leadership then is to define them, to shape them, and to move forward into the new world they demand.

An economic hurricane has swept the world, creating a crisis of credit and a crisis of confidence. History has brought us now to a point where change is essential, and we are summoned not just to manage our times but to transform them.

Our task is to rebuild prosperity and security in a wholly different economic world, where competition is no longer just local, but it's global; and where banks are no longer national, but they're international. And we need to understand, therefore, what went wrong in this crisis, that the very financial instruments that were designed to diversify risk across the banking system instead spread contagion right across the globe. And today's financial institutions, they're so interwoven that a bad bank anywhere is a threat to good banks everywhere.

But should we succumb to a race to the bottom and to a protectionism that history tells us that in the end protects no one? No. We should have the confidence, America and Britain most of all, that we can seize the global opportunities ahead and make the future work for us. And why? Because while today people are anxious and feel insecure, over the next two decades, literally billions of people in other continents will move from being simply producers of their goods to being consumers of our goods, and in this way, the world economy will double in size. Twice as many opportunities for business, twice as much prosperity, the biggest expansion of middle class incomes and jobs the world has seen.

So we win our future not by retreating from the world but by engaging with it. America and Britain will succeed and lead if we tap into the talents of our people, unleash the genius of our scientists, set free the drive of our entrepreneurs. We will win the race to the top if we can develop the new high-value-added products and services and

the new green goods that the rising numbers of hardworking families across our globe will want to buy.

So, in these unprecedented times, we must educate our way out of a downturn. We must invest and invent our way out of a downturn. We must retool and reskill our way out of a downturn. And this is not blind optimism or synthetic confidence to console people. It's a practical affirmation for our times of a faith in a better future.

Every time we rebuild a school, we demonstrate our faith in the future. Every time we send more people to university, every time we invest more in our new digital infrastructure, every time we increase support for our scientists, we demonstrate our faith in the future.

And so I say to this Congress and this country, something that runs deep in your character and is woven in your history, we conquer our fear of the future through our faith in the future, and it is this faith in the future that means we must commit to protecting the planet for generations who will come long after us.

The Greek proverb, what does it say? Why does anybody plant the seeds of a tree whose shade they will never see? The answer is because they look to the future. And I believe you, the Nation that had the vision to put a man on the Moon, are also the Nation with the vision to protect and preserve our planet Earth.

And you know it's only by investing in environmental technology that we can end the dictatorship of oil, and it's only by tackling climate change that we can create the millions of new green jobs that we need and can have.

For the lesson of this crisis is that we cannot just wait for tomorrow today. We cannot just think of tomorrow today. We cannot merely plan for tomorrow today. Our task must be to build tomorrow today.

And America knows from its history that its reach goes far beyond its geography. For a century, you have carried upon your shoulders the greatest of responsibility: to work with and for the rest of the world. And let me tell you that now, more than ever, the rest of the world wants to work with America.

If these times have shown us anything it's that the major challenges we face are global. No matter where it starts, an economic crisis does not stop at the water's edge. It ripples across the world. Climate change does not honor passport control. Terrorism has no respect for borders. Modern communication instantly spans every continent. The new frontier is that there is no frontier, and the new shared truth is that global problems now need global solutions.

And let me say to you directly: you now have the most pro-American European leadership in living memory. It's a leadership that wants to cooperate more closely together in order to cooperate more closely with you. There is no old Europe, no new Europe. There is only our friend Europe.

So, once again, I say we should seize this moment because never before have I seen a world willing to come together so much. Never before has that been more needed and never before have the benefits of cooperation been so far-reaching.

So when people here and in other countries ask what more can we do to bring an end to this downturn, let me say this. We can achieve more by working together. And just think of what we can do if we combine not just in a partnership for security but in a new partnership for prosperity.

On jobs, you the American people, through your stimulus proposals, could create or save at least 3 million jobs. We in Britain are acting with similar determination. But how much nearer an end to this downturn would we all be if the whole of the world resolved to do the same?

And you are also restructuring your banks. So are we. But how much safer would everybody's savings be if the whole world finally came together to outlaw shadow banking systems and outlaw offshore tax havens?

So just think how each of our actions, if combined, could mean a whole much greater than the sum of its parts: all, and not just some, banks stabilized; on fiscal stimulus, the impact multiplied because everybody is doing it; rising demand in all our countries creating jobs in each of our countries; and trade once again the engine of prosperity, the wealth of nations restored.

No one should forget it was American visionaries who over a half a century ago, coming out of the deepest of depressions and the worst of wars, produced the boldest of plans for global economic cooperation. They recognized that prosperity was indivisible. They concluded that to be sustained it had to be shared.

And I believe that ours, too, is a time for renewal, for a plan for tackling recession and building for the future, every continent playing their part in a global new deal, a plan for prosperity that can benefit us all.

And first, so that the whole of the worldwide banking system serves our prosperity rather than risks it, let us agree at our G-20 summit in London in April on rules and standards for accountability, transparency, and reward that will mean an end to the excesses and will apply to every bank, everywhere, and all the time.

Second, America and a few others cannot be expected to bear all the burden of the fiscal and interest rate stimulus. We must share it globally. So let us work together for the worldwide reduction of interest rates and a scale of stimulus that is equal to the depth of the recession and round the world to the dimensions of recovery and, most of all, equal to the millions of jobs we must safeguard and create.

And third, let us together renew our international economic cooperation, helping emerging markets rebuild their

banks. Let us sign a world trade agreement to expand commerce. Let us work together also for a low carbon recovery. And I am confident that this President, this Congress, and the peoples of the world can come together in Copenhagen in December and reach a historic agreement to combat climate change.

And let us never forget in times of turmoil our duties to the least of these, the poorest of the world. In the Rwanda museum of genocide, there is a memorial to the countless children who were among those murdered in the massacres in Rwanda. There is one of the face of a child, David. The words beneath him are brief; yet, they weigh on me heavily. It says: Name, David. Age, 10. Favorite sport, football. Enjoyed making people laugh. Dreamed to become a doctor. Cause of death, tortured to death. Last words, "The United Nations will come for us."

But we never did. That child believed the best of us. That he was wrong is to our eternal discredit. We tend to think of a day of judgment as a moment to come, but our faith tells us, as the writer said, that judgment is more than that. It is a summary court in perpetual session.

And when I visit those bare, run-down, yet teeming classrooms across Africa, they're full of children, like our children, desperate to learn, but because we've been unable as a world to keep our promises to help, more and more children, I tell you, are being lured to expensively funded madrassas, teaching innocent children to hate us.

So for our security and our children's security and these children's future, you know the greatest gift of our generation, the greatest gift we could give to the world, the gift of America and Britain, could be that every child in every country should have the chance 70 million children today do not have, the chance to go to school, to spell their names, to count their age and perhaps learn of a great generation who are striving to make their freedom real.

Let us remember that there is a common bond that across different beliefs, cultures, and nationalities unites us as human beings. It is at the core of my convictions. It's the essence of America's spirit. It's the heart of all our faiths. And it must be at the center of our response to this crisis, too.

Our values tell us we cannot be wholly comfortable while others go without comfort; that our communities can never be fully at ease if millions feel ill at ease; that our society cannot be truly strong when millions are left so weak. And this much we know: when the strong help the weak, it makes us all stronger.

And this, too, is true. All of us know that in a recession the wealthiest, the most powerful, and the most privileged can find a way through. So we don't value the wealthy less when we say that our first duty is to help the not-

so-wealthy. We don't value the powerful less when we say our first responsibility is to help the powerless. And we do not value those who are secure less when we say our first priority must be to help the insecure.

These recent events have forced us all to think anew, and while I have learned many things over these last few months, I keep returning to something I first learned in my father's church as a child. In these most modern of crises, I am drawn to the most ancient of truths. Wherever there is hardship, wherever there is suffering, we cannot, we will not, we will never pass by on the other side.

But you know, working together there is no challenge to which we're not equal. There's no obstacle we can't overcome. There's no aspiration so high it cannot be achieved.

In the depths of the Depression, when Franklin Roosevelt did battle with fear itself, it was not simply by the power of his words, his personality, and his example that he triumphed. Yes, all these things mattered, but what mattered more was this enduring truth: that you, the American people, at your core, were, as you remain, every bit as optimistic as your Roosevelts, your Reagans and your Obamas.

And this is the faith in the future that has always been the story and promise of America. So, at this defining moment in history, let us renew our special relationship for our generation and our times. Let us work together to restore prosperity and protect this planet, and with faith in the future, let us together build tomorrow today.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m., the Right Honorable Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Majority Floor Services Chief escorted the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps from the Chamber.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1245

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE—IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of America, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provides \$20 billion to accelerate the adoption of health information systems by doctors and hospitals; these are electronic medical records. This will modernize health care in this country, it will save billions of dollars by reducing the need for duplicate diagnostic procedures, it will reduce medical errors and improve the quality of services. This will create or save hundreds of thousands of jobs, many in the high-tech sectors, tens of billions of dollars in system-wide savings, including a net reduction in private health insurance premiums for families.

I want the public to know that it's time for change. Our health care system should have been addressed many, many years ago, but under this new administration and under this Democratic leadership of this fine body, we are doing what needs to be done in order to put this country in a posture it needs to be in for the new millennium.

TAX DEDUCTIONS

(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, one of my constituents, Gail, from Lititz, Pennsylvania, recently wrote to me about a provision in the President's recently released budget. She said, among other things, "God has blessed us abundantly in many ways; in turn, we have been able to bless others. We donate a very large percentage of our income to the hungry, homeless, orphaned and widowed. We are in the top tax bracket. Any increase in our taxes or decrease in our charitable deductions will not hurt our standard of living, it will, indeed, hurt the very people that the government is trying to help."

When Alexis de Tocqueville wrote with praise for America, he cited our civic institutions, like churches and other nonprofit organizations, as the basis for our strength in the Nation. The Obama administration is woefully misguided if they think reducing the tax credit for charitable donations will help America. During an economic recession, our churches, charities, and other community organizations that assist many individuals quicker and more effectively than government programs will be harmed. It's a mistake to change our tax policy to reduce funding to these organizations when their help is needed most in communities across America.

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW FOR HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Last week, President Obama submitted a budget that expresses his commitment to transforming health care in America. Tomorrow, he will gather Members of Congress, consumers, business men and women, and health care providers at the White House to discuss how to achieve the common goals he laid out in the budget, "constraining costs, expanding access, and improving quality."

The economic crisis we face is not a cause for delay, it is an argument for comprehensive reform. The need for action couldn't be clearer. Every percentage increase in the unemployment rate means another 1.1 million Americans becomes uninsured.

Over half of all Americans, many of them insured, are doing without medical care because of high costs. Emergency rooms are being forced to turn away patients, and businesses that cover their workers are struggling to be competitive in the face of rising premiums.

We must assure that all Americans are covered and give each a choice of a public health insurance plan or private plan that provides comprehensive, affordable and high-quality care. The time to act is now.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE THE SOLUTION

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise with concern about the President's budget.

Now is not the time to be raising taxes. We should not be raising rates, nor should we diminish the benefits for people who are paying their mortgage as they should be. As determined as the Democrats are to raise taxes, you don't fuel the engines of economic growth by penalizing those who are responsible,

who do play by the rules, and who don't need a bailout. By reducing the tax reductions for mortgage interest, the Democrats are raising taxes, and they are growing government while reducing economic incentives for those who have resources to invest in a faltering economy.

Further, at this time of need, now is not the time to reduce the benefits for making charitable donations. Non-profit religious organizations and institutions of higher education are also struggling in this economy. The net result of the President's budget is less money for donating to those worthwhile causes.

We do have a choice: do you want to keep your money and spend your money, or do you want the government bureaucracy to tax and spend? I believe in the American people; it's their money, not the government's money. Government is not the solution, the American people are the solution.

CONGRATULATING THE 2008 STATE CHAMPION ELK LAKE WARRIORS

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2008 Pennsylvania State championship boys cross-country team, the Elk Lake Warriors. I am blessed to have five terrific kids, all of whom attend Elk Lake, and my oldest three boys are all cross-country runners.

The cross-country team's victory is remarkable for many reasons, it's only the third State championship that Elk Lake has ever won. But what I found truly remarkable was their inspirational path to victory. Not one runner on the team won an individual medal at the State meet, but working together, they won the State title, an incredible lesson for us all. They each gave it their all and demonstrated an incredible dedication to each other and their team; they were victorious.

As we know, our Nation is facing incredible challenges right now. It is all too easy to forget the simple value of pulling together and putting aside our differences in difficult times. I am confident that if we all heed the lessons offered by a small rural school in Pennsylvania, we will succeed. And once again, my congratulations to the 2008 State champions, the Elk Lake Warriors.

MORE TAXES—LESS PROSPERITY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, history shows that if you tax something, you get less of it; if you subsidize something, you're going to get more of it.

This budget raises taxes. We shouldn't raise taxes during a recession

on anyone that pays taxes. Tax increase will do several things. Small businesses that pay most of the taxes, they will have a tax increase. So to pay for these new taxes, they're going to have to cut jobs to pay for those taxes. It raises the utility rates on people that use energy. Now, that hurts those folks, the working poor, who have a fixed income, in essence, a tax increase on the poor. It cuts deductions for home mortgages and charitable contributions; that, in essence, hurts people who try to live in a home and contribute to charities. And the budget redistributes wealth.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You don't make the poor rich by making the rich poor and you don't make the weak strong by making the strong weak."

The budget is flawed with more government spending, more government control, and it raises taxes. Taxes will create less prosperity, not more prosperity.

And that's just the way it is.

A TRIBUTE TO QUENTIN MEASE

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a giant in our community in Houston, Texas, that we lost just a few days ago.

Quentin Mease was 100 years old, and he lived that life vigorously and with great fulfillment. He was a servant of the people. No, he was not elected, but he was one of the founding members of the National Urban League Houston chapter. He was a founding member of what is now called the Harris County Hospital District. One of the satellite hospitals was named after Quentin Mease.

He was truly a giver, a philanthropic, a person who believed that he was, in fact, our brothers' and sisters' keeper. He lost his life, but he was full of life when he passed. He will be recognized on Thursday for a wake and Friday for a funeral.

I believe the words of the President of the United States in his African American History Month that said, "The ideals of the founders became more real and more true for every citizen of African American ancestry to realize our full potential as a Nation, and to uphold those ideals for all who enter into our borders and embrace the notion that we all are endowed with certain inalienable rights."

Quentin Mease, fallen in battle, believed that we were all endowed with certain inalienable rights. He gave his all. He wanted us all to be embraced under this bright and shining flag. He believed in America. As an African American, he is a giant, and I thank him for highlighting young people like myself to give us an opportunity to go forward into the future.

Thank you, Mr. Mease. May God bless you. And may God bless you as you rest in peace.

SMALL BUSINESS—KEY TO GETTING OUR ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, unemployment in my home State of Florida and across the country continues to rise. As the stock markets and retirement accounts fall, our national debt is approaching \$11 trillion. And just last week, Congress approved, over my objections, a \$410 billion spending bill that was 8 percent higher than last year, more than twice the rate of inflation. On top of all this new spending, we now hear that the White House is proposing nearly \$1 trillion in new taxes. Now is not the time to be raising taxes or embarking on a reckless spending spree.

Rather than exploding the size of Federal Government, Congress should be working to strengthen the backbone of our economy with small businesses. Seventy percent of all new jobs are created by small business, many of them in our area family owned.

Let's get our economy back on track by helping to work with small businesses. That's the legacy that we want to leave our children and grandchildren.

PASS THE HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT

(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, by now we all know what a central role the housing market crisis has played in our economic troubles. The housing meltdown is devastating for families and communities, particularly for innocent families who have lived within their means and paid their mortgages on time. Through no fault of their own, their home values are eroding and their life savings are threatened. That's why we must pass the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act. It restores fairness to the bankruptcy system.

Current law allows loan modifications for vacation homes and yachts, yet prohibits them for primary residences. This bill will end this inequity. It also fixes the Hope for Homeowners program to increase mortgage modifications and reduce foreclosures. It is not about bailing out lenders or borrowers who made irresponsible decisions, it is, rather, finding fair and effective solutions to stabilizing the housing crisis and stabilizing the market.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is also needed to get our country back on track. I urge my colleagues to vote for a stronger economy and vote for this bill.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PUTS INFRASTRUCTURE AND AMERICA AT GREAT RISK

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the President of the Louisiana Oil and Gas Association expressing grave concern over the administration's budget proposal we were sent last week. Our Nation's oil and gas industry is not made up of the five or so Big Oil companies; instead, it is several thousand independent oil and natural gas producers. It is these companies that drill and produce the vast majority of oil and natural gas produced here in the United States.

The administration's budget proposals will strip the economic incentives that provide the investment capital that is needed to explore and produce oil and gas for our country. Without these incentives, exploration and production of oil and natural gas will drastically decline, trillions of dollars will be lost, tens of thousands of jobs will be lost, and our Nation's energy security will be severely threatened.

In my home State of Louisiana, 25 percent of the Nation's energy is produced. We are the heartbeat of our Nation's energy infrastructure. Simply put, the administration's budget proposals will put that infrastructure and our country at great risk and drive up home utilities and gas at the pump.

□ 1300

VOTE "YES" ON HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is unusually broad agreement on the fact that to stop the downward spiral of this economy, we have to act on several fronts at once in a forceful and coordinated manner.

We have addressed the need for job creation and tax relief with the economic recovery bill. We are addressing the banking crisis and credit freeze with the second round of TARP funds and the launching of the TALF program. Now we have the chance to take action on a critically important front, stabilizing housing prices. All across the country, neighborhoods are struggling as each foreclosed home reduces the value of nearby properties.

The Helping Families Save Their Homes Act will give more tools to homeowners to stay in their homes and allow judicial modifications of home mortgages. It helps families facing foreclosure stay in their homes, thus stabilizing lives, home prices, neighborhoods and restoring confidence in the economy.

I am confident that a "yes" vote on this bill is in the best interests of our American economy.

BUSINESS AS USUAL

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, later this week President Obama is expected to sign the omnibus spending bill into law. That bill contains nearly 9,000 earmarks. Now, this is unfortunate. It sends a signal that we have ushered in a new era of absolutely the same, business as usual.

I would encourage the President, if he is going to sign the omnibus bill, to at least announce a change moving forward. He could announce, for example, that he will not sign legislation in the future that contains congressionally directed no-bid contracts to private companies.

He should encourage the Congress to end the appearance of pay-to-play when no-bid contracts are given to those who give us campaign contributions. Giving no-bid contracts to our campaign donors should be beneath the dignity of this House. Now our leadership, both on the Republican and the Democratic side, has not recognized this yet, but I hope that the President does.

HELP FOR HOMEOWNERS

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is scheduled to take up H.R. 1106, the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009. While much of the controversy over this bill is focused on the title I provisions, the provisions in title II will provide safe harbor for lenders willing to modify mortgages and improve the HOPE for Homeowners program.

Allow me to dispel a few of the myths surrounding this legislation.

Myth: The bill only benefits a small number of homeowners.

Fact: This bill will actually help all homeowners by protecting their neighborhoods from the negative effects of foreclosure. Every foreclosure brings down the value of nearby homes, further eroding the equity of homeowners who are up to date on their mortgages. Millions of middle class families are just one sickness or one layoff away from a possible foreclosure.

Myth: The bill rewards bad behavior.

Fact: This bill requires homeowners to negotiate with their lenders in good faith before they can even consider applying for judicial modification of their home loan through bankruptcy.

Myth: The bill is a dramatic change in the Bankruptcy Code.

Fact: This bill equalizes the rules by treating residential bankruptcies the same as corporate, farm and vacation home bankruptcies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I'd like to remind my colleagues that while much of the controversy over this bill has fo-

cused on the Title I provisions, the provisions in Title II will help thousands of homeowners and enjoy broad support. Providing safe harbor for lenders willing to modify mortgages and improving the HOPE for Homeowners program are much-needed reforms that will help stem the tide of foreclosures and protect our neighborhoods. I would like to take a few moments to dispel some of the myths surrounding the legislation that could also be referred to as the Neighborhood Protection Act.

Myth: This bill only benefits a small number of low income homeowners or homeowners who bought more house than they could afford.

Fact: H.R. 1106 will actually help all homeowners by protecting their neighborhoods from the negative effects of foreclosure. Every foreclosure in a neighborhood brings down the value of nearby homes, further eroding the equity of homeowners who are up to date on their mortgages. Furthermore, the foreclosure crisis has spread beyond victims of the subprime crisis or individuals who purchased more home than they could afford. As President Obama noted in his address to this body, millions of middle-class families are just one sickness or one layoff away from possible foreclosure. Without the ability to sell or refinance a home with a current value lower than the mortgage value, these families are out of options.

Myth: The bill rewards bad behavior.

Fact: H.R. 1106 requires homeowners to negotiate with their lenders in good faith before they can even consider applying for a judicial modification of their home loan through bankruptcy. And the bill prevents judges from modifying loans for homeowners who have the ability to make their payments or make other bad faith efforts to game the system. The specious argument that the bill rewards bad behavior is being promoted by the banks, who themselves were rewarded for their bad behavior by the previous Administration. After receiving hundreds of billions of dollars in taxpayer bailouts, the banks should be the last to complain. This bill is designed to help families who have worked hard and played by the rules, but are trapped by declining property values and escalating job losses.

Myth: The bill enables homeowners to avoid their financial responsibilities.

Fact: H.R. 1106 allows judges to modify a mortgage only in those cases where it is truly not affordable for the homeowner and even then judges can only reduce the mortgage to the fair market value of the property. Lenders are able to recoup the fair market value of the house, plus interest, which is much better than they usually secure in a foreclosure sale.

Myth: The bill is a dramatic change in the bankruptcy code.

Fact: H.R. 1106 equalizes bankruptcy rules by treating residential bankruptcies the same as corporate, farm, and vacation home bankruptcies. H.R. 1106 will give struggling families or individuals the same right to modify the loans on their primary homes as wealthy investors have to modify the loans on their second or third properties.

Myth: The bill will dramatically increase bankruptcies.

Fact: Bankruptcy proceedings are unpleasant and scar one's credit record for years. No one looks forward to bankruptcy. And this bill provides stringent conditions, with a series of interim steps and requirements, so bankruptcy

proceedings are only used as a last resort after exhausting all other options to save a home.

Myth: This bill is another bailout for the banks and will cost taxpayers tens of billions.

Fact: H.R. 1106 actually redirects existing TARP funds from the banks to homeowners. It also will make sure the TARP funds are spent on economic recovery and neighborhood stabilization rather than salted away in some bank vault or paid to bank shareholders as dividends. This bill does exactly what the American people have asked for; it helps homeowners rather than banks and big business.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1106 is not a perfect bill, but it is one more piece in the mosaic of positive efforts we are making to turn our economy around. It is good for homeowners. It is good for the future stability of our neighborhoods. It is good for our nation's economy.

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me later today in supporting H.R. 1106.

WHERE IS THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION ON SUDAN?

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for Sudan's President Bashir, charging him with seven counts of war crimes and crimes against humanity. This is the first time the court has accused a sitting head of state of war crimes.

The world knows what's happening in Sudan and Darfur, and yet the Obama administration has failed to appoint a special envoy. I have asked him to appoint a former Senator, Bill Frist from Tennessee, who can start today. The tribunal spokesman said the crimes included, and I quote, "murdering, exterminating, raping, torturing and forcibly transferring large numbers of civilians and the pillaging of their property."

According to the U.N., an estimated 300,000 have been killed since the Darfur conflict began and 2.7 million displaced. And yet the Obama administration has failed to appoint a special envoy. As recently as just yesterday, the AP reported that in recent weeks 26,000 people have fled their homes in Darfur and flooded Zamzam refugee camps, already at 50,000.

I close by saying time is short. The killing and the devastation goes on. The administration must act. This cannot wait.

INNOVATION HAS ALWAYS BEEN A HALLMARK OF AMERICAN SUCCESS

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, innovation has always been a hallmark of American success. Innovation will transform the way we generate and store power

from renewable resources, use electricity more efficiently, and create a workforce for the 21st century.

President Obama's budget promotes the development of innovative clean energy technology, modernizes the electric grid, and provides the capital to double renewable energy generating capacity. With these investments we will change the way our country generates, uses and delivers energy. We will produce jobs throughout the United States and begin to end our dependence on foreign oil.

America's prosperity depends on bold action and investments in research and development, on our ability to adapt through innovation and on creating green jobs that will build a foundation for a clean energy economy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RECOGNIZING BEVERLY ECKERT FOR 9/11 VICTIMS WORK

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 201) recognizing Beverly Eckert's service to the Nation and particularly to the survivors and families of the September 11, 2001, attacks.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 201

Whereas on the morning of September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked and destroyed four civilian aircraft, crashing two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City and a third into the Pentagon outside Washington, DC;

Whereas the passengers and crew aboard United Flight 93 acted heroically to prevent the terrorist hijackers from taking additional American lives, by crashing the plane in Shanksville, Pennsylvania and sacrificing their own lives instead;

Whereas thousands of innocent men, women, and children were brutally murdered in the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas pursuant to Public Law 107-306, the 9/11 Commission was formed to ascertain, evaluate, and report on the evidence regarding the terrorist attacks;

Whereas the 9/11 Commission was also required in Public Law 107-306 to make a full and complete accounting of the circumstances surrounding the terrorist attacks, report on the United States' preparedness for, and immediate response to, terrorist attacks, and make findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures that could be taken to prevent, prepare, and respond to acts of terrorism;

Whereas the 9/11 Commission stated in its report that it "interviewed more than 1,200

individuals" to assist in making its recommendations;

Whereas one of the groups representing the victims, "Voices of September 11", testified before the 9/11 Commission;

Whereas Beverly Eckert was the widow of Mr. Sean Rooney, who died in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and following her husband's death, Beverly Eckert co-founded "Voices of September 11", an advocacy group for survivors and 9/11 families;

Whereas Beverly Eckert was instrumental in the development and growth of this important advocacy group, which now claims more than 5,500 members;

Whereas Beverly Eckert worked admirably with the 110th Congress and was a key proponent in the final passage of the "Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007" as the legislation to effectuate the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to prevent, prepare, and respond to acts of terrorism; and

Whereas the United States will forever be grateful for the services of Beverly Eckert and mourn her loss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges Beverly Eckert's service to the Nation and particularly to the survivors and families of the September 11, 2001, attacks;

(2) recognizes Beverly Eckert's work to help bring about implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to prepare, prevent, and respond to acts of terrorism; and

(3) extends its deepest condolences to the family of Beverly Eckert and the families of all those who lost their lives due to the crash of Continental Connection Flight 3407.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILL RAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 201, which recognizes Beverly Eckert's service to the United States of America, particularly the survivors and the families of the attack on September 11, 2001.

Ms. Eckert was the widow of Mr. Sean Rooney, who was killed in the World Trade Center on September 11. For many, the devastating loss of a partner, of a husband, would lead to a state of grief, anger, fear, paralysis.

But Beverly Eckert turned the September 11 attacks into a clarion call of government accountability and transparency, Mr. Speaker. When there were questions about what led to the attacks, Beverly Eckert demanded answers.

When some tried to dismiss her call for answers, she pressed on and cofounded the “Voices of September 11,” an advocacy group for survivors which now claims more than 5,500 members.

This led to the creation of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States—or the 9/11 Commission—and we all remember that commission led by former Congressman Lee Hamilton and, of course, Governor Tom Kean of New Jersey. Beverly Eckert did not stop there. She attended the 9/11 Commission hearings and was there when the 9/11 Commission published its findings and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to allow, because of time factors with some of the Members, two young ladies who are Members of this great body, who are always there first to recognize and sensitive to those people, the real heroes of America.

I yield 2 minutes first to Ms. SLAUGHTER from the State of New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank both gentlemen for the time.

As a New Yorker, obviously the events of September 11, 2001, are really seared in our memory, as I am sure they are in the memory of all Americans.

On February 12, this year, 2009, the Nation was shocked and saddened by the devastating plane accident in Clarence, New York, a few miles outside of Buffalo. Our thoughts and prayers will always be with the family and friends who lost loved ones on Continental Connection Flight 3407.

Today, we are here to recognize one of the persons on that plane, Beverly Eckert, who also lost her life on that day. We thank her for her tremendous service to our Nation and particularly to the survivors and families of the September 11, 2001, attacks.

Mr. Speaker, Beverly Eckert, as mentioned, was the widow of Sean Rooney, who died in the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and had been among the most visible faces of the victims’ families in the aftermath of the attacks. Following her husband’s death, she cofounded Voices of September 11, one of the first advocacy groups for the survivors of 9/11 and families.

Beverly was instrumental in the development and growth of this important group, which is now supported by more than 5,500 members. Along with other members of the Voices of September 11, she testified before the 9/11 Commission to help report on the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Beverly worked with the 110th Congress tirelessly, and she was a key proponent in enacting the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations to prevent, prepare and respond to acts of terrorism. Simply put, Beverly’s work helped to make our Nation safer and more secure.

Beverly was a passenger on Flight 3407 on her way to Buffalo to mark what would have been her husband’s

birthday and launch a scholarship in his memory. We lost an inspiring and tenacious champion in Beverly, and we must continue to honor her memory and accomplishments.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We must continue to honor her memory and accomplishments while carrying on her mission. Today we consider a resolution to acknowledge her service on behalf of the survivors and to recognize her work to help protect our Nation.

The resolution also extends condolences to the families of all those who were lost on the Continental Connection flight.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution to honor the life of Beverly Eckert, commemorating her valuable service to the 9/11 survivors and families in this country.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring Ms. Beverly Eckert.

Ms. Eckert lost her husband, Sean Rooney, on September 11, 2001. Since then, Ms. Eckert has been a tireless advocate for the families and survivors of these September 11 attacks. She is the cofounder of the nonprofit foundation Voices of September 11, which currently has more than 5,500 members.

Ms. Eckert lobbied for the establishment of the 9/11 Commission, passage of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, establishment of the WMD Commission, and the development of a memorial to the victims of the September 11 attacks at Ground Zero.

Ms. Eckert was a passenger on Continental Flight 3407, which crashed on February 12, 2009, near Buffalo, New York. Ms. Eckert, who grew up in Buffalo, was returning to her hometown to honor her husband on his 58th birthday and establish a scholarship in his name.

Ms. Eckert is survived by her three sisters, seven nephews and her one niece. My heart goes out to her family and friends. I hope they can take comfort in the fact that Ms. Eckert has been reunited with her husband.

I honor Ms. Eckert and all those who lost their lives as a result of the tragic crash of Continental Flight 3407.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

□ 1315

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his constant leadership and support for the 9/11 families and for the reforms to make our country safer and to my good friend and colleague LOUISE SLAUGHTER, who authored this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution honoring Beverly Eckert, who died in a plane crash in Buffalo going to honor the memory of her husband on his 58th birthday.

She told me the last time she spoke to him, he was in the burning towers and the fire was coming towards him. She was devoted to him. It broke her heart. But it did not break her spirit. She dedicated her life to making sure that other families did not suffer the same type of loss that she did by not protecting our citizens, by putting in place strong homeland security laws.

As the co-Chair of the 9/11 Family Steering Committee, and I was the founder and Chair of the 9/11 Commission Caucus, we worked almost daily, first to support the creation of the 9/11 Commission; then to fund it, to give it subpoena power, to give it time to do its work. And when they came back with a report that had 47 recommendations to make Americans safer, she then dedicated her life to implementing them into law. I was one of the authors of the first bill that reorganized our intelligence, the first major intelligence reorganization since 1948, to share information so that we could better prevent another attack. And then H.R. 1, which rolled all the other recommendations to make America safer into the bill, H.R. 1, the first bill that the Democratic leadership passed in the last Congress, this passed with Beverly’s leadership and support.

She worked out of my office for 4 years. She would lead vigils in front of the White House. She was at 9/11 constantly raising the need and the importance to pass this important legislation. She was a spirit. She was a leader. She was one of the finest people I have ever met. And many, many people owe a great deal of gratitude for a safer America because of her work.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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.

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

Instead of letting leaders in Washington pat themselves on the back for the 9/11 Commission, which we are apt to do, Beverly Eckert insisted on the implementation of the Commission’s recommendations. When Ms. Eckert was told that the recommendations would be difficult to implement, she was not deterred. Where she saw there were problems, she demanded and worked tirelessly for solutions. She traveled to Washington and pushed for the passage of the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act, as Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. SLAUGHTER pointed out.

To sum up, Beverly Eckert was a tenacious citizen who nudged and prodded the leaders of this Nation to look at their mistakes and implement the steps to correct them. Ms. Eckert was not interested in partisanship, fear-mongering or saber rattling. Beverly

Eckert was a woman who made sure that the death of her husband and those who died on September 11 would not be in vain. In that process she taught us all why we should not give into the fear of terrorism.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution honoring, Beverly Eckert, a great American. As a 9/11 widow, Beverly Eckert rose above a daunting challenge. America has asked her to not only overcome her grief over losing her husband, but to take on a leading role as a advocate for other victims.

Beverly Eckert, who died on February 12 in the crash of Continental Connection Flight 3407 in Clarence Center, N.Y., was co-founder of Voices of September 11, a group representing the victims of the September 11 terrorist attacks. Her husband, Sean Rooney, died in the World Trade Center. Under Eckert's leadership, Voices of September 11 grew into an influential advocacy group of more than 5,500 members. Eckert supported the work of the 9/11 Commission and urged Congress to adopt its recommendations. Less than a week before her death, she met with President Barack Obama at the White House with other terrorist victims' families to discuss changes in the government's handling of terror suspects.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure I am well aware of the importance of keeping the memory of September 11, 2001 at the forefront of our conscious.

This resolution honors Beverly Eckert for her service on behalf of September 11 victims and their families and recognizes her work to bring about the implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to prevent and respond to acts of terrorism. It extends condolences to Eckert's family and the families of all those who lost their lives in the Continental Connection Flight 3407 crash.

Certainly the irony of Beverly Eckert dying in a plane crash that appears to be weather-related is not lost on us. That does not diminish the breadth of her work over the last eight years. It is fitting that Beverly was greeted at the White House by President Obama just a week before she perished.

It is my hope Mr. Speaker that we continue to honor Beverly Eckert and the other victims of Continental Connection Flight 3407 and the terrorist attacks of 9/11 by energizing our pursuit of the terrorists who hurt our nation. We can do this by bringing to justice the perpetrators of those attacks and the forces behind them.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to our nation at this poignant time but also a moment where we can be reminded of the arduous task that this new administration faces in pursuit of terrorists and seeking to raise our profile as a nation of peace. We can be a leader in the fight against terrorism and still saving the world. We can only hope that Sean Rooney and Beverly are reunited in heaven.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a constituent and citizen activist, Beverly Eckert who lost her life in the tragic crash of flight 3407 just a few weeks ago.

In addition to being a beloved sister, aunt, and friend, Beverly, who lost her husband in

the September 11 terrorist attack on the World Trade Center, was an impressive activist and will be missed, both for her outspoken work on behalf of 9/11 victims and by those who knew and love her.

After her husband died on September 11th, Beverly co-founded Voices of September 11, a group that serves those affected by the attacks and advocates for effective response to terrorism.

In the days, weeks and years after the 9/11 attacks, Beverly was a tireless advocate for the victims' families. She spearheaded protests that led politicians to set aside more land for a memorial at Ground Zero, fought to ensure federal authorities would thoroughly probe the cause of the twin towers' collapse, and spoke eloquently again and again about her husband, Sean Rooney, and the many others who died that day.

As a member of the Family Steering Committee, a group of relatives of victims of 9/11, Eckert helped to spearhead the public fight for a 9/11 Commission to investigate the attacks.

Throughout the years, Beverly remained active in the fight against terrorism. This winter she met with President Obama at the White House along with other relatives of those killed on 9/11 and in the bombing of the USS *Cole* to discuss how the new administration would handle terror suspects.

Beverly's activism should remind all of us what the actions of one person can do. While she did not work alone, we all have her to thank for making us safer today. Her patriotism should be admired and her citizenship should serve as a model for us all.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 201.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING THE HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT ON ITS SIXTH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 195) recognizing and honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security on its sixth anniversary for their continuous efforts to keep the Nation safe.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 195

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security was created as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, to consolidate

our Nation's efforts to prevent, prepare for, protect against, respond to, and mitigate against threats to the homeland, including acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security marks its sixth year of full-scale operations on March 1, 2009;

Whereas more than 223,000 employees of the Department of Homeland Security work diligently to deter, detect, and prevent acts of terrorism and stand ready to respond to a terrorist attack, natural disaster, or other emergency;

Whereas the employees of the Department of Homeland Security are dedicated individuals who rarely receive the recognition they deserve;

Whereas the employees of the Department of Homeland Security work tirelessly to protect our Nation, frequently working long hours and sacrificing time with their loved ones;

Whereas the employees of the Department of Homeland Security support the Department's mission to secure the borders, protect critical infrastructure, share information, facilitate safe and lawful travel and trade, and work with States and localities to enhance preparedness;

Whereas the employees of the Department of Homeland Security deserve the best in training and resources to accomplish their vital mission;

Whereas the United States has not been attacked since September 11, 2001, and this is due in large part to the dedicated service of the employees of the Department of Homeland Security; and

Whereas the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their continued and steadfast efforts to secure the homeland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes and honors the employees of the Department of Homeland Security on its sixth anniversary for their continuous efforts to keep the Nation safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILL-RAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Resolution 195, a measure to honor the employees of the Department of Homeland Security and to mark the sixth anniversary of the Department's creation.

The Department of Homeland Security was tasked with the Herculean responsibility of coordinating with State, local, and tribal entities to prevent future terrorist attacks, secure our borders, and to prepare for and respond to events of national significance. Comprised of 22 different Federal agencies

and employing over 223,000 of our finest Federal employees, DHS quickly became one of the largest Federal departments.

Twenty-four hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, employees of the Department of Homeland Security are working to prevent and prepare for any threat to our country. At this very moment they are patrolling our skies, securing our borders, sailing our coastal waters, and screening people and cargo entering our country. They are also collaborating, cooperating, and coordinating with State, local, and tribal governments and first responders in all 50 States and our territories to ensure we can respond to any future large-scale events either man-made or natural. These dedicated Homeland Security employees are working tirelessly to improve the safety for all Americans and are doing a commendable job.

Department of Homeland Security employees stand willing, ready, and able to respond should catastrophe strike. They work long hours to deter, detect, and prevent acts of terrorism against the homeland. They can be sure that Congress will continue to conduct vigorous oversight of management at DHS, but I cannot stress how much we truly appreciate the work of the dedicated DHS employees working to protect the safety of all Americans.

My thanks to Congressman BILIRAKIS for introducing the resolution and to the Speaker for the time on the floor today. I encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 195 as we honor the employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security who work diligently to secure our Nation.

I'm proud to introduce this resolution with Congressman CHRIS CARNEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight, on which I serve as ranking member.

Chairman CARNEY, I look forward to working with you this Congress, and I think our subcommittee is getting off to a great start by having this resolution on the floor today.

I also want to thank Chairman THOMPSON, Ranking Member KING, and the other members of the Committee on Homeland Security who joined as cosponsors of my resolution.

My district is home to many of the department's employees, including Transportation Security officers, Customs and Border Protection officers, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, and Coast Guardsmen. I thank them for the work they do day in and day out to ensure that Florida, and our Nation, is secure.

These employees often do not receive the recognition they deserve. The fact that our Nation has not been attacked

since September 11, 2001, is due to their tireless efforts. They work long hours, often sacrificing time with their loved ones, to get the job done.

In 2006 the Department of Homeland Security ranked nearly last in the Office of Personnel Management's Federal Human Capital Survey, showing overwhelming employee dissatisfaction and low morale. Since that time the department, under former Secretary Chertoff's leadership, has worked to address these issues, and I'm pleased to report their efforts are paying off.

The Office of Personnel Management recently released the results of the 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey, and the department showed improvement in nearly every category of the survey, ranking in the top five of most improvement among Federal agencies. The largest increase came in the job satisfaction indices, evidencing a much-needed increase in employee morale.

This is great news, but more work needs to be done, Mr. Speaker. The department will now use the results of this survey to further improve working conditions at the department and within its components. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight, I look forward to working with the department and Chairman CARNEY to address the concerns of the employees, improve morale, and foster a "one DHS" culture, so very important. The department's employees deserve nothing less, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in honoring the hardworking men and women of the Department of Homeland Security by supporting this resolution.

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

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

As you have heard, Mr. BILIRAKIS and I discussed the Department of Homeland Security and the importance of the employees and the incredible talents that they represent in protecting us 24/7/365. It's actually the most important job we have in this country right now. They are keeping the borders safe. They are making sure we are not attacked, and they have prevented the attacks since 9/11. That in combination with our support will make them the finest domestic force that we have.

I encourage every Member of this body to vote for H. Res. 195.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 195.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, it is an honor for me to join Mr. BILIRAKIS in recognizing the employees of the Department of Homeland Security on the sixth anniversary of the Department's inception.

Since its creation, the Department's mission has continued to grow and evolve. While the initial impetus for the Department's creation was the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11th, the Department has since grown into an

agency that is charged with not only protecting us from terrorism, but also protecting us from dangerous goods, emerging threats, and coordinating response to catastrophic incidents.

Despite a host of challenges and repeated internal reorganization, the Department's employees have worked tirelessly to ensure continued security for all Americans. Their dedication in the face of frequent internal adversity is to be commended.

The Department's employee workforce represents hundreds of occupations, from scientists to emergency managers to border patrol agents to economists. And, although the make-up of the Department is diverse and employee responsibilities are plentiful, all of its employees are united in carrying out the Department's mission to protect the American people, reduce the risk of terrorist attacks, and enhance the Nation's preparedness and response capabilities.

I pledge to them, that I will continue to work to ensure that employees have the necessary resources and training to do their jobs. These dedicated individuals should also be afforded with full protections and rights that are given to other employees in the federal government.

As the Chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I have repeatedly challenged the Department's senior leaders to make the Department a top-notch agency. I believe that the Department's workforce cannot be taken for granted.

With the change in leadership at DHS, there is a real opportunity to improve morale by investing in the men and women that help keep the nation secure. I look forward to working with Secretary Napolitano and the rest of the Department's leadership to make sure that they get the training, resources, and support that they need.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution and thank the men and women who make up the Department of Homeland Security for their constant vigilance and commitment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for an opportunity to speak on an important anniversary. As we honor the Department of Homeland Security we also take the time to salute the nearly 223,000 employees who make up the agencies staff. I recently had the pleasure of meeting the new Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano and made sure to mention how proud I am of her staff.

Congress created the Homeland Security Department as a result of the tragic events of September 11, consolidating the nation's efforts to prevent, prepare for, protect against, respond to, and mitigate threats to the homeland. On March 1, 2003, the Homeland Security Department united 22 agencies, and 2009 marks its sixth year of full-scale operations.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure I am well aware of the sacrifice and diligence of the more than 223,000 Homeland Security employees who work in the department. This resolution recognizes and honors the employees of the Homeland Security Department on its sixth anniversary for their continuous efforts to keep the nation safe.

Our nation has remained safe since the terrorist attacks thanks to the hard work, fastidious attention to detail and dedication of the many employees of this Department.

The day-to-day tedium that the professionals at the Department of Homeland Security only serve to underscore how vital they

are as a protective force. Mr. Speaker, they truly are on the frontlines, at our nation's busiest ports. They are the people who make sure that our children can walk home from that little red schoolhouse; they are the people who allow us to exercise our constitutional right to travel freely and associate with whom we like; they are the people who allow us to proclaim loudly that "I have the right to free speech," to essentially be American.

I would also be remiss if I did not take note of some of the tasks that the department faces this year onward. The Department of Homeland Security is an integral part of the plan to increase usage of safer and more efficient mass transit. We must utilize our federal dollars to improve our rail and over-the-road bus systems. We must work to ensure safe package by training workers to be the best they can and to continue to take pride in their work. These improvements must be modernized to be the best security and safety systems.

The Transportation Worker Identification Credential or TWIC program must be updated to allow for seamless processing for our workers most of whom depend on their jobs to feed their families. Border and Maritime security is the absolute beginning of what it means to be a safe country.

Transportation Security Administration or TSA workers must continue to be better trained because they are on the frontlines of our nation's airport security. These workers must also be afforded the opportunity to have collective bargaining rights if they chose and the ability to report fraud, corruption and wrongdoing. That is the essence of the whistleblower protections which we just voted to include in H.R. 1 that I fought for and will continue to press, and yes, even in a Democratic administration. Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the laundry list of items that Secretary Napolitano and her staff will tackle in the coming months and years. I am confident though that they are up to the task of making the Department of Homeland Security an even better federal agency.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to declare my support for the employees of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and to thank them for their important service to our country. I recognize that their tireless work and dedication often keep them from their families and loved ones. Accordingly I wish to thank them for the sacrifices they make in their service to our nation.

However, I believe it is important to point out that more must be done to support all of the employees at DHS. In 2003 the former administration terminated the collective bargaining rights of TSA screeners just as TSA workers were ready to vote on joining the union of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE). Transportation security workers deserve collective bargaining rights. It is an insult to these dedicated men and women within DHS, including FEMA and Border Patrol, that their rights to organize have been denied. Transportation Security Officers deserve the same collective bargaining rights enjoyed by other employees of the Federal workforce.

I unequivocally appreciate the dedicated service of DHS employees. Their hard work and commitment to public service is outstanding and valuable.

Mr. CARNEY. 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. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 195.

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. BILIRAKIS. 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 MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 14) supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 14

Whereas multiple sclerosis can impact men and women of all ages, races, and ethnicities; Whereas more than 400,000 Americans live with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas approximately 2,500,000 people worldwide have been diagnosed with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas every hour of every day, someone is newly diagnosed with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas the exact cause of multiple sclerosis is still unknown;

Whereas the symptoms of multiple sclerosis are unpredictable and vary from person to person;

Whereas there is no diagnostic laboratory test available for multiple sclerosis;

Whereas multiple sclerosis is not genetic, contagious, or directly inherited, but studies show there are genetic factors that indicate certain individuals are susceptible to the disease;

Whereas multiple sclerosis symptoms occur when an immune system attack affects the myelin in nerve fibers of the central nervous system, damaging or destroying it and replacing it with scar tissue, thereby interfering with or preventing the transmission of nerve signals;

Whereas in rare cases multiple sclerosis is so progressive it is fatal;

Whereas there is no known cure for multiple sclerosis;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, an affiliation of multiple sclerosis organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life for all those affected by multiple sclerosis, recognizes, and celebrates Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition's mission is to increase opportunities for cooperation and provide greater opportunity to leverage the effective use of resources for the benefit of the multiple sclerosis community;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and celebrates Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during 1 week in March every calendar year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are to invite people to join the movement to end multiple sclerosis, encourage everyone to do something to demonstrate their commitment to moving toward a world free of multiple sclerosis, and to acknowledge those who have dedicated their time and talent to help promote multiple sclerosis research and programs; and

Whereas this year Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 2, 2009 through March 8, 2009: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages the President to issue a proclamation in support of the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages States, territories, possessions of the United States, and localities to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(4) encourages media organizations to participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week and help educate the public about multiple sclerosis;

(5) commends the efforts of the States, territories, and possessions of the United States who support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(6) recognizes and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to combating multiple sclerosis by promoting awareness about its causes and risks and by promoting new education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to medical treatment; and

(7) recognizes all people in the United States living with multiple sclerosis, expresses gratitude to their family members and friends who are a source of love and encouragement to them, and salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who provide assistance to those so afflicted and continue to work to find cures and improve treatments.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleague the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. CAPPs, for yielding me the time. As a former nurse, Congresswoman CAPPs understands very, very well what people with multiple sclerosis must go through. I appreciate her work in managing this resolution. I thank her for her advocacy on behalf of people with MS and for working to ensure that everyone has access to quality, affordable

health care in America. Thank you, Congresswoman CAPPS.

I also want to thank my colleagues Congressman RUSS CARNAHAN and Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS, the co-chairs of the Multiple Sclerosis Caucus in the House, for working with me on this resolution and for keeping the Congress focused on MS issues. This is really a bipartisan issue, and I appreciate both of my colleagues for working together to make sure that it stays that way.

I also have to thank the over 110 cosponsors who joined with us to champion MS Awareness Week and who made the consideration of this resolution today possible on the suspension calendar. In particular I want to thank Chairman HENRY WAXMAN and Ranking Member JOE BARTON and their staffs for agreeing to bring this resolution straight to the floor, and, of course, to Christos Tsentas on my staff, who understands this issue very well and has shepherded us through this process.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't mention the work also of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition and in particular the National MS Society and its staff, especially Shawn O'Neail, for leading the charge to create MS Awareness Week and for helping us with this resolution. And, of course, I have to thank all of those who are living and suffering with multiple sclerosis and all of the friends and family and loved ones who care for them and take care of them when they are in need. This resolution is about commending you as well. And let me just say I have to thank my dear sister Mildred for teaching me what it is like to live with multiple sclerosis.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman CAPPS, I called my sister and I talked to her before I was going to share her story to make sure that she didn't have a problem with any privacy issues, and she said to me, "Barbara, if there is anything you can do to raise awareness about the condition that not only myself has, but many, many, many Americans, then just do it and share what I have to tell you." So this is her story, coming from my sister Mildred.

She said to me, "You know, it is so frustrating to go to a doctor and for me to ask a doctor a question about the symptoms of my disease and the doctor says 'I just don't know.'" She said at first she thought the doctors were just putting her off, but come to find out the doctors just don't know.

So this bill is for all of the times that she told me she gets up in the morning, and this is very typical of MS patients, she gets up in the morning and wonders whether she will be able to walk that day. Let me just say for all of the times that she is in remission, dreading the next flare-up, she said to me that every day she wonders what is going to trigger the return of her symptoms.

Mr. Speaker, she also said to me that it is very important that we raise awareness about MS and that we do more outreach and more public edu-

cation, more research, and really provide for more care for MS patients and more supportive services. My sister, I believe she was diagnosed when she was about 26 or 27. She didn't tell me I could tell her age, so I won't do that, but she is a year younger than I am and 2 years ago I celebrated the 21st anniversary of my 39th birthday. So you can figure that out.

She has been living a productive and fruitful life. She has learned about the treatments and medications. Fortunately, she has had access to some of the best, and she wants everybody to have access to the types of treatment she has had. But she also recognizes there may or may not be a cure during her lifetime, and that this Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, which we designated for March 2 to March 8, is really the beginning of this effort. So, for that she is deeply grateful, like I know all MS patients are throughout the country.

Some people may not know what multiple sclerosis is. Let me just explain a little bit about it, because this resolution is about raising awareness.

MS is a chronic, unpredictable disease of the central nervous system. It is thought to be an autoimmune disorder where the immune system incorrectly attacks healthy nerve fibers of the central nervous system, interfering with transmission of nerve signals throughout the body. People with MS can experience a range of symptoms that can either have permanent or intermittent damage, depending on the type of MS that they have. These symptoms can include blurred vision, loss of balance, poor coordination, slurred speech, tremors, numbness, extreme fatigue, problems with memory and concentration, paralysis, blindness and more.

Most people are diagnosed with MS between the ages of 20 to 50, just as my sister was, though there is no actual diagnostic laboratory test for multiple sclerosis. I remember my sister was diagnosed by the process of elimination, given all the tests that were available then. Given the range of symptoms that occur, it is also quite common for someone to be misdiagnosed, and typically it takes about 10 years to receive a correct diagnosis.

There are over 400,000 people, 400,000 people, throughout the United States suffering from MS, and worldwide over 2.5 million cases have been diagnosed. But the real numbers of people living with MS are almost certainly higher.

Although MS is largely characterized as a disease that affects Caucasian populations, it does occur among African Americans and other minority groups and can be quite severe. As my sister said, it is a disease that really does need to come out of the closet for people of color. Because people of color tend to access the health care system less frequently, they may not get diagnosed at the rates they should.

Let me just say, our First Lady, Michelle Obama, her dad, Mr. Frasier

Robinson, had multiple sclerosis, so our First Family clearly understands the need for this awareness and for outreach efforts and for more resources put forth toward really finding the cause and cure of MS.

The causes of MS are unknown, though there are an unusually high number of MS cases among Gulf War veterans. There is no cure for the disease.

So the resolution that we are considering today will support the work of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition in raising awareness about MS by urging States, localities and the media to participate in MS Awareness Week. Also we are pleased that the defense appropriations bill included \$5 million to fund research into multiple sclerosis among our veterans, so I look forward to working with Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA to ensure that these funds are well used.

Again, let me thank all of my colleagues for their support. It is very timely and urgent that we consider this. On behalf of my sister Mildred, who lives in Las Vegas, Nevada, and all of those individuals throughout the country with MS, let me just thank you so much for your leadership and for this resolution.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 14, supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. I certainly want to commend my colleague from California, Representative BARBARA LEE, for introducing this very important and very timely resolution.

As many of you are now aware, this week is Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, and I would encourage everyone listening today and all Americans to take some time and reflect on this disease and its impact on our families, our friends and our society.

Representative LEE talked about her sister and what the family has gone through, and I think as a physician, although I am not a neurologist, I think she explained it, Mr. Speaker, perfectly in regard to her description of the disease of multiple sclerosis. I know to her disappointment it really hasn't changed much over the 10 or 15 years since her sister came down with the disease. It is still a diagnosis of exclusion. It is hard. There is no marker, there is no blood marker, and it is very difficult. So the points that BARBARA LEE brought out are absolutely accurate and very informative.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no one in my family that suffered from multiple sclerosis. I have had some very close friends who suffer from it and are doing well. But as Representative LEE pointed out, it comes and goes. They have good days and bad days. One man, a great friend, is in a wheelchair and has been for many years, but he has had children and grandchildren. Another lady is a very good friend as well and she has had children.

But, again, this is a disease that can end up ultimately as bad as something like Lou Gehrig's disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. It doesn't often progress to that extreme degree, but I indeed had a first cousin about my age who died from Lou Gehrig's disease, so I am very much aware of this condition and very supportive of this resolution regarding multiple sclerosis.

MS and other chronic diseases like it, they change lives, and it presents significant challenges for those who suffer, for them and for their families, as BARBARA LEE mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, MS is a chronic disease that attacks the central nervous system. Essentially MS heavily impairs and prevents nerve cells in the brain and in the spinal cord from communicating with each other. They just can't make that connection. So those symptoms that she described, from numbness in the limbs, loss of vision, and, yes, even eventually paralysis in some cases, are very unpredictable, and, of course, it can vary from person to person.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for the 400,000 Americans living with MS, the cause of the disease, as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, remains unknown. But I want to recognize and applaud the work currently underway at NIH, the National Institutes of Health, and other medical research institutions across the country to improve the lives of people with multiple sclerosis. There is little doubt that our collective resolve to find a cure remains undeterred, as demonstrated by this great resolution.

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

Mrs. CAPPES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the co-Chair of the Multiple Sclerosis Caucus, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership and work on this. I am very proud and honored to be co-Chair of the Congressional MS Caucus with my colleague Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS. This is truly a bipartisan effort and one that just had tremendous resources and support from around the country to help raise this awareness. I encourage everyone to show their commitment and support of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week and the MS movement with really simple actions throughout this week, MS Awareness Week, March 2 through 8.

MS Awareness Week was created by the MS Coalition to raise national awareness about the disease and to recognize those who have dedicated their time and talent to promoting MS research and programs.

In order to raise awareness, I am very pleased that Representative BARBARA LEE has taken the lead to introduce H. Con. Res. 14, recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of MS Awareness Week, encouraging the President, State and local governments

to issue proclamations designating MS Awareness Week, and encouraging the media to help educate the public about MS. Today, I ask for all of my colleagues' support.

I want to give a special thanks to the MS Society back in St. Louis, Missouri, my home, that has been so active and been so helpful to me in this effort, and also want to remember my first cousin, Betty Carnahan, who we lost years ago and who first helped me learn about this disease.

Because of small gestures by everyday people, my colleagues in this body, and cutting edge research by our Nation's finest, each day people living with MS have a better and a brighter future to look forward to.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

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

I wish to speak on H. Con. Res. 14 by rising in support of it, as I do, in recognition and support of the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, and I do so on behalf of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of the Central Coast of California, which does such great work in raising awareness of the issue and raising funds to support their work and the work of the Society across the country, and also in providing vital services to those afflicted with multiple sclerosis who are my constituents.

This week of awareness and recognition takes place from March 2nd to March 8th, and it is an honor to speak on behalf of this awareness, commending as I do my colleague from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, whom we heard, who introduced this resolution along with the cochairs of the Multiple Sclerosis Caucus, Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. BURGESS.

□ 1345

Many of us have very special people in our lives who live every day with MS. I know I do, and I'm thinking right now particularly of one young friend.

Multiple sclerosis, as we have been discussing, is a chronic and unpredictable disease of the central nervous system. Four hundred thousand people throughout the United States and 2½ million around the world are suffering today from multiple sclerosis. It's thought to be an autoimmune disorder where the immune system incorrectly attacks healthy nerve fibers of the central nervous system, interfering with transmission of nerve signals throughout the body.

People with MS, as we know, experience a range of symptoms that can be either permanent or intermittent, depending on the type of disease that they have. These symptoms can include blurred vision, loss of balance, poor coordination, slurred speech, tremors, numbness, extreme fatigue, problems with memory and concentration, paralysis, blindness and more. And as we have heard from Barbara

Lee's sister's story, it's very hard to diagnose, and often takes years to do that. And it afflicts people, often women, between the ages of 20 to 50.

There is no actual diagnostic laboratory test for multiple sclerosis, and so many questions about it. It's quite commonly misdiagnosed.

Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week was created by the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, a group of affiliated organizations, to help raise awareness and to leverage additional resources to fight this disease.

The resolution we are considering today will support the work of this coalition by urging States, localities and the media to participate in MS Awareness Week, and by encouraging people, including Members of Congress, to educate themselves about the disease.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 14.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONTH

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 45) raising awareness and promoting education on the criminal justice system by establishing March as "National Criminal Justice Month".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 45

Whereas there are approximately three million Americans employed within the justice system;

Whereas approximately seven million adults are on probation, parole, or are incarcerated;

Whereas millions of Americans have been victims of crime and, consequently, lost income, incurred medical expenses, and suffered emotionally;

Whereas the cost of crime to individuals, communities, businesses, and the various

levels of government exceeds the billions of dollars spent each year in administering the criminal justice system;

Whereas, in 2006, fifty percent of Americans admitted they fear that their home would be burglarized when they are not home; thirty-four percent of American women feared that they would be sexually assaulted; and forty-four percent of Americans feared they would be a victim of a terrorist attack;

Whereas approximately thirty-five percent of Americans have very little or no confidence in the criminal justice system and the negative effects of crime in regard to confidence in governmental agencies and overall social stability are immeasurable;

Whereas crime rates have dropped since the early 1990s, but most Americans believe that the rate of crime is increasing;

Whereas Federal, State, and local governments increased their spending for police protection, corrections, judicial, and legal activities in fiscal year 2005 by 5.5 percent or \$204 billion; and

Whereas there is a need to educate Americans and to promote awareness within American society as to the causes and consequences of crime, as well as the strategies and developments for preventing and responding to crime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) National Criminal Justice Month provides an opportunity to educate Americans on the criminal justice system; and

(B) Americans should be aware of the causes and consequences of crime, how to prevent crime, and how to respond to crime; and

(2) the House of Representatives urges policymakers, criminal justice officials, educators, victim service providers, nonprofits, community leaders, and others to promote awareness of how to prevent and respond to crime through National Criminal Justice Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Congressman TED POE of Texas for introducing this legislation.

Establishing March 2009 as National Criminal Justice Month will help increase awareness of the harmful effects of crime, not only on the immediate victims, but on our society as a whole. It will also help bring public focus on the need to make our criminal justice system as effective as possible, not only in responding to crime, but in helping to reduce its incidence.

Millions of Americans have been victimized by crime. Millions more are on

parole, on probation, or incarcerated. And our Nation spends billions of dollars each year on efforts to address crime. And yet too many Americans say they have little confidence in the criminal justice system.

There are a number of steps we can take to address this lack of confidence. For one, we could invest more resources in education. Educated Americans not only have more opportunities, they also have a greater appreciation of the effects they have on the world around them, and they certainly have a much dramatically lower incidence of criminal behavior.

By failing to invest in education, we have allowed a cradle-to-prison pipeline to develop. What we should be building is a cradle-to-college pipeline instead. And we see the unfortunate results on any given day, over 2½ million incarcerated in our prisons, almost all of them poor, almost two-thirds of them African American or Latino.

There's another thing we need to do, and that's to focus beyond the step of incarceration and to think about rehabilitation, keeping first-time offenders from becoming repeat offenders. That requires investing meaningfully in vocational training, education, counseling and other skills development that prisoners need in order to re-enter society and become productive citizens.

Congress took an important step in that direction last year when it passed the Second Chance Act. Now we need to follow through with adequate funding to make its promises take hold.

Third, I think it's time we acknowledge the failure of the so-called War on Drugs as our government has fought it over the last few decades. Increasingly stiffer and stiffer sentences for non-violent drug offenses hasn't worked, not to significantly reduce illegal drug use or the criminal enterprise that has grown up to feed it. It's worked only to swell the prison population.

It's time that we brought more of the focus on intervention, treatment and yes, fact-based education to come to grips with the drug problem. The Drug Courts program has been more successful in curtailing recidivism because of its focus on treatment. Studies show that those sent to Drug Court have a 1-year recidivism rate, only one-sixth as high as those sent to prison for a similar offense.

I believe making this month National Criminal Justice Month can help the many in our communities who are dedicating themselves to reducing crime bring greater awareness to their efforts.

I encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 45 as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of this resolution, House Resolution 45. The goal of this resolution is to raise awareness and promote education of our criminal

justice system by establishing March 2009 as National Criminal Justice Month.

It's important to educate Americans about our criminal justice system and encourage discussion on how to prevent and respond to criminal conduct. That's why this legislation has been introduced.

As a former prosecutor and judge, I've been involved in the criminal justice system for a long time, 8 years as a prosecutor and 22 years as a criminal court judge in Houston, Texas. And this resolution will encourage communities to discuss the causes, consequences and long-term effects of criminal conduct in our country.

It is important for us to talk about why guilty defendants should receive appropriate punishment for their acts, but we should also do everything in our power to make sure victims receive the assistance that they need. After all, long after the crime is committed, a victim still has to face devastating consequences. Sometimes victims are sentenced to a life of misery because of the crime that was committed against them.

We have the responsibility to protect the lives of the innocent, and to advocate on behalf of crime victims. That is why I've established the bipartisan Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my friend, JIM COSTA from California. The mission of the Caucus is to ensure that victims and law enforcement have a voice in Congress.

Every year, millions of Americans become victims of crime. Those crimes range from robbery to homicide. Unfortunately, these people don't choose to become victims of crime, but they are picked by someone else in our community as prey. And suddenly they are thrust into the criminal justice system without having a say.

Victims of crime have no high-dollar lobbyist in Washington, D.C. They look to Members of Congress to advocate on their behalf. And the purpose of the system is to provide justice for victims and defendants, because the same Constitution that protects defendants of crime protects crime victims as well. People who commit crimes against the rule of law, which is our society's rule of law, should be held accountable for their actions.

In addition, by establishing March 2009 as National Criminal Justice Month, this resolution will also recognize and applaud the efforts of law enforcement officials, judges, court staff, and the many probation officers throughout the country who work with offenders to help them reintegrate into our community.

Throughout my years of service, I've been impressed with the professionalism and dedication of the public servants who work in the criminal justice system. These brave and dedicated Americans work every day to make our communities a better and safer community, and they work with defendants to help them turn their lives around.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I have no additional speakers, so I would continue to reserve if the gentleman has speakers.

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

Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Justice statistics, 35 percent of Americans have little or no confidence in our criminal justice system. It is unfortunate that one-third of the people in this country feel that way. And we shouldn't be surprised because that's all that they hear when they turn on their local news at night is crime and violence. It's mostly bad news about crimes being committed in their communities and across the Nation.

But the reality is that crime rates have dropped dramatically since the 1990s. However, because of what people hear and see on the news, most Americans believe the crime rate is actually increasing. It is important to recognize the gains we have made in combating crime across the country, and Americans should have more confidence in this criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I've traveled to multiple countries and observed the way their criminal justice system operates. I've been in China, and back in the 1980s I was in the former Soviet Union. I would say that neither one of those countries has a justice system. They just have a system. And our criminal justice system is the best in the world. Not only is it unmatched in its ability to determine the guilt of an individual, but also in the way it assures the rights of defendants and victims in a court of law.

This resolution will encourage people across America to talk about the ways to prevent and respond to criminal conduct. And in doing that, it will help restore people's faith in the best justice system in the world, and that's the one that we have in this country because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I once again commend the gentleman for introducing this legislation. I urge its passage. I share his enthusiasm for our system of justice, that preserves the rights of the defendant but also elevates the needs of the victims for justice.

We honor those who work in our system, be they judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, police officers, and I would say, yes, also drug treatment people who are trying to prevent crime from recurring. So this month celebrates those in our community who serve in the criminal justice system. They deserve our thanks.

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. ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend

the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 45.

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. POE of Texas. 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.

EXTENDING CERTAIN IMMIGRATION PROGRAMS

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1127) to extend certain immigration programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1127

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL IMMIGRANT NONMINISTER RELIGIOUS WORKER PROGRAM.

Subclauses (II) and (III) of section 101(a)(27)(C)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C)(ii)) are amended by striking "March 6, 2009," each place such term appears and inserting "September 30, 2009,".

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF FOREIGN COUNTRY RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL GRADUATES.

Section 220(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) is amended by striking "March 6, 2009" and inserting "September 30, 2009".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1127 extends two immigration programs, one for religious workers and one for doctors who serve in medically underserved areas, through the end of this fiscal year. If we do not extend these programs, they will sunset on March 6, 2009, just 3 days from today. These programs are too important to let expire.

The Special Immigrant Non-Minister Religious Worker Program allows reli-

gious workers to enter the United States to do important work. The 5,000 religious workers eligible for these visas each year are called to a vocation or are in traditional religious occupations with bona fide nonprofit religious organizations. They are missionaries, counselors, instructors, and pastoral care providers. Considering the current economic crisis we are experiencing and the degree to which Americans are turning to religious organizations for help, these religious workers are needed now more than ever.

The other program is the so-called Conrad "J Waiver," a critically important immigration program that helps medically underserved communities attract highly skilled physicians. This program is crucial to the States as it helps them attract doctors who have received their medical training in the United States to work in areas that desperately need doctors.

Its importance was demonstrated again a year and a half ago when a tornado utterly destroyed the town of Greensburg, Kansas. Without this program, that town would not have had any doctors. They were of tremendous help in keeping casualties to a minimum. We need to keep this program going so that States can attract medical talent and can keep the doors of small town clinics open.

Both of these programs have strong bipartisan support, and this bill would extend the programs through the end of the fiscal year when the issue can be revisited, hopefully, in a much broader context.

I commend committee Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH for his work in making this a bipartisan measure. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California for introducing this very important legislation, this commonsense legislation, to help the medical community but, more importantly, to help those who are medically ill throughout the United States and the rest of the world. So I support H.R. 1127, which reauthorizes two deserving programs through the end of this fiscal year.

Foreign citizens who participate in medical residencies in the United States on what is called the "J" visa exchange program must generally leave the United States at the conclusion of their residencies and reside abroad for 2 years before they can be allowed to return to this country. The intent is to encourage American-trained foreign doctors to go home to improve health conditions and advance the medical profession in their native countries.

In 1994, Congress created a waiver of this 2-year foreign residence requirement, and this waiver was available, if requested, by the State departments of public health for foreign doctors who

are committed to practicing medicine for 3 years in areas having a shortage of health care professionals. This program has been very successful, and Congress has extended the waiver on multiple occasions.

This waiver's current authorization expires this Friday. The gentlelady from California, with this legislation, reauthorizes the waiver until September 30, 2009, the end of the fiscal year.

This bill also extends the authorization for certain religious worker immigrant visas. The Immigration and Nationality Act makes available green cards each year to special immigrant religious workers. This program allows religious denominations in the United States to bring in needed religious workers—both ministers and those working in religious occupations or vocations—so long as the workers have been performing those functions for at least 2 previous years.

The non-minister categories were added by the 1990 immigration bill, and Congress has extended their authorization several times since then. However, the authorization also expires this Friday. This bill extends the program through September 30, 2009, the end of the fiscal year. These visas assist many American religious denominations to meet the needs of their followers.

Because this bill reauthorizes two worthy immigration programs, I urge my colleagues to support this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must stand in opposition to allowing immigration extensions or reforms without addressing a temporary extension of the H-2B returning worker program.

The H-2B visa program was created to provide access to nonimmigrant, temporary workers for seasonal and peak load needs when no American workers can be found. Foreign workers offer small and seasonal businesses short-term help, and they return to their home countries at the end of the season. H-2B visas are capped at 66,000 visas per year. Even with 66,000 visas per year, it does not meet the labor needs of seasonal businesses.

To help fill these needs, Congress established the H-2B returning worker program in 2005. This program exempts returning workers who have received an H-2B visa in one of three previous fiscal years from counting against the 66,000 cap. However, this exemption expired on September 30, 2007. In the 110th Congress, this exemption had the support of 158 bipartisan Members of Congress—88 Democrats and 70 Republicans. In the 111th Congress, the bill has just been introduced, and we already have the support of 32 Democrats and 23 Republicans. As of January 7, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services had already received enough

visa petitions to exceed the cap for H-2B visas for the second half of this fiscal year.

This demand highlights the immediate need for Congress to extend the H-2B visa returning worker program to help small and seasonal businesses fill their seasonal labor needs and to keep full-time Americans and businesses working. These returning workers have provided relief to small businesses throughout the Nation, covering a broad spectrum of industries like landscapers, tourism, restaurants, hotels, and seafood processors.

H-2B workers offer short-term help. They cannot and do not stay in the United States. More importantly, the H-2B program contains strong provisions to ensure American workers have the first chance to work.

Without an extension of the returning worker program, small and seasonal businesses will face significant labor shortages this year as they did last year. We have constantly been told we cannot bring this bill to the floor until we address comprehensive immigration. Then why are we bringing up the J-1 program when we're letting H-2B expire?

Therefore, regrettably, I must oppose H.R. 1127.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. SMITH of Texas).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1127, but I also agree with STEVE KING, the ranking member of the immigration subcommittee, about the need for religious worker reciprocity. Some countries that send religious workers to the United States refuse entry to religious workers from the United States and do not allow for the free exercise of religion.

Each year, the U.S. Commission of International Religious Freedom compiles a list of countries that seek to control religious thought and expression, that show open hostility to religious minorities and that fail to protect certain religious groups. The 2008 list includes Burma, North Korea, Iran, Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

One way to help advance religious freedom is to do as Representative KING suggests and prevent citizens of countries that are hostile to religious freedom from participating in our religious worker visa program. Both the Special Immigrant Non-Minister Religious Worker Program and the rural J-1 visa waiver program are set to expire this Friday, March 6. H.R. 1127 extends both programs until September 30, 2009.

The J-1 visa program provision waives the 2-year foreign residency requirement for foreign doctors who are willing to serve in medically underserved areas. The waiver program enables people in rural and in intercity communities to have access to quality medical care. The Special Immigrant Non-Minister Religious Worker Program allows 5,000 religious workers per

year to enter the United States to assist churches and other religious establishments.

While I support the program, I have long been concerned about the level of fraud. In 2006, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Office conducted an assessment on the religious worker visa program. They selected 220 religious workers at random and found fraud in one-third of the cases. In addition, they found "many of the cases reviewed had multiple fraud indicators." In 32 of the fraudulent cases, the religious institution was not bona fide. It either did not exist or it existed only on paper. Thirty-nine of the fraudulent cases were marked by fraudulent supporting documentation or material misrepresentations within a document by a legitimate religious institution.

The Department of Homeland Security issued a final rule last November, making several changes designed to reduce fraud in the program. Immigration Chairwoman LOFGREN and I are awaiting a report by the DHS inspector general regarding the effectiveness of those fraud prevention measures. I hope we will address concerns about fraud and will also ensure that reciprocity is contained in any future extension of the religious worker visa program.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in support of this legislation, and I do so with some sadness because I agree with the point made on the H-2B visa by the gentleman from Michigan.

However, within this J-1 bill before us, H.R. 1127, is legislation to extend the Conrad 30 program, which expires on March 6, 2009. Now, that is a program, the basis of which many foreign medical professionals presently serving in many medically underserved areas, including in North Dakota, are here. So if we don't get this done in time—and let's face it. March 6, 2009 is right on our head right now—we raise havoc with the delivery of medical care through many rural underserved areas. We are literally talking about the medical professionals having to pack up and go home. We've worked mighty hard to get them there in the first place. If we lose them, they may never come back.

What's more: What about the patients in these rural clinics this afternoon who are seeing their physicians? What if the physician is gone and care is disrupted?

There are many ways to make a point, but we have got something that could be, for many, a matter of life and death, and that's keeping these medical professionals in the rural area by extending for 6 months this Conrad State 30 Program. It's just too important. We need it too badly.

So I urge the enactment of this legislation, giving us 6 more months on that

program. Then I urge us to take the gentleman's point and pass the H-2B visa reform.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration (Mr. KING of Iowa).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we're here to address the extension of these two programs, including the religious worker visa program extension, which is set up to authorize now until September 30 of this year, until the end of this fiscal year.

I had recommended that we bring this bill back before committee for the purposes of a markup so that we could reevaluate the policy. We have had hearings on this subject matter in the previous Congress, and we all know that the actions of the previous Congress don't color the existing Congress.

The history of the religious worker visa program has had some problems with fraud. It was created in 1990, but from the beginning, it has been a magnet for people who want to perpetrate a scam on America's immigration system.

According to the State Department's Bureau of Consular Affairs—and this is dated September of 2005, their Fraud Digest—"The religious worker visas are known as some of the most difficult to adjudicate."

The Fraud Digest then goes on to discuss various cases in which people were prosecuted for fraudulent use of the program, the religious worker program. For instance, in 2004, a Venezuelan national was convicted in Virginia visa fraud. He had filed 179 fraudulent petitions for religious ministers. In addition to creating fraudulent certificates of ordination, diplomas and other supporting documentation, he also obtained valid 501(c)(3) tax exemptions from recognized religious organizations without their knowledge.

The immigration subcommittee has long been aware of the fraud in this program. Mr. Speaker, I take you back to a 1997 GAO investigation which was requested by the subcommittee. The State Department conducted a field inquiry to get the views of consular offices as to the level and type of fraud. In 41 percent of the 83 responding posts, some type of fraud or abuse was acknowledged. The State Department also noted that, under the program's regulations, "almost anyone involved with a church, aside from the explicitly excluded occupations of cleaning, maintenance and support staff . . . arguably could qualify as a religious worker."

□ 1415

This clearly wasn't the intent of the program. It doesn't remain the intent of the program that will, I think, likely be reauthorized today.

When the GAO released its final report in 1999, the agency noted that the types of fraud often encountered in the processing of religious worker visas "involved petitioners making false

statements about the length of time that the applicant was a member of the religious organization and the nature of the qualifying experience."

The report went on to state that "evidence uncovered by INS suggests that some of these organizations exist solely as a means to carry out immigration fraud." That was then. This is more current.

Recently, I will say in July of 2006, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service's Office of Fraud Detection and National Security conducted a fraud benefit assessment on the Religious Worker Visa Program. They selected 220 cases at random—of which we're very familiar with on the committee—they found an astonishing 33 percent fraud rate. That's one of every three were fraudulently based. In 32 of the fraudulent cases, the religious institution either didn't exist or only existed on paper. And 39 of the fraudulent petitions included fraudulent supporting documentation or material representations within a document.

Other instances of fraud included cases where the petitioner could not be located or connected to any religious entity and where the petitioning religious entity was unaware that the petition had been filed and was unaware of the beneficiary.

Also in the modern era, in 2003, Mohammed Khalil and three of his sons were arrested in connection with submitting false applications to bring over 200 individuals to the United States using the religious worker visa program. During court proceedings, prosecutors revealed that Khalil made statements to an undercover witness professing allegiance to Osama bin Laden. He also allegedly stated, "Hopefully, another attack in the United States will come shortly."

That gives you, I think, Mr. Speaker, the feel for how this program has been abused.

However, I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the RECORD, and eventually to the American people, that I recognize—as will every Member of this Congress—that there are very sincere religious workers who come to the United States that fit within the category and within the intent of this Congress. And I think what we need to do today is honor them, thank them, recognize that this is a country that was built upon religious freedom. And where we can promote religious freedom, we need to do so within our own borders and around the globe.

That's why I have raised the issue that we are receiving religious workers from countries that will not allow American religious workers to go into them unless they fit within their narrowly defined religious category.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHILDERS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KING of Iowa. So this being an American value of religious freedom

and religious liberty, we need to also export that freedom around the world. We have many soldiers that are buried in foreign lands to promote that freedom. They've paid their price. There's been a price paid in this country continually for religious freedom. We need to promote it around the world.

For us to open up the doors of the United States of America to religious workers from countries who come here to advance their version of their side of society and not have those countries allow American missionaries to come into them, I think sets up a standard that we should not tolerate. So I will be introducing legislation that sets up a reciprocity program in this religious workers visa program. And I look forward to the opportunity in September or prior to September to raise this issue in a better format.

Until that time, and believing that we will have an open forum in this Congress and a real legitimate debate on the subject of religious worker reciprocity, I intend to support this resolution today and work in good faith to improve it before it comes up for reauthorization on September 30, 2009.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers.

If the gentleman has additional speakers, I would reserve and allow him to proceed.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. To the gentleman from Texas, I thank you for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm here to speak in favor of at least a portion of this bill related to the J-1 Visa program. I am a co-chair of the Rural Health Care Coalition along with the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY). In our efforts in rural States to attract and retain physicians in communities that are highly underserved with medical care, the J-1 Visa program, the Conrad 30 program, has become a critical component of our ability to maintain a health care delivery system.

Kansas alone since 2002 has attracted and retained 103 physicians. There are many communities that I represent in Kansas that have no doctor except for a J-1 Visa doc. Now, a J-1 Visa doctor is someone born in a foreign county but trains in the United States, takes their residency and certification here and earns the ability to practice medicine.

In return for serving in an underserved area—and while I represent generally a rural State—these underserved areas are often urban areas of our country as well. And in return for serving the needs of patients in those communities across America, they are allowed to remain in the United States for an additional 3 years.

Just last August—an example of where this comes home—the American Methodist Ministries of Garden City, Kansas, finally was able to recruit a

physician for their community health clinic. That physician is a J-1 visa doctor from Peru; bilingual—a very added attractive feature to this physician's practice, but for a community that was so desperate for a physician, really a dream come true.

Much about how to save lives, improve the health of Kansans and Americans relate to this program. We have tried for a number of years to extend the J-1 visa program longer than for a year at a time. And there are those who want to make changes, reallocate the physicians among States. The Conrad 30 program, the J-1 visa program, allocates 30 physicians per State in the country. The program is managed by State agencies who make the determination and have some flexibility in determining the definition of what is underserved. Most often, it's a general practice, a family, internal medicine doctor; but occasionally it's a specialist in an area that has no ability to attract and maintain a specialist, maybe even at a university hospital setting.

So I come to the floor today to express my desire to see that the J-1 visa program is extended and would tell you that it's very much about saving the lives of persons and very much about increasing the chances that we improve the health of Americans across our country.

So I'm appreciative of the Judiciary Committee bringing this bill to the floor. I congratulate its author for that success, and I'm looking forward to seeing it work its way through a long and always arduous process as we try to balance various States, various regions of the country and a need for physicians across America with the available physicians in this country.

So I appreciate being yielded to. I thank the Speaker for the time I have had to speak in favor. I would like to encourage my colleagues, whether you're from a rural area like me or an urban area like many others, this program matters in the lives of many Americans.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman has additional speakers.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I support this resolution.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just urge, again, support for this measure. I would also like to include in the RECORD a letter dated today signed by a number of religious groups, including the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, the Mennonites, the National Association of Evangelicals, the U.S. Catholic Conference of Catholic Bishops and others outlaying the need for religious workers in this country and urging support of the bill.

MARCH 4, 2009.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to strongly urge the House of Representatives to pass

H.R. 1127, legislation that would extend the Special Immigrant Non-Minister Religious Worker Visa Program through September 30, 2009. As you know, without congressional action, this important program is set to expire on March 6, 2009.

The Special Immigrant Non-Minister portion of the Religious Worker Visa Program became law in 1990. Originally enacted with a sunset provision, it has enjoyed broad, bipartisan support in Congress and has been reauthorized four times since then.

Under this important program, up to 5,000 visas each year are available for religious workers employed by a broad range of religious denominations and organizations. Religious communities that participate in the program have found these special visas vital to carrying out their work. The following are just a few examples of how large and small religious denominations and organizations use the visas to benefit their own communities and the larger society:

Catholic dioceses and Catholic institutes of religious men and women rely heavily upon religious sisters, brothers, and lay missionaries from abroad, who are sponsored and qualify for these permanent residency visas. Some fill a growing need in the Catholic Church for those called to religious vocations. Others provide critical services to local communities in areas including religious education, and care for vulnerable populations such as the elderly, immigrants, refugees, abused and neglected children, adolescents and families at risk.

Jewish congregations, particularly in remote areas with small Jewish communities, rely on rabbis, cantors, kosher butchers, Hebrew school teachers, and other religious workers who come from abroad through the religious worker program. Without them, many Jewish communities would be unable to sustain the institutions and practices that are essential to Jewish religious and communal life.

Smaller religious communities rely on the visa, as well. For example, the lifetime vocation of members of the Church Communities International, a religious communal order, includes a commitment to Christian brotherhood and faithful service through the provision of emergency relief, housing assistance, food distribution, education, medical care, counseling and mediation. To affect its ministries, the order depends upon the ability afforded by the program to relocate non-clergy religious members from its locations overseas.

Other religious denominations, such as the Methodist and Baptist churches, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, the Lutheran Church, the Hindu faith, the Church of Scientology, and the Seventh Day Adventist Church, also rely on the visas to bring in non-minister religious workers, who, in addition to providing some of the same services mentioned above, also work in areas as diverse as teaching in church schools, temple workers, producing religious publications, sustaining prison ministries, and training health care professionals to provide religiously appropriate health care.

Because of the increasingly diverse ethnic makeup of our religious congregations and the nation as a whole, the special immigrant religious worker visa category is particularly important in addressing the specific pastoral and service-related needs of ethnic groups, including the Hispanic, Asian, and African communities. A special category for non-minister religious workers is also necessary because religious organizations face obstacles in using traditional employment immigration categories, which historically have not fit their unique situations.

We ask that you support H.R. 1127, which would extend this important program, prior

to its expiration on March 6, 2009. Your support is vital for the continuation of the Non-Minister Special Immigrant Religious Worker Visa program and for the service of its beneficiaries on behalf of religious organizations and communities across the nation.

Thank you for your continuing support of the Religious Worker Visa Program and your assistance in achieving a permanent extension of this program.

Respectfully,

American Jewish Committee; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Church Communities International; Conference of Major Superiors of Men; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mennonite Central Committee, United States.

National Association of Evangelicals; National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahai of the United States; The Church of Scientology International; The First Church of Christ, Scientist, Boston, MA; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; World Relief; U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

I would just briefly note that as to the H-2B program, we are struggling mightily to see if we can reach consensus on that. We have efforts underway. I can make no guarantee that we will be successful, but there are active efforts underway to see if consensus can be reached.

As for the other issues raised, I would just like to note that Mr. SMITH and I have worked very closely to make sure that this program, the Religious Workers Program, has integrity. And we now have 100 percent site visits for every church that applies, which we are advised informally by DHS, has really brought a much greater level of integrity to this system. And I think it's a product of the work that we did in the last Congress that helped us to be able to say that today.

So I urge support of this measure.

As for the reciprocity issue, I look forward to hearing the ranking member's proposals. I would just note, however, that because Russia is not very happy when we send evangelicals to their country, it doesn't mean that we should deny Russian Orthodox believers in the United States the assistance of Russian Orthodox member laypeople. I think that we'll work through these issues. This is an important step forward. And I urge its support.

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. ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1127.

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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1106, HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009

Mr. CARDOZA, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-23) on the resolution (H. Res. 205) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1106) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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:

House Resolution 201, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 195, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 45, 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.

Proceedings on remaining postponed motions to suspend will resume later.

RECOGNIZING BEVERLY ECKERT FOR 9/11 VICTIMS WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 201, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 201.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Berry	Broun (GA)
Ackerman	Biggart	Brown (SC)
Aderholt	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Adler (NJ)	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Altmire	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Andrews	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Austria	Blunt	Buyer
Baca	Bocchieri	Calvert
Bachmann	Boehner	Camp
Bachus	Bonner	Cantor
Baird	Bono Mack	Cao
Baldwin	Boozman	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Capps
Barrow	Boswell	Capuano
Bartlett	Boucher	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Carnahan
Bean	Brady (PA)	Carney
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Berkley	Braleley (IA)	Carter
Berman	Bright	Cassidy

Castle	Himes	Mica
Castor (FL)	Hincheey	Michaud
Chaffetz	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Chandler	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Childers	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Clarke	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Clay	Holden	Minnick
Cleaver	Holt	Mitchell
Clyburn	Honda	Mollohan
Coble	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Coffman (CO)	Hunter	Moore (WI)
Cohen	Issa	Moran (KS)
Cole	Inslee	Moran (VA)
Conaway	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Connolly (VA)	Issa	Murphy, Patrick
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim
Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Murtha
Costa	(TX)	Myrick
Costello	Jenkins	Nadler (NY)
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Culberson	Jones	Nye
Cummings	Jordan (OH)	Oberstar
Dahlkemper	Kagen	Obey
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Olson
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Olver
Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (TN)	Kildee	Pallone
Deal (GA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascarell
DeFazio	Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)
DeGette	Kind	Paul
Delahunt	King (IA)	Paulsen
DeLauro	King (NY)	Payne
Dent	Kingston	Pence
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters
Dicks	Kissell	Peterson
Dingell	Klein (FL)	Petri
Doggett	Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME)
Donnelly (IN)	Kosmas	Pitts
Doyle	Kratovil	Platts
Dreier	Kucinich	Poe (TX)
Driehaus	Lamborn	Polis (CO)
Duncan	Lance	Pomeroy
Edwards (MD)	Langevin	Posey
Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Price (GA)
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Ellsworth	Latham	Radanovich
Emerson	LaTourette	Rahall
Engel	Latta	Rangel
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Rehberg
Etheridge	Lee (NY)	Reichert
Fallin	Levin	Reyes
Farr	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Filner	Linder	Roe (TN)
Flake	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Forbes	Loebsack	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Rohrabacher
Foster	Lowe	Rooney
Fox	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
Franks (AZ)	Lujan	Ross
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Rothman (NJ)
Fudge	Lungren, Daniel	Roybal-Allard
Gallegly	E.	Royce
Gerlach	Lynch	Ruppersberger
Giffords	Mack	Rush
Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	Ryan (OH)
Gohmert	Maloney	Ryan (WI)
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Salazar
Goodlatte	Marchant	Sanchez, Linda
Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)	T.
Granger	Markey (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves	Marshall	Sarbanes
Grayson	Massa	Scalise
Green, Al	Matheson	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schauer
Griffith	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt
Guthrie	McCaul	Schock
Gutierrez	McClintock	Schrader
Hall (TX)	McCotter	Schwartz
Halvorson	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Hare	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Harman	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Harper	McHugh	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Sestak
Heinrich	McMahon	Shadegg
Heller	McMorris	Shea-Porter
Hensarling	Morris	Sherman
Hergert	McNerney	Shimkus
Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)	Shuler
Higgins	Meeke (NY)	Shuster
Hill	Melancon	Simpson

Sires	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Slaughter	Thompson (PA)	Waters
Smith (NE)	Thornberry	Watson
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Watt
Smith (TX)	Tiberi	Waxman
Smith (WA)	Tierney	Weiner
Snyder	Titus	Welch
Souder	Tonko	Westmoreland
Space	Towns	Wexler
Spratt	Tsongas	Whitfield
Stearns	Turner	Wilson (OH)
Stupak	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Sullivan	Van Hollen	Wittman
Sutton	Velázquez	Wolf
Tanner	Visclosky	Woolsey
Tauscher	Walden	Wu
Taylor	Wamp	Yarmuth
Teague		Young (AK)
Terry		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Boyd	Garrett (NJ)	Perriello
Campbell	Hall (NY)	Putnam
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Speier
Ehlers	Miller, Gary	Stark

□ 1453

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT ON ITS SIXTH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 195, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 195.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Blackburn	Capito
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Capps
Aderholt	Blunt	Capuano
Adler (NJ)	Bocchieri	Cardoza
Akin	Boehner	Carnahan
Alexander	Bonner	Carney
Altmire	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Andrews	Boozman	Carter
Arcuri	Boren	Cassidy
Austria	Boswell	Castle
Baca	Boucher	Castor (FL)
Bachmann	Boustany	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Baird	Brady (TX)	Childers
Baldwin	Braleley (IA)	Clarke
Barrett (SC)	Bright	Clay
Barrow	Broun (GA)	Cleaver
Bartlett	Brown (SC)	Clyburn
Barton (TX)	Brown, Corrine	Coble
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Coffman (CO)
Becerra	Ginny	Cohen
Berkley	Buchanan	Cole
Berman	Burgess	Conaway
Berry	Burton (IN)	Connolly (VA)
Biggart	Butterfield	Conyers
Bilbray	Buyer	Cooper
Bilirakis	Calvert	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Camp	Costello
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Courtney
Cao	Cao	Crenshaw

Crowley Johnson, E. B.
 Cuellar Johnson, Sam
 Culberson Jones
 Cummings Jordan (OH)
 Dahlkemper Kagen
 Davis (AL) Kanjorski
 Davis (CA) Kaptur
 Davis (KY) Kennedy
 Davis (TN) Kildee
 Deal (GA) Kirkpatrick (MI)
 DeFazio Kilroy
 DeGette Kind
 Delahunt King (IA)
 DeLauro King (NY)
 Dent Kingston
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Dicks Kissell
 Dingell Klein (FL)
 Doggett Kline (MN)
 Donnelly (IN) Kosmas
 Doyle Kratovil
 Dreier Kucinich
 Driehaus Lamborn
 Duncan Langevin
 Edwards (MD) Larsen (WA)
 Edwards (TX) Price (CA)
 Ellison Latham
 Ellsworth LaTourette
 Emerson Latta
 Engel Lee (CA)
 Eshoo Lee (NY)
 Etheridge Levin
 Fallin Lewis (CA)
 Farr Lewis (GA)
 Fattah Linder
 Filner Lipinski
 Flake LoBiondo
 Fleming Loeb sack
 Forbes Lofgren, Zoe
 Fortenberry Lowey
 Foster Lucas
 Foxx Luetkemeyer
 Frank (MA) Luján
 Franks (AZ) Lummis
 Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel
 Fudge E.
 Gallegly Lynch
 Gerlach Mack
 Giffords Maffei
 Gingrey (GA) Maloney
 Gohmert Manzullo
 Gonzalez Marchant
 Goodlatte Markey (CO)
 Gordon (TN) Markey (MA)
 Granger Marshall
 Graves Massa
 Grayson Matheson
 Green, Al Matsui
 Green, Gene McCarthy (CA)
 Griffith McCarthy (NY)
 Grijalva McCaul
 Guthrie McClintock
 Gutierrez McCotter
 Hall (TX) McDermott
 Halvorson McGovern
 Hare McHenry
 Harman McHugh
 Harper McIntyre
 Hastings (FL) McKeon
 Hastings (WA) McMahon
 Heinrich McMorris
 Heller Rodgers
 Hensarling McNerney
 Herger Meek (FL)
 Herse th Sandlin Meeks (NY)
 Higgins Melancon
 Hill Mica
 Himes Michaud
 Hinchey Miller (FL)
 Hinojosa Miller (MI)
 Hirono Miller (NC)
 Hodes Miller, George
 Hoekstra Minnick
 Holden Mitchell
 Holt Mollohan
 Honda Moore (KS)
 Hoyer Moore (WI)
 Hunter Moran (KS)
 Inglis Moran (VA)
 Inslee Murphy (CT)
 Israel Murphy, Patrick
 Issa Murphy, Tim
 Jackson (IL) Murtha
 Jackson-Lee Myrick
 (TX) Nadler (NY)
 Jenkins Neapolitano
 Johnson (GA) Neal (MA)
 Johnson (IL) Neugebauer

Thompson (PA) Visclosky
 Thornberry Walden
 Tiahrt Walz
 Tiberi Wamp
 Tierney Wasserman
 Titus Schultz
 Tonko Waters
 Towns Watson
 Tsongas Watt
 Turner Waxman
 Upton Weiner
 Van Hollen Welch
 Velázquez Westmoreland

Wexler Whitfield
 Whitfield Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13
 Boyd Hall (NY)
 Campbell Larson (CT)
 Davis (IL) McCollum
 Ehlers Miller, Gary
 Garrett (NJ) Perriello

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1503

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 45, 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. ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 45.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]
 YEAS—415

Abercrombie Blumenauer
 Ackerman Blunt
 Aderholt Boccieri
 Adler (NJ) Boehner
 Akin Bonner
 Alexander Bono Mack
 Altmire Boozman
 Andrews Boren
 Arcuri Boswell
 Austria Boucher
 Baca Boustany
 Bachmann Brady (PA)
 Bachus Brady (TX)
 Baird Braley (IA)
 Baldwin Bright
 Barrett (SC) Broun (GA)
 Barrow Brown (SC)
 Bartlett Brown, Corrine
 Barton (TX) Brown-Waite,
 Bean Ginny
 Becerra Buchanan
 Berkley Burgess
 Berman Burton (IN)
 Berry Butterfield
 Biggert Buyer
 Bilbray Calvert
 Bilirakis Camp
 Bishop (GA) Cantor
 Bishop (NY) Cao
 Bishop (UT) Capito
 Blackburn Capps

Dahlkemper
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Driehaus
 Duncan
 Edwards (MD)
 Edwards (TX)
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Fallin
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gallegly
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Graves
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall (TX)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herse th Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 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)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Massa
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Neapolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer

Olson
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rahall
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Massa
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Neapolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer

Tonko	Wasserman	Wilson (OH)
Towns	Schultz	Wilson (SC)
Tsongas	Waters	Wittman
Turner	Watson	Wolf
Upton	Watt	Woolsey
Van Hollen	Waxman	Wu
Velázquez	Weiner	Yarmuth
Visclosky	Welch	Young (AK)
Walden	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Walz	Wexler	
Wamp	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—16

Boyd	Hall (NY)	Rangel
Campbell	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Capuano	McCollum	Speier
Davis (IL)	Miller, Gary	Stark
Ehlers	Perriello	
Garrett (NJ)	Putnam	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1512

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on March 4, 2009, I missed two votes, that on H. Res. 195 (rollcall vote No. 95) and H. Res. 45 (rollcall vote No. 96). Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” for both H. Res. 195, Recognizing and honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security on its sixth anniversary for their continuous efforts to keep the Nation safe, and H. Res. 45, Raising awareness and promoting education on the criminal justice system by establishing March as “National Criminal Justice Month.”

DESPITE OUR DISAGREEMENTS,
WE ARE ALL STILL AMERICANS

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, many economic indicators show that our country is in her greatest time of need since the Great Depression, with too many citizens unemployed, losing their homes and their jobs, and they're looking to us here in Washington for leadership.

I become increasingly alarmed when I hear the voice of divisive mainstream media hosts attempting to inspire others to join them in wishing failure upon our government, our elected President, and our country in crisis. To wish failure on our elected leaders is to wish failure upon our financial markets, our businesses, our workers, and our children.

Ironically, during the debate leading to the Iraq war conflict, many of the same “opinion leaders” suggested that anyone who held a contrary opinion to the President about going to war was somehow uninspired, unpatriotic, and even un-American.

I put my life on the line for this country along with my brothers and sisters in the military so such ill wishers could say whatever they wanted to. The minority's wishing that President Obama fail is wishing that our Nation fails and inflames and ignites and divides our great Nation.

This is the time for a debate of ideas and solutions. In this great time of need, I reject extremism that divides our country, and we should all embrace a voice that unites us around a common thread: that despite all of our disagreements, we are all still Americans.

□ 1515

TRIBUTE TO JAMES L. WATSON

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, my district, Gaston County and the City of Gastonia lost a great leader when they lost three-term City Councilman James L. Watson, who passed away this Wednesday.

“Slug” Watson, as he was known, became a great baseball player in youth and was always known as “Slug.” He was a great friend of mine and an early supporter of mine. He was an Army veteran, president of his own small business and a community stalwart. Citizens of West Gastonia had no greater friend and advocate than James Watson.

James was also an active member of his church, where he was a deacon. Upon his election in 2003, his constituents in Ward 6, the only area of Gastonia that overlaps with my congressional district, found themselves also served by a city councilman who had a passion for service and loved helping people. Slug showed us all perseverance. He ran three times for city council and lost, but he was elected three times after that.

James left his native Gastonia to serve our country in the Army and later went on to earn a degree in Small Business from the University of South Carolina.

Upon returning, he embarked on a successful business career with several firms, culminating in the founding of Watco of Gastonia, a parts company of which he was the President and Owner for the past 24 years.

Citizens of West Gastonia had no greater friend or advocate than James Watson. He was a stalwart in the community for decades. He served on the Shiele Museum Board of Trustees, The Gastonia Recreation Advisory Board, was on the first Executive Board of Gastonia Community Watch Association, was past President of the Hunter Huss High School Booster Club, and was a Shriner. He was also an active member of Maranatha Baptist Church where he was a former Deacon.

In politics, I learned a real lesson from James, that of persistence. He ran for City Council three times before he was victorious.

I want to extend my condolences to his wife of nearly 50 years, Carolyn,

and the entire Watson family, as well as the mayor and city council of Gastonia. We have all lost a true statesman and a great leader.

PUTTING THE COUNTRY BACK ON
TRACK

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we start to debate the budget that was submitted last week, I think a lot of Americans all across the country and a lot of people here in this Chamber have some very serious concerns about the direction that this administration seems to be taking us in. This rampant spending and tax increases are dangerous to our country and our economy at a time when we are having trouble and difficulty all across the land.

The last thing we need is a \$1.4 trillion tax increase, over \$600 billion of which would fall on the backs of every small business owner in this country, and over \$600 billion in the form of a carbon tax, a tax on energy, that every consumer in this country would pay in higher utility rates.

This is surely not the time to be raising taxes to the tune of over \$1.4 trillion on the backs of small businesses and families across this country. We need to go in a better direction. We will be proposing that, and hopefully the administration will work with us to put us on a better path to get our country back on track.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE RED COATS ARE COMING—
THE RED COATS ARE COMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should inform you that the Red Coats are coming! The Red Coats are coming! The United States Capitol once again has been invaded by the Red Coats. I am not talking about Prime Minister Gordon Brown who spoke to this assembly this morning. I am not talking about the fact that the British came and burned this building in 1814. No, not at all. But the Nation's Capitol is simply being taken away from the American people.

The new Capitol Visitors Center, the CVC as they call themselves, opened its

doors in December of 2008, and since that day many new bureaucratic regulations have been decreed. These new regulations infringe on the American people's right to visit this Capitol. It is their building. It doesn't belong to us or to the Red Coats.

Mr. Speaker, there once was a time when a family would come from my district. They would show up at my office and they would ask to see the Capitol. Myself or a staffer would bring them over to the Capitol, take them through these mighty halls by showing them the statues of the two famous people from Texas, Stephen F. Austin and Sam Houston, giving them a peak at the old Supreme Court Chamber, and they could spend as much time in this building as they wanted to. But no more. Apparently the good old times have been replaced by censored, controlled tours which can only be given by the CVC staff, the Red Coats.

Now, before a staff member can even help on a tour of this Capitol, that person must attend a 6-hour or 2-day-long propaganda school given by the CVC Red Coats. The actual tour that everybody must see before they come into this building starts with an opening video given by the Red Coats. It is a controlled and censored video and a controlled and censored trip through this building. The theme opens in the video by saying that the national motto of the United States is "E Pluribus Unum", which means, according to the video, "Out of Many, One."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must have missed something. I thought that the United States motto was directly above your head, which says "In God We Trust." But not according to the Red Coats. They just changed the national motto on their own. There is, in fact, no mention of those words or religious history of our country in the entire CVC complex. This includes their exhibit halls, which are supposed to chronicle the real history of America. But the Red Coats have rewritten the history of the United States and omit religion or any reference to God.

Once citizens watch the video, they are allowed into this building to go on their tour, as long as they do it on time and they are not late. You can't wander around and get away from the Red Coat tour guide like the old days. They get to spend a few minutes in the rotunda, a few minutes in Statuary Hall and a couple of minutes in the crypt. But that is it. There is no looking around at the paintings by Brumidi in the hallways. And if your State statue is not on the controlled tour, you are out of luck. You don't get to see it. Unfortunately, now one of Texas' statues is off the approved route. I guess my constituents will just have to become a Member of Congress before they will ever get to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should make visiting our Capitol a safe and pleasurable experience for all constituents and all Americans everywhere, and these politically correct positions

by the Red Coats are not the way to do it.

I recently signed a letter that is being sponsored by Mr. KIRK and Mr. LOEBSACK that outlines just a few of these ridiculous regulations. This letter, bipartisan, of course, goes to Mr. Ayers, the acting Architect of the Capitol, who is the chief Red Coat.

Member offices have little control over scheduling tours. Once in awhile somebody will just show up in my office and they want to go see this building. It is their first and only trip to Washington. You can't do that anymore. You have got to get on a list and you have got to make that request a month ahead of time at least before you can come into this building. Those "dropin" days are over, unfortunately, because the Red Coat police are in charge, and if they walk through the building and they get off the tour, the Red Coat police dress them down.

Late groups are often turned away. If a family misses their tour by a few minutes or the security lines are too long and they don't get there on time, they may be out of luck and not even get in this building. They are sent home to come back another time. Unless they are trained by the CVC, congressional staff members are no longer allowed to even give tours. And don't forget those "reeducation sessions" last between 6 hours and 2 days.

According to a letter I just received from the CEO of the Visitor Center, things are going pretty good, according to them. They say thousands of people are making reservations. Well, apparently that is true, because my staff assistant is having an impossible time booking tours for our constituents during the first week of April, spring break, when most of them are coming up here. And the Capitol, unfortunately, is not friendly anymore.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Capitol belongs to the American people. It doesn't belong to us. It doesn't belong to the Red Coats. It belongs to the American people. And I am disappointed in the new regulations from the CVC and the disrespect that has been shown to the American people and Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Red Coats have arrived and they are stealing the people's Capitol away from America. That ought not to be, but that's just the way it is.

LET'S GIVE THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD DIGNITY AND OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Iraqi Government is reopening the infamous Abu Ghraib prison. It has been renovated to include computers, recreational areas, a library and a barber shop for the prisoners. The Iraqis promise to treat prisoners humanely

and in accordance with international standards.

Some disagree with this decision to reopen Abu Ghraib. They say it should have been turned into a museum to document the crimes that took place there. Others say it should have been simply knocked down. But the Iraqi Government says it must keep the facility because it actually needs the space.

The renovations are designed to remove any reminders of the terrible violations of human rights that took place at Abu Ghraib when it was under U.S. control. Those violations did a great deal of damage, Mr. Speaker, to America's reputation. Even worse, they sent a terrible signal to the world. The UN has reported that nondemocratic countries have used U.S. actions in places like Abu Ghraib to justify their own abuses.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the world expect America to offer a better example than that. They expect us to work for peace and to treat people with dignity and compassion.

The Obama administration has already taken important steps in that direction. The President has renounced torture. He has ordered the closing of Guantanamo Bay. His administration has also released documents which show how the previous administration violated the constitutional rights of the American people right here at home.

President Obama has also pledged to use diplomacy instead of war as the first tool of American foreign policy. He has signaled his willingness to talk to Iran and Syria, two nations that we must engage to create stability in the Middle East. He is trying, Mr. Speaker, to diffuse tensions with Russia, and Secretary of State Clinton has pledged a vigorous effort to kick-start the stalled peace process between Israel and the Palestinians.

But there is still a lot more that we just have to do. We must remove all of our troops and military contractors out of Iraq by August 2010. Leaving 50,000 residual troops is unacceptable. The Iraqi people will view it as an enduring occupation force and it will delay the reconciliation and the unification the Iraqi people need. They need that to build stability and democracy in their country.

We must also redeploy our troops out of Afghanistan and use humanitarian assistance instead of military force to achieve our goals there.

□ 1530

Every expert on Afghanistan knows that foreign military intervention never succeeds in that part of the world. Helping the Afghan people to build schools and roads will work a lot better than sending in more troops.

I've also called for a worldwide ceasefire or "time-out" to give diplomacy, to give humanitarian assistance and conflict resolution a chance to work. By intensifying our efforts in

these areas, Mr. Speaker, our efforts of “soft power” or “smart power” and reducing the size of our military, we can move towards a conflict-free world.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has said, and I quote him, “We have a significant stake in ensuring that those who live in fear and want today can live with dignity and opportunity tomorrow.”

The President is right. Instead of bombs, instead of bullets, let’s give the people of the world dignity and opportunity. That’s the way to defeat terrorism. That’s the way to keep America safe, and that’s the way to ensure peace around the globe.

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.)

DEMOCRATS’ CAP-AND-TRADE AMOUNTS TO A STEALTH ENERGY TAX ON EVERY AMERICAN

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. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States stood here in the well the other night, and one of the things he said that was met with a great deal of applause was that there wasn’t going to be one dime, not one dime of new taxes on anybody making under \$250,000 a year, any family making under \$250,000 a year.

And yet what was omitted from his talk was the cost to every single person because of a tax increase that’s kind of hidden. It’s called the cap-and-trade tax increase. And it’s going to cost about \$65 billion a year. And it deals with carbon dioxide emissions.

Every time we use coal or gas or any substance to create energy in this country, it emits carbon dioxide. And so \$65 billion in new taxes are going to be levied on business that will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices on their electricity, their gasoline, their oil, their food and almost anything they buy, because anything they buy is made from energy. And the energy in this country is going to be taxed up to \$65 billion a year with this cap-and-trade tax that the President’s got in his budget. The American people simply don’t realize that.

Now, there was an interview that was on Fox the other night. And I want to read to you just a little bit about that. First of all, let me just say that Peter Orzag, the former CBO Director and current OMB Director down at the White House, verified that energy taxes designed to decrease carbon emissions like those in President Obama’s budget will be passed on to American families, and this will be passed on in the form of higher prices to every family in the

form of higher prices for energy, food, lodging and everything else.

Senator Obama, when he was in the Senate, admitted during the presidential campaign, said, “Under my plan of cap-and-trade, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.”

And on Fox the other night, Jim Angle was reporting on the cap-and-trade issue, and he said, “Almost every activity in the U.S. economy emits carbon dioxide, but President Obama wants to impose a cap on total emissions throughout the economy and charge industry a new tax of at least \$65 billion a year for their current activities.”

Now, when the President said he’s not going to tax anybody, any family making under \$250,000 a year, that’s erroneous, because when you take the tax they’re going to have to pay indirectly for the cost of food, lodging, energy of any kind, it’s going to result in thousands and thousands of dollars to every family.

When you turn on your lights in your house, when this budget is passed, you will be paying much more money for your electricity. When you buy gasoline at the pump, you’re going to pay more for your gasoline. When you get fuel oil or coal or anything else that you use for energy, you’re going to be paying because of this tax that’s being passed in this budget by this President.

And it’s going to be on everybody, not just the people making under \$250,000. It’s going to be on everybody. Every man, woman and child who lives in this country that uses energy will be taxed. And I think the American people need to know that. That’s why I’m down here on the floor, because when they say they’re not going to raise your taxes, and that everybody making under \$250,000 is not going to pay one dime more in taxes, they’re not telling you the whole story. You are going to pay more in taxes and you’re going to pay through the nose.

VEGAS IS MAD AND IS NOT GOING TO TAKE IT ANYMORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I’m mad and I’m not going to take it anymore. I’ve had enough of my colleagues bashing my district, my hometown and the community I love, Las Vegas. I’ve sat back as Las Vegas has been maligned, insulted and lied about for the sole purpose of making political points. I’ve been waiting for common sense to prevail. But I’m here to say that this nonsense, the bashing and the lies about Las Vegas have got to end, and they’ve got to end now.

It started with Senator MCCONNELL’s misguided attack on the stimulus bill by singling out a mob museum in Las Vegas as an earmark in the stimulus package. There’s only a couple of things wrong with that. There never

was an earmark in the stimulus bill. There are none. And there certainly wasn’t one for a mob museum. There was never a mention of it in the stimulus package. But the lies continued.

And then we found out about the maglev train. Countless Republicans have misrepresented the \$8 billion included in the stimulus bill as being an earmark for the Las Vegas-Anaheim maglev route. The only problem is, even after it was pointed out that there is no earmark, that Las Vegas and California are going to have to compete with the other projects, that this has been a project that’s been in the works for 20 years, and that it will bring thousands of visitors to the Las Vegas area and to the Southern California area, the lies continue.

The latest one was Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal. He repeated the lie in his televised response to the President’s remarks to Congress, claiming the bill included funding for a magnetic levitation line from Las Vegas to Disneyland. That is absolute nonsense.

And then it goes one worse. Representative TRENT FRANKS just mentioned today that there’s a maglev train going all the way from Disneyland to the Moonlit Bunny Brothel. Now, I grew up in Las Vegas. I’ve never heard of the Moonlit Bunny Brothel. But I guarantee that maglev train is not going there.

And then the latest whipping boy is in the omnibus bill. Sustainable Las Vegas. Just yesterday Senator MCCAIN took to the floor of the Senate to attack Sustainable Las Vegas. What does Sustainable Las Vegas mean, he yelled?

Well, let me enlighten the Senator. It’s a University of Nevada education and research program on energy supply, water supply and air quality, very serious issues for the desert Southwest, cities like Las Vegas and Phoenix and Tucson. But the Senator knows that.

So why is that program being singled out? Why is it different from the hundreds of other projects that are given to university research programs throughout the United States, including universities in Arizona? Because it has Las Vegas in its name.

And let me tell you about my hometown of Las Vegas. It’s a community of families looking for a better life, a community of schools and churches and mosques, Saturday soccer, a community of working people, small businesses and beautiful hotels.

And that brings me to the most egregious affront to Las Vegas. Stop bad-mouthing Las Vegas, and stop telling businesses and major companies to stay away from Vegas. You are hurting our economy. You’re forcing major layoffs of employees in the hotel industry. Hundreds of thousands of Nevadans depend on the tourism and convention business for their livelihood.

Las Vegas has long been a city where serious business is conducted, where small and large conventions can be accommodated. When it comes to business meetings, Las Vegas is the best

city on the planet. You still get the best bang for your buck. Great hotels, great convention facilities, great transportation, great restaurants and a great price.

When you badmouth Las Vegas, you are hurting our major industry, you're hurting your fellow citizens. By taking away their livelihood, you are taking food out of their children's mouths.

Las Vegas is having a very tough time right now. High mortgage foreclosure rate, high unemployment, high bankruptcy rate; we are hurting. Every attack on Las Vegas by my colleagues is a knife in the heart of my city. So I implore my colleagues, stop bashing Las Vegas. Find some other whipping boy. We've had enough. We're not going to take it anymore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE END IS NOT NEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the end of the war is not near. I might ask, are the troops coming home from Iraq as promised? Not quite. Sixteen months is too quick, so the plan now is to do it in 34 months. The administration claims all the troops will be out of Iraq by the end of 2011. Sure they will.

We're told that 50,000 U.S. troops will still be in Iraq in August of 2010, and we're supposed to cheer. We're told that they won't be combat troops, so we're to believe that means they won't be exposed to any danger. If they are non-combat troops, does that mean they are bureaucrats, policemen, teachers or soldiers without weapons? This will hardly satisfy the Iraqis, who resent any foreign troops at all in their country. A U.S. puppet government protected by 50,000 American soldiers is not the road to peace.

Will the Iranian-friendly Shiite majority not be motivated to take advantage of the instability we have created?

Will the 100,000 Sunni militants we arm and subsidize continue to obey our wishes? It sounds to me like a powder keg exists with the indecisiveness of our Iraqi policy.

There is no intention to close the dozens of military bases that now exist. The world's biggest embassy will remain in Baghdad and incite continued resentment toward the American occupation. Our soldiers will remain easy targets of the rightfully angry nationalists.

Our presence will serve as an incentive for al Qaeda to grow in numbers and motivate more suicide bombers. An indefinite presence, whether in Iraq,

Afghanistan, or Pakistan, will continue to drain our financial resources, undermine our national defense, demoralize our military and exacerbate our financial crisis. All this will be welcomed by Osama Bin Laden, just as he planned it. It's actually more than he had hoped for.

More likely the outcome will be that greater than 50,000 Americans will be in Iraq in August of 2010, especially when the contractors are counted. Violence will accelerate. We will be an occupier at the end of 2011, and we will remain a pariah in the Middle East.

The war in Afghanistan and Pakistan will be much bigger, unless the dollar follows the path of the dollar-based world financial system and collapses into runaway inflation. In this case, the laws of economics and the realities of history will prove superior to the madness of maintaining a world empire financed by scraps of paper.

Our military prowess, backed by a nuclear arsenal, will not suffice in overcoming the tragedy of a currency crisis. Soviet nukes did not preserve its empire or the communist economy.

This crisis demands that we quickly come to our senses and reject the foreign policy of interventionism. Neither credit coming from a Federal Reserve computer nor dollars coming from a printing press can bail us out of this mess. Only the rule of law, commodity money and liberty can do that.

Mr. Speaker, let's consider reinstating the Constitution before it's too late.

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.)

HOUSING AND BANKRUPTCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, please let me share with you concerns regarding the bill, H.R. 1106, on housing and bankruptcy that were rolled together, four bills rolled together into one likely to come before the House for consideration tomorrow.

□ 1545

First of all, the bill continues and reinforces the seriously flawed mortgage securitization approach to the U.S. housing market. The overarching concentration and securitization of the housing mortgage market by Wall Street bond houses and money center banks are continued in the bill rather than replaced by an approach that restores prudent Main Street lending practices again.

Our housing finance system is far too concentrated. Its system-wide impru-

dent practices centered in the securitization process, itself, have done enormous damage domestically and internationally and have ripped neighborhoods and communities apart across our Nation. The bill and related administration actions adhere to and, indeed, expand Wall Street securitization as the fundamental architecture of our Nation's mortgage and loan financial system. The continuation of this risky and imprudent system has converted poorly underwritten, poorly appraised and poorly serviced mortgage loans, the majority a result of predatory lending practices to securitize bond instruments. Financial activity and equity have been drawn out of local regions and have been concentrated in a very few irresponsible and likely fraudulent, in many cases, Wall Street money center banks.

The vast majority of troubled subprime mortgages are held by institutions whose names you know—JPMorgan, Bank of America, Citigroup, HSBC, Wachovia, Wells Fargo—and the proximate cause of the severe economic downturn our Nation is experiencing in the mortgage foreclosure crisis and its consequential seize-up of credit is due to the practices of those institutions.

That seize-up is due to widespread uncertainty about valuing mortgages on the ledgers of those financial institutions and others across our country. Until that uncertainty is repaired by employing the skills of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and by true value accounting at the Securities and Exchange Commission, any bill we might consider here merely bites at the edges of a systemic reform that will fall far short of what is needed. Any major housing bill may be evaluated by whether it contributes to reforming this fundamental financial architecture that has brought our economy to this point.

Responsible lending requires that our financial system re-empower the local banking, local underwriting and local mortgage markets first. Such a reform plan should be a foundation stone that precedes any legislation that proposes to transfer hundreds of billions of dollars more to the very money center banks and servicing companies that have produced the chaos that ails our mortgage lending system. Reform must come first, not last. No matter how well-intentioned any housing bill is, there must be a broader policy context in which it is advanced.

Number 2, the vast majority of people in foreclosure are not in bankruptcy. Different regions of our Nation are likely to be impacted differently, and this bill will not help them, and I place in the RECORD plenty of information about that.

Number 3, the bill will not bring private-sector lenders back to the mortgage market. Thus, it will not restore confidence across the troubled credit markets. You could see that the President announced the program last

month, and the market has already discounted it; the dollar has been further driven down, and our stock markets are even weaker.

Number 4, the bill actually cherry-picks mortgage winners and losers while cramming down the bankruptcy option for others, denying equal justice under property law to all. The bill throws the far larger numbers of homeowners with non Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac troubled loans to the bankruptcy courts, almost like a cramdown, presuming their culpability, while doing nothing to ascertain lender and servicer performance or even guilt in the mortgage contract. In doing so, the bill denies millions of our citizens immediate, full legal rights and representation in legal proceedings.

Number 5, irresponsible and likely fraudulent lenders and servicers should not be rewarded with any more taxpayer-funded money as the bill does. Again, we should be using the FDIC and the SEC as they were properly intended, and that is not being done.

You know, one of the questions we can ask under this bill is: How will Treasury and HUD pick who gets principal awarded and who doesn't under this bill to try to work out a few of the loans that are out there?

Number 6, this proposal creates a future private market incentive to dump troubled loans to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that does not restore the market discipline that is necessary.

Number 7, there are no provisions in the bill to recoup funds to the U.S. taxpayer for the significant cost of this bill. The banks, actually, in one provision in the bill will get a little bit if a mortgage appreciates in value once it's sold, but the government will get nothing.

Finally, the cost estimates of this bill are truly questionable. The administration says maybe it might cost \$275 billion, but in truth, that is only a guess. If home values continue to plummet and the plan does not succeed in whole or in part, it is likely that the cost of the bill will be much higher. What about if Freddie and Fannie loans redefault? Already, the administration is asking for another \$400 million of additional guarantee authority in those instrumentalities.

In sum, our citizens deserve full justice, not a continuing reliance on the very institutions that brought us to this fork in the road.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House is scheduled to vote on H.R. 1106

Please let me share with you 8 concerns I have regarding the 4 bills that have now been rolled into one to address the mortgage foreclosure crisis and its bankruptcy provisions.

The first concern is the bill continues, and reinforces, the seriously flawed "mortgage securitization" approach to the U.S. housing market.

The overarching concentration and "Securitization of the housing mortgage market by Wall Street" bond houses and money center banks are continued rather than re-

placed by an approach that restores "Main Street Prudent Lending" practices. Our housing finance system is far too concentrated. Its system-wide imprudent practices, centered in the securitization process, have done enormous damage domestically and internationally, and have ripped neighborhoods and communities apart across our nation.

This bill, and related Administration actions (e.g., the SBA loan securitization provisions of the Recovery Act) adhere to and, indeed, expand "Wall St. securitization" as the fundamental architecture of our nation's mortgage and loan financial system. The continuation of this risky and imprudent system has converted poorly underwritten, poorly appraised, poorly serviced mortgage "loans"—the majority a result of predatory lending practices—to securitized "bond" instruments. Financial activity and equity have been drawn out of local regions and concentrated in a few very irresponsible, and likely fraudulent, Wall Street and money center banks. A handful of these investments houses, which have brought our nation to the financial edge, have converted very recently to bank holding companies to come under the cover of federal insurance protection.

The vast majority of troubled subprime mortgages are held by the following irresponsible, money center institutions or subsidiaries they created—JP Morgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, HSBC, and Wachovia, Wells Fargo. The proximate cause of the severe economic downturn our nation is experiencing is the mortgage foreclosure crisis and consequential seize up of credit across our nation's financial system. This is due to widespread uncertainty about valuing mortgages on the ledgers of financial institutions. Until that uncertainty is repaired, any bill that merely bites at the edges of systemic reform will fall short of what is required.

Any major "housing" bill must be evaluated by whether it contributes to reforming this fundamental financial architecture that has brought our economy to this point. If not, it will not restore a rigorous and prudent lending model for home loan origination and servicing, with disciplined secondary markets. If reform does not occur, financial power will continue to be concentrated on Wall Street and money center institutions, and equity drawn away from to local communities. Responsible lending requires that our financial system re-empower the local banking, underwriting, and mortgage markets. Such a reform plan should be the foundation stone that precedes any legislation that proposes to transfer hundreds of billions of dollars more to the money center banks and servicing companies that produced the chaos that ails our mortgage lending system. Reform must come first, no last. No matter how well intentioned any housing bill, there must be a broader policy context in which it is advanced.

The 2nd concern is the vast majority of people in foreclosure are not in bankruptcy. Different regions of our nation are likely to be impacted differently. This bill will not help them.

The bill's partial and confusing approach to who will be helped, and who will not be helped in their housing situation, will exacerbate the economic crisis, not ease it. Far from being a systemic solution to the housing credit and foreclosure crisis, this bill cherry picks some "winners" who will achieve mortgage workouts. The anticipated Obama plan will address

only some mortgage holders whose mortgages happen to be held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The majority of mortgages not held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac will not be addressed by the Obama plan. This omission represents the vast majority of subprime, troubled mortgages in our nation. Federal taxpayer-funded subsidies, thus, will flow to help workout only those loans held by federally guaranteed secondary market instrumentalities.

Furthermore, the complexity of this bill means as well as the Obama plan any benefits are likely to be uneven rather than systemic. Some loans owned by Freddie and Fannie will be targeted; the vaster number of subprime loans will not be considered. In regions like Ohio, where the recession has worn on and deepened over this decade, it is unclear who may benefit. At best there are rough estimates available now, state by state, as to how many loans may be eligible or affected. Most of the borrowers who aren't in either FNMA/Freddie will be out of luck in the Obama plan. States like Ohio and Michigan could be absent workout assistance again, or with minimal impact, as they have been under the Hope for Homeowners Bill, rushed through Congress last July, wherein only 25 homeowners have been assisted. It is conceivable that many greedy consumers, whose loans happen to be owned by Fannie and Freddie, could be helped, while the majority of families in states like Ohio, where foreclosures are rising, will not get help as their loans are largely subprime. What is fair about this?

The 3rd concern is the bill will not bring private sector lenders back into the mortgage market. Thus, it will not restore confidence across the troubled credit markets.

Why? This bill is uneven, lacks clarity, and is even confusing in picking who might be assisted, and who might not be assisted. Thus, the bill will cause more market disruption. As in the Obama plan's announcement last month, it was discounted by the market and already has further driven down the value of the dollar and our stock markets. The market knows this bill will not address the fundamental problems of seized credit markets and lack of interbank confidence plaguing our banking system.

The 4th concern is the Obama plan cherry picks mortgage winners and losers, while this bill crams down the bankruptcy option for others, denying equal justice in property law to all. As a last resort this bill throws homeowners to the bankruptcy courts—almost like a cramdown presuming their culpability—while doing nothing to ascertain lender and servicer performance, and even guilt, in the mortgage contract. In so doing, the bill denies millions of our citizens full legal rights and representation in legal proceedings about their Mortgage contract—as well as a complete mortgage audit. The courts should weigh the interests of all parties in the mortgage contract. Normal judicial proceedings could yield that. The bankruptcy option relegates normal judicial proceedings to second place to determine lender culpability. Mortgagors need primary attention not secondary and equal legal representation when confronting Wall Street megabanks and servicers, as mortgage fraud and predatory practices pervaded the sick housing system America faces today. This bill throws citizens into bankruptcy court before real justice and transparency of the mortgage instrument as a

contract is unwound in a court of law. Are borrowers the only party to the mortgage contract? The bill does not provide equal justice as lenders, banks, and servicers responsible are held harmless legally, and some even provided funding. What unequal justice is this?

The 5th concern is irresponsible and likely fraudulent lenders and servicers should not be rewarded with more taxpayer-funded money, as the Obama plan does. The normal federal institutions skilled in mortgage workouts, and bank insolvencies, should be engaged—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Lenders and servicers should be required by legislation to participate in mortgage workouts. Our government shouldn't be paying lenders or servicers anything to get them to participate. It is likely mortgage and accounting fraud were endemic across several institutions, as well as lack of proper reporting back to mortgagors under the Truth in Lending and Real Estate Practices Act. Frankly, workouts systemwide should have been occurring in the time-proven way—by engaging FDIC's full powers along with updating the SEC's approach to true value accounting for real estate loans held on the books of lenders. As this still is not being done, the economic harm gets worse daily. The TARP Bailout gave power to the wrong federal department to handle real estate workouts. Treasury had had no experience in real estate lending. Treasury has never been the appropriate federal agency to do bank and mortgage workouts. Its focus has always been Wall Street. Their record since TARP has demonstrated they have done nothing to get the banks and servicers to the table to do workouts as a result of the billions the banks have received from TARP. Now, under the Obama plan, how will Treasury and HUD pick who gets principal funds and who doesn't?

The 6th concern in the Obama plan creates a future private market incentive to dump troubled loans to FNMA and Freddie.

In the way this legislation favors loans held by FNMA and Freddie Mac, it does not restore prudent lending rigor to the marketplace, but signals that the government will become the dumpster for troubled loans. Again, this bill's architecture sends the wrong message to the market.

The 7th concern is there no provisions in the Obama plan to recoup funds to the U.S. taxpayer for the significant cost of the bill.

Any federal assistance to homeowners should include provisions to recoup to the government some portion of the appreciation of any housing assets that may be available on sale of affected units. The Obama plan does provide such recoupment to the bank, in the case of reworked FNMA/Freddie loans, but not to the government which is assuming a huge additional guarantee risk. The Administration plan is silent on such recoupment to the U.S. government.

The 8th concern is the cost estimates for the Obama plan are questionable.

Cost estimates provided by the Administration total at least \$275 billion. But, in truth, they represent only a guess. If home values continue to plummet, and the plan does not succeed in whole or part, it is highly likely the cost of the plan will rise much higher. Further, it is highly uncertain whether many Freddie and FNMA loans will not redefault, increasing long term costs. Already, the Administration is

requesting increased guarantee authority on both be raised a total of \$400 billion more. An overriding concern remains that most subprime loans at the heart of the foreclosure crisis are not held by FNMA/FreddieMac. Lack of resolution in that segment of the market will further pull down home values and exacerbate the situation. To add some perspective, there is a real question as to whether the \$75 billion dedicated to loan modifications will be significant enough to right the market. Ohio alone needs \$20 billion to fill its housing finance gap. This plan might help places like California where the housing bubble burst but its impact in Ohio is unclear, where the recession has dragged on for 8 years. People need adjusted home mortgage, and even rent-to-own rental schedules. These must be negotiated one by one. The Administration plan will not help the vast majority of underwater homeowners because their plan is not systemic in its approach.

In sum, this bill and the Obama plan do little to nothing to address the fundamental cause of crisis—widespread and overuse of concentrated securitization practices, mortgage and appraisal fraud, and the seize up of credit markets due to improper use of federal instrumentalities in attempting to resolve the situation.

Our citizens deserve full justice, not continuing reliance on the very institutions that brought us to this fork in the road.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CALVERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FEAR MONGERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have heard so much about global warming for so long. It is interesting, though: We're now hearing the term "climate change." Has anybody started to ask why we're no longer hearing about global warming as being the evil thing and now we're hearing climate change is the evil thing?

You know, I try to figure it out. All I can figure is that we're getting data indicating that the Earth may have been cooling for some time now. Groups that are getting enormous contributions, maybe even Nobel Prizes, whatever, by claiming global warming realized, uh-oh, if we're going to keep the money flowing in, we'd better be able to adapt in case the world is cooling instead of warming, so let's start saying we've got to do something about climate change. From my standpoint, that would mean we have to have some real serious discussions with the sun and with God. Nonetheless, climate change is now evil.

I read an article recently that indicated that, you know, when we've been saying these greenhouse gases are trap-

ping the heat in, it just may be that those carbon dioxide/greenhouse gases are causing the sun to bounce off into space and that they may be cooling the planet. They're going to have it either way, apparently. It's warming. It's cooling. They want to be alarmists because that allows a socialist agenda to come forward, and it allows the government to become big brother and run everything.

You know, the wonderful Democratic Party member teachers who I had growing up, they were fantastic. In junior high, we were talking about photosynthesis and how a plant can take carbon dioxide and end up producing oxygen out of the process. It would seem that it would be cyclical. If you look at the patterns of the Earth, what we have are cycles up and down. The temperature goes up, and the temperature goes down over time—back up and down. You have more greenery. More carbon dioxide will apparently help that to grow. Then if we get too much, we'll start having too much oxygen and not enough carbon dioxide. It's just amazing how nature addresses these issues by having cycles where it comes and it goes.

But if you're in government and you want to control everything, you have got to scare people. You have got to have people alarmed, and that's what we're hearing over and over here on the floor of the House: Let's scare America. Let's make them be afraid of carbon dioxide because—guess what. If we really had the responsibility of regulating carbon dioxide, I can tell you from personal experience there are some people around here who are breathing too much. We're going to have to cut out some of this breathing because there's a whole lot of breathing going on, and that's too much carbon dioxide. That is how absurd it has been getting. You know, Congress is not the answer to everything that's wrong with the world. It's just not.

Then we've got this omnibus spending bill that was passed last week. Maybe the Senate passes it tomorrow night. It was irresponsible. It was immoral. We as a generation, in effect, have gone to the bank—in this case China—as our Secretary of State has and has just asked them to "keep buying our debt, please." We go to China as the bank and say, "Please, keep buying our debt. We're going to borrow money. We're not going to pay you back, but our children and our grandchildren will take care of paying you back." That is immoral. That is irresponsible for a parent to borrow money and say, "My children someday will pay you back because I can't control my spending. I'm just throwing money away, but they'll pay it back someday." That is not what we should be doing.

Now, at the same time, we on the Natural Resources Committee are having hearings all the time. People don't realize we're putting more and more of our natural resources off limits. Every

month, more natural resources are off limits. We're having hearings now because they want to put a moratorium back on drilling the Outer Continental Shelf. It would provide a million jobs. ANWR would provide a million jobs. The untouched gas in Alaska would provide a million jobs. Yet, even though it would cost nothing—no raised taxes—they don't want to do it.

It's time to stop the fear mongering. It wasn't right when Secretary Paulson talked President Bush into it, and it's certainly not right now in order to promote a socialist agenda. Let's do the right thing for a change and quit borrowing money because we can't control ourselves. Our kids will have to pay it back. Let's control ourselves and show some responsibility for a change.

THE NEED FOR THE ANTHRAX ATTACKS INVESTIGATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this week, I reintroduced the Anthrax Attacks Investigation Act, H.R. 1248. Since the attacks occurred, I have pressed for a full investigation into this insidious biowarfare attack on our country.

My bill's purpose is simple: to examine and to report on how the attacks occurred and on how we can prevent similar episodes in the future. Numerous experts and advisory committees say that biological attacks or emerging epidemics are our greatest public risks.

As you may know, the anthrax attacks in 2001 originated from a postal box, evidently, in the Twelfth Congressional District in New Jersey. They disrupted the lives of people throughout the region and the country. For months, Americans lived in fear of a future attack and of the possibility of receiving cross-contaminated mail. Mail service was delayed, and people wondered whether there was a murderer at large in their midst. Further, my own congressional office and others here in Washington were shut down after it was found to be contaminated with anthrax. These attacks raised the fear of terrorism to a fevered pitch.

Since the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation announced in early August of last year that Dr. Bruce Ivins was their prime suspect before his suicide a month earlier, I've spoken with FBI Director Mueller about the case. He readily has admitted that the case against Dr. Ivins is and was circumstantial and that the FBI has no direct physical evidence tying him to the attack. No anthrax spores were found in his car or his home, and the FBI has no evidence that Ivins actually mailed the letters in New Jersey. Nevertheless, the FBI and the DOJ are closing the case because they believe the available circumstantial evidence against Dr. Ivins is overwhelming and because no evidence has surfaced to suggest that he had any accomplices.

A number of important questions about this case remain unanswered: How did the perpetrator or perpetrators manage to pull off these attacks that were somewhat complicated in the first place? Why did the FBI pursue the wrong suspect for so long? Is the science behind the case sound? Should the case be closed? Have we learned the right lessons, and have we implemented the right changes in our defenses to make another such attack less likely? Why are investigators so certain that Ivins acted alone?

Indeed, last month in Baltimore, at the conference of the American Society for Microbiology, FBI scientist Jason Bannan told the press something I had not previously heard from the FBI officials, something that only raises more questions about the FBI investigation.

Dr. Bannan noted during the investigation that the FBI collected at least 60 water samples from communities where government laboratories work with anthrax. The purpose of collecting the samples was to see if there was any unique chemical signature in one of the water samples that would match with the water that was used to grow the anthrax spores that were mailed. According to the New York Times, Bannan said, "The water research ultimately was inconclusive about where the anthrax was grown."

□ 1600

Despite this, the FBI remains adamant that the anthrax could only have come from that site in Maryland that Dr. Ivins used even though the Bureau has never been able to replicate the chemical signature of the material in the attacks.

This is just one question.

As has so often been the case, each new revelation by the FBI seems only to raise more questions about the conduct and conclusions of the investigation underscoring why an independent review of the investigation is needed badly. In addition, there are important policy and public safety questions that our government has yet to answer satisfactorily.

In December 2008, the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Proliferation and Terrorism—itsself an outgrowth of the 9/11 Commission and its recommendations—issued a report. It used alarming language to prod our government to act. It affirmed something that was demonstrated with the deadly anthrax attacks: Terrorists will likely use weapons of mass destruction attacks on America which feature biological weapons.

However, examining the 2001 anthrax attacks was not an explicit mandate of that Commission. This was in contrast to the 9/11 Commission which was specifically charged with looking at how the September 2001 attacks happened, why the Federal Government failed to prevent the attacks and what remedial measures were necessary to prevent a similar catastrophe in the future. The

question is, have we implemented the lessons learned from those attacks in the fall of 2001?

The Commission that I am proposing here is similar to this 9/11 Commission that should look at the incident, why it was not prevented, and what we can do to prevent such things in the future. Just as the 9/11 Commission looked not only at the attacks that morning but also recommended changes in the structure of government agencies, screening methods and government oversight, so should an anthrax commission look not only at the specific crime but also at measures for prevention, detention, and investigation of future bioterrorism.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of National Women's History Month, and I would like to recognize some of the great women throughout our Nation's history by focusing on my congressional district in South Florida.

These pioneers have fought valiantly for various causes, but they have all helped to lead the exodus of American women from an era of subjugation into one of equality between the genders. In South Florida, we have truly been blessed by the lives and the leadership of some of the great pioneering women of our Nation's history.

I'm talking about women like Roxcy Bolton. Roxcy was inducted into the Florida Women's Hall of Fame for forcing police and prosecutors to make rape crime a priority, as well as illustrating to health departments the need for rape treatment centers.

Dr. Ellen Prager is another such woman of greatness in South Florida. Dr. Prager has dedicated 20 years of her life to our ocean. She has had an accomplished career that began as a safety diver and research assistant at an underwater habitat in St. Croix. Now, Dr. Prager is the chief scientist for the Aquarius Reef Base in Key Largo, Florida, where I have had the distinct pleasure of scuba diving with her and her esteemed scientists twice already.

Aquarius is the only operating undersea research laboratory in the world, and it allows Ellen and her fellow scientists to spend as much as 2 consecutive weeks underwater studying the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary. From Aquarius, Dr. Prager utilizes a telepresence to educate people around the world about the wonders of our planet's oceans.

Marjory Stoneman Douglas was another such pioneering woman. Ms. Douglas began Friends of the Everglades, an advocacy group dedicated to the preservation of the Florida river of grass. Ms. Douglas was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for her work on behalf of this precious and

delicate ecosystem, which has become engrained in the unique culture of the great State of Florida.

Athalie Range, Mr. Speaker, was another pioneer among the great women of Florida. Ms. Range was the former president of the Liberty City Elementary PTA in 1953. Ms. Range fought to eliminate the deplorable conditions of segregated public schools. She may not have been the only one to notice the disparity between white and black schools, but she was one of the first to do something positive about it. She stood before the all-white school board, which turned out to be no match for her fighting spirit. These segregationist policies, which seemed to be set in stone, were smashed beneath the weight of her mighty will.

In fact, South Florida is blessed with many remarkable women, and our chapter of RESULTS is cultivating distinguished, altruistic women like Betsy Skipp, Gale Neumann, and Kathleen Gordon. These women have devoted their precious time and their ample talents to this amazing organization that advocates solutions to raising the standards of living throughout the globe.

Their role within RESULTS has been to pioneer the use of microenterprise programs to empower even more women to pursue their dreams and achieve greatness of their own. These women are heroines. I admire them, and young girls in South Florida aspire to achieve even a fraction of what they have.

Every day I am thankful that my daughters will have the benefit of walking the road that these courageous women have paved for all of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

VOTE "NO" ON NO-BID CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, later this week we'll vote on whether to instruct the Ethics Committee to investigate the relationship between earmarks and contributions from the PMA Group, an organization that is currently under investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice.

Last week, I offered a broader resolution. This one is specific. At its core is the notion that the House should have a higher standard of conduct than whether or not a Member can be indicted or convicted. The broader resolution gained the support of 182 Members—a substantial number, but still short of passage.

Let me make an appeal to the newer Members of this body, those who have been elected in the past few election cycles: Most of you campaigned on principles of good government, that Congress should take its article 1 powers seriously, that we should be careful and deliberative stewards of the public purse.

I have some sobering news. It's now up to you to uphold the dignity and decorum of this institution. It's now up to you to ensure that those who view our proceedings from afar will have enduring respect for what is done here.

This duty would normally fall to the more seasoned Members of this body, particularly those who have been entrusted with leadership positions. One would assume that they would feel it their obligation to be the guardians of the reputation and the dignity of the people's House. But this is not the case.

For whatever reason, those who have been chosen to lead have chosen not to lead on this issue. While the Department of Justice investigations swirl around us, while some of our former Members sit in prison, we have opted for business as usual, insisting that campaign contributions do not constitute "financial interest," whistling past the Justice Department as we go.

Those who have been entrusted in leadership positions may tell you that securing no-bid contracts, even for those who give you campaign contributions, is simply an exercise of your article 1 authority under the Constitution. But you know better than that.

When the President stood in this body 1 week ago and called for an end to no-bid contracts, he received a standing ovation. We all stood and cheered. But the very next day we passed legislation that provided thousands of no-bid contracts, including several to clients of the PMA Group—a lobbying group currently under investigation by the Department of Justice.

So here we are. A privileged resolution has been offered that would ask the House Ethics Committee to investigate earmarks and campaign contributions related to the PMA Group. We will vote on that resolution on Thursday.

This resolution, or something similar to it, will eventually pass. We will eventually come to understand that it is beneath the dignity of this institution to continue to sweep this issue under the rug and pretend that no one will notice.

It simply isn't right to give no-bid contracts to those who give us campaign contributions. I believe that the overwhelming majority of this body understands that, regardless of what our leaders may tell us. I think an overwhelming majority of this body knows that we need a higher standard than we currently employ.

Madam Speaker, we owe this institution far more than we are giving it. Let us vote for this privileged resolution and give it the respect it deserves.

DEFENSE SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the President has announced we will soon be sending an additional 17,000 troops to Afghanistan, bringing our total there to approximately 55,000.

A few days ago, I read a one-line mention in a story that the Defense Department, which is now the Department of Foreign Aid, was going to spend \$100 million to build a new road in Afghanistan. I think our Founding Fathers would think we had flipped out or lost our minds to spend \$100 million to build a road in Afghanistan, especially since we are over \$11 trillion in debt and thus are spending money that we do not have. Of course, \$100 million is just a tiny drop in the bucket of the billions and billions that we have spent over there since 2001, in an impoverished country that is no realistic threat to us whatsoever.

Of course, every giant bureaucracy is doing everything it can to expand its mission and exaggerating its threats so it can get more money. That is what the war in Afghanistan is really all about—money and power instead of any real threat.

According to the Congressional Research Service, we have spent \$173 billion in Afghanistan since 2001, and as far as I'm concerned, it's pouring money down a rat hole. It is a complete waste. I think if there are any fiscal conservatives left in Congress, they should be horrified by the waste that is going on over there.

General Petraeus said in an article in the Washington Post a few days ago that the situation in Afghanistan, despite all of this money, has deteriorated markedly in the past 2 years. Those were his words. He said Afghanistan has been known over the years as the graveyard of empires, and if we're not careful, it's going to help be the graveyard of our empire as well.

Professor Ian Lustick of the University of Pennsylvania wrote recently about the money feeding frenzy of the war on terror and he wrote this: "Nearly 7 years after September 11, 2001, what accounts for the vast discrepancy between the terrorist threat facing America and the scale of our response? Why, absent any evidence of a serious terror threat, is a war on terror so enormous, so all-encompassing, and still expanding?"

"The fundamental answer is that Al Qaeda's most important accomplishment was not to hijack our planes but to hijack our political system.

"For a multitude of politicians, interest groups and professional associations, corporations, media organizations, universities, local and State governments, and Federal agency officials, the war on terror is now a major profit center, a funding bonanza, and a set of slogans and soundbites to be inserted into budget, project, grant, and contract proposals."

And finally, Professor Lustick wrote, "For the country as a whole, however, it has become a maelstrom of waste."

Now we have a national debt of \$11.315 trillion, an incomprehensible figure—and the GAO tells us in addition that we have over \$55 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities.

It's just not going to be long at all before we're not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security and Medicare, veterans pensions, and all the things we have promised our own people if we don't stop spending money in ridiculously wasteful ways.

And, of course, what does the Defense Department tell us? Just as they always do: What they want is more money to spend in Afghanistan and more troops in every place else.

Bruce Fein, who was a high-ranking official in the Reagan administration, wrote just a few days ago in the *Washington Times* that it is ridiculous that we now have troops in 135 countries and approximately 1,400 military installations around the world. And he said we should redeploy our troops to the United States.

He said, "No country would dare attack our defenses and our retaliatory capability would be invincible. Esprit de corps would be at its zenith because soldiers would be fighting to protect American lives on American soil, not Afghan peasants."

And he wrote this: "The redeployment would end the United States casualties in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, it would end the foreign resentments or enemies created by unintended killing of civilians and the insult to pride excited by foreign occupation."

At the end of this column, he wrote: "The American empire should be abandoned and the republic restored. The United States would be safer, freer, and wealthier." And, Madam Speaker, I can tell you, I agree with him.

□ 1615

FRAGILE X SYNDROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARPER. I come to you today to tell you a story, and it's my family's story that has great relevance to many of you, and many of you in this country.

My wife and I met and started dating when she was 15 and I was 17. We met at a great place to meet your spouse, church. We dated for 5½ years and got married. And we didn't really think we wanted children—we really wanted grandchildren, but could not figure out a way to get there. And we finally decided, after 10 years of marriage, that we would have some kids.

Our first son, Livingston, was born in 1989, and he is now 19 years old. As we went through his development in early years, we noticed that he was not doing

things as soon as we thought he should be. Everything that he did was in the very tail end of the late normal range; he did them, but it was delayed. Our pediatrician told us it was okay, that he would probably grow out of this, and we continued to go along with just normal life.

At one point, when he was about 19 months old, we went out of town on a trip, left him with one of the grandparents. And he got sick while we were out of town and had to go to the doctor. At that point, the next week the doctor called me and said I think that there's something wrong with your son; I don't know what it is, but we'll look, we'll try to figure out what it is. At that point, we were 4 months pregnant with our daughter. And we didn't know, we just started looking to see why he was developmentally delayed. We started going—and I say "we," my wife was the one who did the brunt of this work. There was speech therapy twice a week, occupational therapy twice a week, tests, trips to the hospital, to the doctor, all the things that you do, trying to determine what's wrong with your child.

That continued. We went through all types of tests; we went through genetic tests that came back normal, we went through other things. We were finally given a misdiagnosis of mild cerebral palsy and labeled a near miss on autism. That's what we dealt with for the next 2 years. So we did those things that you had to do to survive.

At some point in 1993, when he was almost 4 years old, our next-door neighbor went to an education seminar in Jackson, Mississippi, and went to a breakout session called Educating Children With Fragile X. Our next-door neighbor had never heard of Fragile X. And she goes to this session, watches the video, hears this parent speak, and her mouth falls open. And she comes home that night and tells us, I think this is it. At that point, we requested testing to be done specifically for Fragile X syndrome, and it was determined that, indeed, he did have that.

The things that led us to know things were wrong, he was rocking some when he would sit, he was doing a lot of hand flapping, and maybe chewing on some objects. And then he was late doing many things, speech and language and those type issues. So we got the diagnosis of Fragile X syndrome. We went to the Children's Hospital in Denver, Colorado, where he was evaluated by Dr. Randi Hagerman and her Fragile X team. It's been tough, but we have a wonderful son. He is a blessing to everybody that he comes across. And we're so thankful for our son Livingston.

Our daughter Maggie does not have Fragile X syndrome. But I wanted to mention this today because there are over 130 parents from across 35 States—all over the country—that are here today for National Fragile X Advocacy Day. And I want to commend them for the hard work that they're doing, the

things that they're doing to bring attention to this.

This is something that we can work on together here in Congress. It is a bipartisan effort. We can work to find the right things for research, things that will help on treatments, and things that will ultimately lead to a cure. And I'll tell you this, for all parents of special needs children, this is something you should never give up on, never stop fighting, never quit believing. Our son graduated from high school last year. He is now in a local community college. He works two nights a week.

I want to thank the National Fragile X Foundation for all their hard work.

KEEP GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE WAY AND EMPOWER THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise because I am concerned about the direction of this country and the fundamental and proper role of government.

I still remember reading and seeing the old films and seeing President Kennedy stand up and say, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country," and yet we seem to be moving in the wrong direction.

The furnace, the engine that is the United States of America, what makes America so great are the entrepreneurs, that entrepreneurial spirit. It is the American people who grab hold of things and make things happen; and yet at every turn I look and I see government getting in the way.

As I meet with entrepreneurs, as I meet with people who own businesses and employ people and have jobs, they don't sit back and say, boy, I wonder what the government is going to do to make my life better. The question that they ask is, what sort of hindrances are going to be in the way?

We've got to understand in this country that manufacturing is good; it's good to manufacture. We have to actually create and build things in the United States of America. We can't simply be a service-based economy. And yet at every single turn I see these radical environmentalists who want to get in the way and prohibit us from actually developing and creating something. I see this so-called cap and trade—I think it's more like a cap and tax, where we're going to simply tax our way out of our problems and say every piece of energy that we create in this country we're going to add a tax to it. That's not going to grow this country; that's not going to propel us forward.

We have created so many barriers to entry for the person who wants to start their own home-based business to the largest manufacturers that are in this

country. We have to empower these people, and that means getting government out of the way, creating life that's more simple.

Now, is there a role and responsibility for government to regulate certain things, for instance on Wall Street? Of course there is. Nobody has ever suggested that we just simply get rid of everything, but we have not streamlined the process.

Look, I'm a Republican. The President has said several things that I agree with, that I applaud him for—the ending of no-bid contracts, a push for earmark reform; he said he wants smaller government. I even like the fact that he put the Iraq appropriations into the base budget instead of these supplemental appropriations, and I applaud him for that. But it is imperative for the American people to hold their public leaders accountable for what they say they're going to do. I think that's all we ask. I've got a wife, I've got three kids. All I want them to do is I just want my kids to do what they say they're going to do.

And so when the President calls for appropriations without earmarks, and the very next day—the very next day—we get to vote on a bill with 8,500 earmarks in it, you just have to look at that and say, wait a second, the talk is good, but are we actually walking the walk? It's not yet happening.

We don't have time to wait anymore. We talk about smaller government. Well, we just passed the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States of America for \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion. We had just something like 13 hours to actually review it. Please, we have to be held accountable.

I'm a freshman. It is an honor and a privilege to serve the United States Congress. I didn't create this problem, but I am here to help clean it up. And for those of us that have been elected, entrusted by the people, the constituents within our districts, I say, please, hold us all accountable; raise expectations. It is not government, it is not government that is going to get us out of this; it is going to be the empowerment of the entrepreneur, it is going to be the empowerment of the American people that will drive and propel this country forward. It is always what has created the greatest success in the United States of America. It is the power that makes us the greatest country on the face of this planet. But we have to make sure that we keep government in check.

It's about smaller government, not bigger government. Please, I ask that we be united and fight for this cause, fight for the American entrepreneur. Keep government limited, keep it out of our way, and empower the American people.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING EXPORT OF CERTAIN ITEMS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), I hereby certify to the Congress that the export of two environmental chambers to be used to test automotive parts is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, and that the material and equipment, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from this export, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2009.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2009.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national

emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2009.

THE PROTECTION OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to my good friend and colleague, ZACH WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the Speaker, and most of all I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his extraordinary leadership. He brings us to the floor today to talk about something that doesn't get enough attention.

At a time of economic duress and hardship, all eyes are on the economy, and for many reasons that is absolutely right. But there are some real big issues that, frankly, are being overlooked under this new administration and across the country today and they are fundamental to what kind of people we are.

Today, we're talking about the protection of life. We all know that abortion divides our country. And we're grateful for all those Americans who say that they want to reduce the number of abortions in our country, those that say that they oppose abortion, but then when it comes time, as the previous speaker said, to actually enact policies, that's the most important time that you can actually stand up for what you say you believe.

With the stroke of a pen, we now have a new executive order that says that taxpayers, basically, in this country will fund abortions that Americans want to have anywhere in the world. That is something overwhelmingly opposed by the American people, that their taxpayer dollars would go to fund abortion.

We teach our children the lesson of the boiled frogs, where if you throw a frog in a pot of boiling water it will jump right back out, but if you leave the frog in cold water and slowly turn the temperature up, that frog will die and never leave the water. So, over time, here we are just becoming more and more accustomed to this harsh treatment of innocent life by the people of the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

This issue of abortion does divide us, but there are fundamental truths about the protection of innocent life from conception forward and our Constitution, which we all swear to uphold, protecting life.

Today, Mr. SMITH is going to go into detail about why it is so important for those of us who believe as we believe—many of us on religious convictions—that we should protect all innocent life, and how, frankly, that is under assault in this country today, sometimes

by the stroke of a pen, sometimes on the floor of this great deliberative body, but it is constantly now something that is under attack.

□ 1630

I have recently reintroduced a bill that is very related, H.R. 1050, reintroduced with an outstanding Member of Congress from the Democratic side, Representative BART STUPAK from Michigan, a devout Catholic. He and I have introduced H.R. 1050, which bans human cloning.

Listen, most people would say, what, you have to pass a bill to ban human cloning? Human cloning is not banned under the laws of the United States of America? And the answer is no.

Now, interestingly, seven of the other G8 countries, the industrialized nations, including Canada, France, Germany and Italy, have completely, unequivocally, banned human cloning, but not the United States of America, no.

If anything, I would think it would be the other way around. We would have been the first to say “no” to human cloning, but with the G8 we are the last.

This process that the proponents of cloning call therapeutic cloning is advancing to the degree that reproductive cloning, the cloning of human beings, is just the next step. Many have given testimony here at the Commerce Committee, the health subcommittee, that human cloning is just a matter of time. It’s not if it will happen in this country, it’s when it will happen in this country.

The other industrialized countries, the sophisticated countries of the world have said, no, ban it, stop it. This is a Frankenstein-type outcome. This is fundamental. It’s not gray, it’s black and white.

This does not ban embryonic stem cell research. It bans embryonic human cloning. This is a fundamental question of what we are all about and whether or not we will allow this.

Even the United Nations, which is not exactly a conservative body in the world, passed a declaration to adopt all measures necessary to prohibit all forms of human cloning inasmuch as they are incompatible with human dignity and the protection of human life.

This hour is dedicated to the protection of human life. Let’s ban human cloning in this country, surely to goodness. We can do that in a bipartisan way on the floor of this House.

I call on the House to support BART STUPAK and ZACH WAMP in H.R. 1050.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, but especially for his extraordinary work on banning human cloning and for his leadership on life issues in general.

Madam Speaker, human embryo-destroying stem cell research is not only unethical, unworkable and unreliable, it is now demonstrably unnecessary.

Recent spectacular breakthroughs in noncontroversial adult stem cell re-

search and clinical applications to effectuate cures with the mitigation of disease or disability have been well documented. For several years, significant progress has been achieved with adult stem cells derived from non-embryonic sources, including umbilical cord blood, bone marrow, brain, amniotic fluid, skin and even fat cells. Patients with diseases, including leukemia, type 1 diabetes, multiple sclerosis, lupus, sickle cell anemia and dozens of other maladies have significantly benefitted from adult stem cell transfers.

Members will recall back in 2005, President Bush signed legislation that I authored, along with my friend and colleague, Mr. ARTUR DAVIS, which provided \$265 million to establish a comprehensive nationwide network to collect, type and disseminate, using best practices, umbilical cord blood, the aftermath, the leftover, the medical waste, after a baby is born.

Some 4 million women give birth in the United States every year. In the past, the umbilical cord and the placenta was simply thrown away, despite the fact that it is teeming with stem cells that could be used to effectuate cures and to mitigate disease. The legislation combined cord blood and bone marrow efforts under HRSA, so now we have a program, a nationwide program, to try to help people who are suffering from serious disease.

We know that leukemia patients can be greatly benefitted, in some cases cured, from leukemia as a result of those transplants. Many of our African-American friends, some 1 out of every 500 who suffer from sickle cell anemia can also benefit greatly from these kinds of transplantations. That legislation is being run by HRSA and it is working.

Adult stem cells, Madam Speaker, are truly remarkable. They work, they have no ethical baggage, and advances are made every day at a dizzying pace.

But perhaps the greatest breakthrough of all, Madam Speaker, was the discovery of a process that turns every day ordinary skin cells into pluripotent embryo-like stem cells.

On November 20, 2007, Japanese scientists Shinya Yamanaka and Wisconsin researcher James Thompson shocked the scientific community by independently announcing their ability to derive pluripotent stem cells to the reprogramming of regular skin cells, regular skin cells turned into pluripotent skin cells. The iPS cells, as they are called, are made by adding a small number of factors or genes to regular skin cells in a Petri dish that can remodel mature cells into stem cells that are functionally identical to those obtained from embryos.

In other words, Madam Speaker, scientists have found a way of transforming your cells, skin cells, and mine, into stem cells called induced pluripotent stem cells or iPS. Pluripotent stem cells are those miraculous building block cells that can be

coaxed into becoming any type of tissue found in the human body.

Unlike embryonic stem cells that kill the donor, are highly unstable, have a propensity to morph into tumors and are likely to be rejected by the patient unless strong anti-rejection medicines are administered, induced pluripotent cells, stem cells, have none of those deficiencies and are emerging as the future, the greatest hope of regenerative medicine. While some Members of Congress and President Obama still don’t get it, the breakthroughs have not been lost on the mainstream press.

For example, on November 21 Reuters reported, and I quote, “Two separate teams of researchers announced on Tuesday they had transformed ordinary skin cells into batches of cells that look and act like embryonic stem cells, but without using cloning technology and without making embryos.”

The New York Times reported on this same day, “Two teams of scientists reported yesterday that they had turned human skin cells into what appear to be embryonic stem cells without having to make or destroy an embryo—a feat that could quell the ethical debate troubling the field.”

The Associated Press said, “Scientists have created the equivalent of embryonic stem cells from ordinary skin cells, a breakthrough that could someday produce new treatments for diseases without the explosive moral questions of embryo cloning.”

Even University of Wisconsin’s Dr. James Thompson, the man who first cultured embryonic stem cells, told The New York Times, “Now with the new technique, which involves adding just four genes to ordinary skin cells, it will not be long before the stem cell wars are a distant memory. ‘A decade from now, this will just be a funny historical footnote.’”

Dr. Thompson told the Detroit Free Press, “While ducking ethical debate wasn’t the goal, (it is) probably the beginning of the end of the controversy over embryonic stem cells.”

In Medical News Today, Dr. Thompson went on to say, “Speaking about this latest breakthrough, the induced cells do all the things embryonic cells do. It’s going to completely change the field.”

“The other advantage of the new method is the fact that using cells drawn from the patient’s own skin, the stem cells can be customized to the patient, bringing numerous benefits, such as the elimination of immune system rejection. They are probably more clinically relevant than embryonic stem cells.”

Madam Speaker, this past Monday, more good news, no, let’s call it great news on the iPS front. Research teams from the United Kingdom and Canada published two papers in the prestigious scientific journal, Nature, announcing that they had successfully reprogrammed ordinary skin cells into induced pluripotent skin cells without

the use of viruses to transmit the re-programming genes to the cell. Using a “piggyback” system, as they called it, the scientists were able to insert DNA where they could alter the genetic make-up of the regular cell before being harmlessly removed.

According to many scientists, the removal of potentially cancer-causing viruses means this breakthrough increases the likelihood that iPS cells will be safe for clinical use in human patients. The lead scientist from Canada, Andras Nagy, was quoted in the Washington Post saying, “It’s a leap forward in the safe application of these cells. We expect this to have a massive impact on this field.”

And George Daley at Children’s Hospital in Boston said, “It’s very significant. I think it’s a major step forward in realizing the value of these cells for medical research.”

This breakthrough, Madam Speaker, suggests the momentum has decisively and irrevocably swung to non-controversial stem cell research like iPS cells and away from embryo-destroying research. The lead scientist from the UK was quoted in the BBC saying, “It is a step towards the practical use of reprogrammed cells in medicine, perhaps even eliminating the need for human embryos as a source of stem cells.”

Finally, in the Washington Post Dr. Nagy made a series of interesting comments this week. First, that his studies showed that the iPS cells had many of the properties of embryonic stem cells. Secondly, while the research in this case was done on fetal cells, the approach had worked equally well with adult stem cells. And, third, since iPS cell research should no longer require the specialization of virus labs and researchers, the number of researchers working on iPS cells is expected to increase again beyond the large number already devoting their attention to induced pluripotent cells since November of 2007. There has been an explosion in this area, because this holds the greatest promise.

Time magazine reports, reporting on the efficacy and the advantage of iPS stem cells, “The iPS technology is the ultimate manufacturing process for cells; it is now possible for researchers to churn out unlimited quantities of a patient’s stem cells, which can then be turned into any of the cells that the body might need to replace or repair.”

Despite all of this, Madam Speaker, this new and extraordinary progress in the iPS and adult stem cell research arena, the Obama administration and the House and Senate Democratic leadership remain obsessed with killing human embryos for experimentation at taxpayer expense.

Why persist in the dehumanizing of nascent human life when better alternatives exist, alternatives that work on both ethics grounds and efficacy grounds. Nonembryonic stem cell research is the present and it is the future of regenerative medicine, and the only responsible way forward.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for sharing this time with me and for taking the lead on this special order on stem cell research.

I want to also say that I want to associate myself with the remarks from our colleague from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) in saying that this is an extremely important issue for us to be dealing with.

If we don’t deal with the issue of life, if we don’t deal with what are the ethical principles that drive us, then the other things really don’t matter. We have a lot of things that are weighing on people’s minds in terms of the economy, and we know that’s important, and we are very concerned about folks who have lost their jobs and who are struggling with the economy.

□ 1645

But what’s most important is that we deal with the essential elements of what makes us human beings, and I think it’s important that we are doing this Special Order tonight.

One of the most gratifying experiences that I have had since I have been in Congress was one night about 3½ years ago when we were supposed to be doing a Special Order on stem cell research. We were scheduled to do that. I wasn’t going to lead it, but all of my colleagues suddenly had conflicts and asked me if I would lead the Special Order. I was standing right here and I spoke for about 40 minutes about the issue. And when I got back to my office, which took me about 5 minutes, it was at 9:30 at night, and one of my staffers was still there waiting for me, and she told me that she’d had a call, as soon as I finished my speaking on the floor, from a gentleman from Maryland. He said he had never watched C-SPAN in his life. He was surfing through the channels, saw this little gray-haired woman standing on the floor of the House, wondered how an average citizen was able to stand on the floor of the House and speak because he thought it was only Members of Congress that could do that. So he stopped to listen. And he heard my description of stem cell research. And he just called to thank me for doing it and to tell me that he didn’t understand the issue and now he did and he was very gratified by that.

So I am very, very pleased that our speaking to people about this issue does make a difference, and I hope that by having this Special Order today, we will have many people who understand the issue better and will have their minds changed if they were going in the wrong direction or have their minds made up if they didn’t have an opinion.

What I did that night was describe basically what stem cell research is and what are the differences in the way people talk about it, and I think that continues to be an important issue.

I am a very strong pro-life person. All people who are pro-life are in favor of stem cell research. I support stem cell research. Many people believe that pro-life people do not support stem cell research.

However, we don’t support research that requires the killing of human life. That’s what’s important to us. We know that we can do stem cell research without destroying human life. We also know that a lot of taxpayer money is being spent on embryonic stem cell research. And I think, frankly, we’re paying more than our fair share for research that many people find to be morally repugnant.

For 2008 NIH estimated it would spend \$37 million on embryonic stem cell research. That \$37 million is not nothing; it is a lot of money. However, from that money we have achieved no positive results. That is, we have nothing to show for all the money that has gone into embryonic stem cell research. That point needs to be made over and over again because we have gained treatment for 70 diseases through the use of adult stem cell research, and what separates those of us who are pro-life from those who are pro-abortion is that we support research into adult stem cells.

One of the reasons I am also very excited about the research that is going on in adult stem cells is because Dr. Anthony Atala and his team at Wake Forest in the Institute of Regenerative Medicine are getting great results as a result of their research into adult stem cells and they are not destroying human life. Dr. Atala, who came to Wake Forest from Harvard and brought a large team with him, is a tissue engineering specialist, and he has found that amniotic fluid stem cells have those pluripotent properties that have been pointed out earlier that grow as fast as embryonic stem cells. He’s received tremendously positive response, particularly in growing bladders. In addition, stem cells coming from the umbilical cord and from the placenta and amniotic fluid have shown tremendous results, as my colleague Mr. SMITH has talked about.

So it’s important that we always distinguish between adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research. We must continue to educate the American public on this issue, and we need to explain to people the ethical questions that we are dealing with.

We should never in this country sanction research that would harm other human beings. Many of us know that there was research done in the 1930s with prisoners that was very wrong. We have condemned that research over and over again. But since that time, we have had very, very strong and ethical programs to protect adults from diseases that would cause them harm and that would cause them death, and yet people don’t see the same problem when we are dealing with embryos, and we must point that out to people. We are crossing an ethical Rubicon when

we sanction using embryos for research or creating embryos for this research. That is going over the line, and we must explain that to the American public. We must explain the long-term implications for our society and for the human race. Not being careful to take care of human life at the beginning of life has implications for whether we will take care of human life all throughout life and particularly at the end of life. We also have to point out that we have gotten much better results, again, from the use of adult stem cells and umbilical cords and other ways to get cells other than destroying life.

I hope today that there's at least one other person like the gentleman in Maryland who saw me do this 4 years ago and who's understanding this issue for the first time and understands particularly the distinction that we are making between doing ethical research on adult stem cells and what most of us consider is unethical research on embryos which will destroy them. Then we can continue to support programs like that of Dr. Atala at Wake Forest University and other places where they're seeing excellent results. That's the kind of research this country should be doing. We know we can get good results from that.

And I want to support again my colleagues who are here tonight speaking on this issue and helping the American public and others understand it. We are an ethical people, and we want to continue to be an ethical people and do research that will produce good results.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back to the leader for tonight, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Congresswoman FOXX, for your wonderful and very incisive comments today, and I really appreciate your leadership on life issues as well, especially when it comes to embryonic stem cell research and the alternative that is, without question, adult stem cells and especially induced pluripotent stem cells derived from such everyday skin that we all carry on our bodies, which has proven to be highly efficacious and works, and I think it is the future.

I would like to now yield to Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. First, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey for conducting this very, very important discussion.

Madam Speaker, over the past several years, I have received scores of letters from my constituents that reflect widespread national confusion about stem cell research. Let me take a few moments to cut through the fog on this important issue.

There are two types of stem cell research often confused in our public debate. The first, which I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support, is the type of stem cell research which uses cells derived from sources such as cord blood, skin, and bone marrow, com-

monly known as adult stem cell research. This is good science, helping to save American lives and providing real treatment options now.

The American people deserve to know that adult stem cell science is progressing at a staggering pace, showcasing over 70 successful clinical treatment models for conditions ranging from heart disease to Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury, sickle cell anemia, stroke damage, leukemia, chronic liver disease, and many, many more. The empirical evidence is sound, and it really is eye opening, giving hope to those who suffer from these debilitating conditions.

Madam Speaker, the American people also deserve to know that there is a clear distinction between adult stem cell science and embryonic stem cell science. Between hope and promise for cures on the one hand and misleading, misguided efforts to funnel their tax dollars to bail out research companies, research enterprises, that thrive on the destruction of nascent human beings, embryos, who are no less human than Members of this august legislative body.

Widely touted and vigorously promoted nationwide as a potential cure for many of the same conditions that adult stem cell research may treat, embryonic stem cell research requires the destruction of unborn human persons to derive stem cells for research. We know that embryonic human life is still human life. The marvels of modern science leave no room for confusion on this important point. Moreover, embryonic stem cell research has shown no clinical success to date. It represents a degradation of human life that is wrong. Science that harms human beings, no matter how small they are, no matter how vulnerable they are or easily disposable they are, is always wrong.

With so many proven ethical alternatives, embryonic stem cell research presents an unnecessary moral dilemma for persons of goodwill. It siphons limited Federal funds away from adult stem cell research that is now saving lives. And American taxpayers, who have recently been asked to shoulder an unprecedented deficit that will burden generations to come, should not be forced to pay for it. Adult stem cell research works, saves lives, and avoids the ethically divisive issue of the destruction of innocent and unborn human life.

So, again, with that I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for conducting this important dialogue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. FORTENBERRY for his leadership. He has shown, since he has been here, himself to be not only a leader but someone who thinks both inside and outside the box on so many human rights and humanitarian issues. And this is a human rights and humanitarian issue, and I thank him for his contribution not just today on the floor but every day as a Member of this august body.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to yield to Mr. FORBES.

And before doing so, I'd just remind our colleagues that a couple of years ago, Mr. FORBES and Mr. LIPINSKI brought a researcher from Brazil and a researcher from the United States who had another breakthrough, in this case cord blood, for type 1 diabetics. And some of the diabetics, virtually all except two, who had been given cord blood transplantation got off their insulin. They were no longer insulin dependent. And, again, so many people in this Chamber, so many people in the White House, and perhaps even HHS don't seem to get it; that the real progress, the real advances are being made in the realm of adult stem cells, and those kinds of advances are being made each and every day. And Mr. FORBES is the prime sponsor of some very, very important legislation dealing with adult stem cells, which I hope he will elaborate on.

I yield to Mr. FORBES.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you, Congressman SMITH. And I also want to thank Congressman FORTENBERRY for his comments and to begin by saying that many of us come to this debate for different reasons. Some because of philosophical reasons, some for political reasons. I come to it for a rather personal reason.

My father, about 5 years ago, died from Parkinson's disease. My brother currently has Parkinson's disease. So it's near and dear to my heart. But what's most important is I don't need political debates or political rhetoric. What I need is some cures or I need someone who can provide some way of treating those illnesses.

If you just step back and take a moment, as Congressman SMITH has pointed out, we find that all of the major breakthroughs have been with adult stem cells, not with embryonic cells. In fact, I have here a scorecard, and I know no one can see this in the body tonight, but if you showed the victories for peer-reviewed studies from adult stem cells, you would have 73 different illnesses that have been treated successfully with adult stem cells. And then if you look on the embryonic side, you would find 0 over there.

And one of the exciting things for us as we go through this debate is, as I travel around, I find, Congressman, as I know you do, that a lot of people really do not understand the difference between the two because the debate gets muddled many times; but as Congressman FORTENBERRY pointed out so correctly to us, we really have now three major types of cells that we're talking about.

□ 1700

We are talking about the adult stem cells, which have absolutely no ethical problems and have shown all of the benefits for really dealing with illnesses. We then have the embryonic

stem cells, which have a number of ethical concerns and have shown absolutely no benefits in treating illnesses. And now we have the induced pluripotent stem cells, or the IPS cells, which are ethical, because they, Congressman, as I think you mentioned, really come back from the adult cells as we work back and reprogram those and they have all the capacity of the embryonic cells without any of the ethical problems.

So really what we have is a situation where the science in this whole discussion has outpaced the debate, and the science has now proven that we really don't need the research for the embryonic stem cells. But in a day and age where every day we give up and see so much negative news, there is some exciting, good news, as Congressman SMITH has pointed out, and I would like tonight just to talk about some of those great advances that we have seen.

First of all, in 2007, the Journal of the American Medical Association published a study on the first stem cell treatment for diabetes patients. Researchers from Northwestern University and Brazil performed a clinical trial with 15 diabetic patients, and 13 of the 15 patients with type 1 diabetes were insulin-free after receiving an adult stem cell transplant using blood stem cells.

In 2002, doctors treated a patient for Parkinson's disease with his own neural stem cells. This is the world's first clinical trial using stem cells for the treatment of Parkinson's disease. Doctors actually isolated the patient's stem cells, induced them to differentiate into the desired nervous system cells and implanted them back into the patients' brain.

Just a few weeks ago, a study on this treatment was published in the *Bentham Open Stem Cell Journal* and the study outlines the long-term results of this trial. For the 5 years following the procedure, the patient's motor skills improved by over 80 percent for at least 36 months.

Now, a word of caution must be added that since this is a single case study, a larger clinical trial is needed to replicate these findings and assess their long-term sustainability. But notwithstanding, this is an incredible scientific breakthrough.

In 2006, the *Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* reported a treatment for spinal cord injury using adult stem cells. A doctor in Portugal transplanted nasal stem cells into seven patients with spinal cord injury. Following the procedure, these patients regained some motor function and sensation, and two patients showed bladder control improvement.

I understand that the FDA recently approved a clinical safety trial using human embryonic stem cells for newly injured spinal cord patients. However, it is important to note that this is not a treatment, but only approval to begin experiments with humans to test

for safety. On the contrary, this 2006 study demonstrates actual patient treatment using adult stem cells.

All of these studies show that stem cells can be derived from human cells and used to successfully treat patients, all while maintaining ethical standards. Advancing scientific development and protecting life do not have to be opposing forces.

In just a brief summary, I would like to respond to another question that Congressman SMITH had or suggested he had, and that is that we talk about the Patients First Act, which is a bipartisan bill that was introduced previously. It is now H.R. 877, the Patients First Act, which has been introduced in the 111th Congress. It was originally introduced by Congressman LIPINSKI from Illinois and myself as H.R. 2807.

As we step back, for those of us with loved ones who suffer from these illnesses as I did with my father and I currently do with my brother, it just makes common sense that we would like to do a couple of things.

First of all, we would like to get as much research as we can to the problem, and not just floating out for some hypothetical research. The second thing is we don't want all the theories around, we don't want all the political posturing. What we want is cures in today's time so that we can get them to these patients and they can impact their lives.

So we wrote a bill that did something that is really novel. It used some common sense. It just said what would happen if for a change, instead of worrying about what all of the interest groups wanted, we put the patients first. If you put the patients first, you ask one simple question of the NIH. You simply ask them to do this: Tell us which research, either on the adult stem cells or embryonic stem cells, is going to get the most near-term clinical benefits for the patients, and that is where we want to laser in our money. That is where we want to focus in our money, because that gives us the greatest opportunity for a cure and certainly for treatment.

I am convinced if you do that, right now the scorecard would be 73 for the adult stem cells and zero for the embryonic stem cells. But as Congressman SMITH has so accurately stated, even if you say there is research potential with the embryonic stem cells, there is actually no reason why we couldn't use the IPS cells to do all of that without one bit of ethical problem.

So, Congressman, I just want to tell you tonight in this world of bad news, there is some exciting news out there of what we are seeing. I think patients have reason today to hope if we just do our job and we say let's get off of the divisive debate that has marred this whole area for so long. Let's concentrate on where we can put our research to help patients. In so doing, I think we will end up doing the research with the adult stem cells, and the

promise there I think is really limited now for what our patients will see.

So thank you so much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you to RANDY for his extraordinary contribution and for his leadership on these issues, especially having dealt with and currently dealing with such a difficult hardship with his own family.

I will never forget when Parkinson's disease and fetal tissue transplantation in the mid-1990s was being offered as the panacea, the brass ring, to try to end that very horrible disease, which we all know people, you know it personally in your own family. Unfortunately, we found very quickly that taking fetal tissue from a baby about to be aborted turned out to be an unmitigated disaster as this very unstable group of cells would very quickly proliferate and become various bone tissue and other tissue inside the brain, causing worse convulsions and tremors on the part of the patients in whom the transplantation was given.

I think we have a very similar parallel today where there is an excessive amount of hype and hyperbole about embryonic stem cells, which have an unbelievable propensity, very grave propensity, to become tumors. Not only are they killing embryos to derive the stem cells, but once those stem cells are in hand they become tumors, they are unstable, and, if transplanted into humans, there is a great fear that we would see a replication of the fetal tissue debacle of the mid-1990s.

As you pointed out so well, RANDY, there is an ethical alternative that does not have the rejection factor, will not require anti-rejection drugs, whether it be Celsep or any of these other drugs that those that get transplants get. None of that would happen. And you don't have the tumor formations from these IPS cells.

Mr. FORBES. If the gentleman will just yield briefly and then I will yield right back, one of the things that is so exciting for us as we look in this debate is many of the people that began, the scientists that began doing research on embryonic research have now folded their tent and realize they don't have to do that. They are going back and now saying we don't need to do that. We will use IPS cells or do the adult stems cells.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As you said, the pioneers of embryonic stem cells are now the pioneers of the ethical IPS.

Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the comments from our colleague from Virginia too.

I want to just take us a minute to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his commitment over the years, over the decades, even though you don't look that old, over the decades of standing up for the defenseless, the most vulnerable, for standing up and making a commitment to the truth that all life is precious, it should be

protected, it is sacred, and government has a fundamental responsibility to protect the weak from the strong. That is what Congressman SMITH has done for years, and I am proud to join in that effort, along with other pro-life Members of the United States Congress.

We all want positive treatments to result from stem cell research. We just don't want to destroy human life in getting those treatments. And I thought the gentleman's comments from Virginia were right on target where he talked about the positive results, the positive treatments that have resulted from adult stem cell research. Unbelievable. The scorecard, as the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, is overwhelmingly in favor.

It is interesting, and the gentleman from New Jersey made this point: The ethical decision is the smart decision. The ethical decision is the actual productive decision. It is the one that leads to positive results for families, for people out there, so they can get the treatment they need, and doesn't destroy human life in the process. That is what we should champion. That is the ideal that is consistent with this country that is frankly consistent with our founding.

I always go back to this, and I will close with this and yield back to our pro-life chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus. The document that started it all, and I think it is important to go back to these first principles, the document that started it all in this country, the Declaration of Independence, it is interesting what the Founders said when they said we hold these truths to be self-evident. All are created equal, endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is always interesting to note the order the Founders placed the rights they chose to mention. Can you pursue happiness, can you go after your goals and your dreams, those things that have meaning and significance to you and your family if you first don't have liberty, if you first don't have freedom? And do you ever experience true liberty, true freedom, if government doesn't protect that most fundamental right, your right to life.

That is what the congressman from New Jersey, Congressman SMITH, has been doing for years, and we appreciate that and we are proud to join in that effort to protect human life and to protect research that is actually going to make sure we protect human life as we move forward and get those positive results that are going to help all kinds of people across this country, around the world, all kinds of families around this country and around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would just say to my friend, I thank you for your leadership as well. You are new to the Congress. Not that new. You certainly have stepped out time and time again, and it is greatly appreciated by all.

It is interesting that before we have had votes on embryonic stem cell research in this body, Members who take the other view have taken to the floor, to the well of the House, and said things like this, this is from Rahm Emanuel as reported by The Washington Post, I remember when he said it, "It is ironic that every time we vote on this legislation, [embryonic stem cell research, embryo destroying research legislation] all of a sudden there is a major scientific discovery that basically says you don't have to do embryonic stem cell research."

Our good friend and colleague DIANA DEGETTE said, "I find it very interesting that every time we bring this bill up there is a scientific breakthrough."

That is because, Madam Speaker, almost every day there is a scientific breakthrough in the area of adult stem cell and the induced pluripotent stem cells. The skin cells that have been turned into embryo stem cells without destroying or killing an embryo, without the ethical baggage, that is the biggest breakthrough of all. And it seems to me that we should be rejoicing. We have moved beyond the ethical debate because we have something in hand that is the promise and the hope of regenerative medicine.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Well said, Congressman SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Thanks to the gentleman for yielding.

I have put up a quote here which we'll get to in just a moment, and it is on the subject that we are currently discussing about stem cell research. I apologize if some of this is redundant, but I think this new information is very interesting and very exciting and I think it bears perhaps a little important redundancy.

For more than a decade Congress has been debating the ethics of using taxpayer dollars to fund research that requires the destruction of a human embryo. Science is making this debate obsolete.

At the beginning of the embryonic stem cell debate, only 2 years after human embryonic stem cells were first derived, President Clinton's Bioethics Council concluded, and here it is written, that in our judgment, in 1999, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission under President Clinton, said, in our judgment, the derivation of embryos remaining following infertility treatments is justifiable only, that is only if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for advancing this research.

Now, thanks in part to the very same researcher who first discovered how to derive human embryonic stem cells, researchers have discovered how to make pluripotent embryonic-like stem cells without harming or destroying a human embryo.

Let me repeat that. They have discovered a way of creating embryonic-

like stem cells without harming or destroying a human embryo.

You may have heard about these cells. They are called iPSC for induced pluripotent stem cells. They were first discovered in 2007. These cells are made by reprogramming adult cells, such as cells from your skin, into embryonic-like cells.

Of course, just to digress for a moment, to understand what the purpose of this whole idea of stem cells is, it is taking undifferentiated cells, and the future is amazing. We can create organs potentially.

□ 1715

Just think about, in terms of kidneys, hearts or whatever being transplanted. We would have organs that would no longer require any sort of immuno-suppressive drugs.

Anyway, in the 2 years since this technique was first published, hundreds of scientists have been feverishly at work perfecting this technique. Just this week, researchers published a major, just this week now, a major improvement on the technique of creating human iPSC stem cells. You may have read about this in the Washington Post that came out on Monday.

Previously, in order to reprogram cells to their embryonic-like state, researchers relied on viruses which were known to cause cancer when injected into humans. Now, researchers have shown that it is possible to make iPSC stem cells without the harmful virus. In fact, the factors used to reprogram the cells are completely removed, leaving behind only the embryonic-like iPSC stem cells.

So what this means is, not only are we having to use embryonic cells, which means destroying an embryo, a human life, but we can literally take it from the skin of an adult. And even more importantly, we don't have to use viruses to reprogram the nucleus. The problem with viruses, of course, you can introduce all sort of matter into the DNA, such as cancer, which is very dangerous.

These cells are even better than embryonic stem cells from embryos created through IVF because they can both be patient-specific and disease-specific, even for diseases we only barely understand.

Surely this meets the criteria set forth by the Clinton Bioethics Commission. Researchers, funded in part by our own National Institutes of Health, have discovered a viable and promising alternative to destroying embryos for their stem cells. Such research is no longer justifiable, even according to the Clinton criterion, which I've laid out here in large print. And certainly research that is both morally controversial and out of date does not need to be subsidized by the American taxpayer.

So, even in spite of all this, through private means, embryonic stem cell research can still go on, even though it's not needed, as long as taxpayers do not pay for it.

I feel there was never a justification in the past to destroy embryos for the purpose of stem cell research. But now we have two reasons to embrace this new technology, and that is, as I pointed out a minute ago, the fact that it's safer because we don't have to use viruses, and we no longer have to destroy embryos.

So, in closing, Madam Speaker, surely, even those who maintain a pro-abortion position will support this newer, safer technique which requires no Federal dollars to destroy human embryos.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, Mr. FLEMING, for his contribution and for his leadership. I would like to yield to Mr. BILIRAKIS 3 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, fellow Members, I'm glad to be on the House floor with you this afternoon discussing this very important topic of adult stem cell therapy. The breakthroughs in technology that have been already discussed, they are exciting, the breakthroughs. And I'm encouraged that science and medical communities are moving toward an ethical approach to treating very sick patients.

This miracle of ethical adult stem cell therapy really hit home with me last month when I met with a Florida cardiologist by the name of Dr. Zannos Grekos, who has been using adult stem cells to treat his very sick cardiopulmonary patients. The doctor has had extraordinary results, and the best part is no embryonic stem cells are used.

Dr. Grekos' groundbreaking procedure involves a simple blood draw which extracts adult stem cells from the patient's own blood. Since it is the patient's own blood, there is no possibility of the body rejecting its own stem cells. The few naturally occurring stem cells in the blood are cultivated into millions of regenocytes. The regenocytes are re-injected back into the patient's heart or blood vessels. They then stimulate tissue re-growth and greater blood flow to the affected area.

This treatment has proven to have miraculous results, and once again, the best part is that embryos are not destroyed and, because regenocytes are extracted from the patient's own blood, they cannot be rejected by the patient's body.

It was reported on CNBC.com a couple of weeks ago that this groundbreaking treatment has successfully treated heart disease, and even helped a patient beat a rare metabolic condition known as Fabry Disease, which would otherwise require a heart transplant.

Madam Speaker, the government should not be in the business of funding destruction of embryonic stem cells. We should be in the business, however, of assisting bright, young, innovative doctors and scientists like Dr. Grekos, who have forged a path of ethical adult stem cell therapy.

I, for one, am excited about the future of this therapy, and encourage this body to do all we can to support ethical adult stem cell therapy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. BILIRAKIS, thank you so much.

Mrs. BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

It's exciting to see what science has wrought just in the last few days, the discoveries that have come about. But the bottom line in all of it is this: Cloning will lead to the exploitation of women. That's harmful and that's not good, especially for poor women in the United States and around the world.

Women's eggs are required in the process of cloning, and the extraction technique exposes otherwise healthy women to the risk of infertility and, sadly, tragically, even of death.

The recent cloning scandal that we've witnessed in South Korea should serve as a warning here to those of us in the United States. Many Korean women were coerced into donating their eggs for Professor Hwang's fraudulent research. Not only is it wrong, really wrong to destroy human embryos, but it's even worse to put women in a position where their health is at risk to do unethical research, especially now, when we find science has taught us we don't have to.

The use of the iPS cells, or the adult stem cells, make it unnecessary to use women's eggs, while researchers who have been pushing human cloning have been seeking them.

We all know that November 20, 2007, a Wisconsin researcher and a Japanese scientist discovered, they independently announced their ability to derive pluripotent stem cells through the reprogramming of regular stem cells. This is a marvelous breakthrough.

And then just days ago, on March 1, 2009, two research teams demonstrated they could reprogram cells without the use of potentially cancer-causing viruses. This is marvelous.

iPS can produce a large number of both patient-specific as well as disease-specific stem cell lines because, according to the Telegraph newspaper, tests on the reprogrammed cell lines showed they behave exactly, exactly like embryonic stem cells. These cells have already been used to make heart muscle, brain neurons, motor neurons, blood, insulin secreting cells.

We are thrilled at the advances that science has made. Let's use these advances to make sure that we can further do more research that will protect people's lives.

But, at the same time, let's not hurt women, let's not destroy their lives, and let's not destroy their fertility; and certainly we shouldn't do anything that should lead to women's death.

And I thank you so much to the gentleman from New Jersey for leading this important hour. Thank you so much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mrs. BACHMANN, thank you very much for

your leadership and your very eloquent words.

I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. MARK SOUDER.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend, colleague from New Jersey.

I think one of the happiest moments in our life, or any grandparent, is to see your first grandchild. And my grandson, Grant, was born about a year and a half ago to my daughter, Brooke and her husband, Jeff. And we've watched him develop.

But from the time he became an embryo, egg and sperm joined, his stem cell content, his cell content was the same as it is now. All he's added is a little bit of chubbiness and a little bit of height as he's grown.

Now, in about a month our first granddaughter is going to be born, Reagan. And we've watched her grow in the womb. But from the time she was conceived, she became a separate human being. Nothing's really going to change. It's just she's going to grow and she's going to develop personality, add to her intelligence. But she's been the same make-up from the beginning.

Now, the question is, is why are some so intent on taking human life? And why are they so intent in using our taxpayer dollars to make us do that?

We've worked for many years. You've been a stalwart in this. We did a hearing, when we were in the majority, where we showed that there were already scientific breaks occurring in skin cells and so on. And as you said, sometimes the allegation is, why do these breakthroughs come right before we have a big vote?

They come constantly, as you so eloquently said, on lupus, on different diseases. Now we have yet another one. The advances are all in non-embryonic.

So why do we continue, other than because to try to take guilt relief off an abortion, to try to confuse the issue of when human life begins, why do we continue to, quite frankly, waste so much, when, in fact, many people would have been cured, healed and better had we put it into other types of stem cell research other than embryonic?

Thank you for your leadership. And I yield to you for a close.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. SOUDER.

Let me just say in conclusion, Madam Speaker, that the present and the future of regenerative medicine, which holds great promise and hope for each and every one of us, every one of us has members of our own family who have suffered from degenerative diseases, developmental disabilities and the like. We all know the pain and the agony.

I chair or co-chair the Autism Caucus, the Spina Bifida Caucus, the Alzheimer's Caucus, and believe passionately in trying to find cures for diseases. But the future of regenerative medicine is with adult stem cells, including and especially non-embryonic but embryo-like induced pluripotent

stem cells, iPS. That has to become, iPS, a household word.

THE MAJORITY MAKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, it's a great honor for me to be here tonight to join with many of my colleagues from The Majority Makers, the Class of 2006, which brought change to the Congress, and now hopes to join with President Obama to bring change to the country. We're here tonight to talk about the challenges facing this country that are manifold, the incredible, unprecedented nature of our situation, the opportunities that we face, because every challenge comes with opportunities, and also to talk about the budget that President Obama has proposed to this Congress, because it is a budget that takes us in a very different direction in this country, echoing and reinforcing his theme of his campaign, which was to bring change to the country. And it's also the motivation for all of us who came to Congress in the Class of 2006.

□ 1730

You know, I have the great privilege of serving on the Ways and Means Committee and also on the Budget Committee. Over the last 2 days, we've heard Secretary of the Treasury Timothy Geithner and OMB Director Peter Orszag talking about what the situation is in the country—the economic challenges we in the world face—and also what the Obama administration plans to do about them in asking for our assistance. Two things have been very clear in listening to both of these two gentlemen, who are new to their jobs, in listening to the new administration and also in listening to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they're responding to the initiatives of the administration.

The two things are: One, that they like to take potshots at the budget, which is fair game, because this is, after all, sometimes a partisan exercise. Also, the ideas that they bring to the debate are really no new ideas at all. As a matter of fact, listening to Republicans talk about the economic situation and their suggestions for how we move forward is kind of like listening to the coach of the Detroit Lions saying, "hey, use my playbook," after they just went 0 and 16. I don't want to pick on the Detroit Lions, but that's really what it sounds like because they bring no new ideas to the table.

That's what is so impressive about this team that President Obama has assembled and about the budget that he has brought to the Congress and to the American people. It is a budget that is full of new ideas and of new approaches to very old and very difficult problems.

So, as we're here tonight to talk about where we've been and where we're going and where we need to go in this country, I just want to mention the fact that Prime Minister Gordon Brown was here today. The theme of his address to the joint session of Congress was—and he has mentioned the expression many times—"faith in the future." That's really what we're trying to bring to this country, faith in the future, because that faith has been destroyed over the last decade in the United States, and that's what we are so committed to doing, and I think that's what the Obama administration is committed to doing as well, to restoring faith in the future, because that is also what has driven our country, our people, our businesses, and our institutions, which is that we believe there is a better time facing us, a better time ahead, and we have taken those steps. We have worked as hard as we can and have used our ingenuity to realize the future that we all aspire to. So I look forward to the discussion tonight as it's always a pleasure to be with my colleagues.

I would like to yield, first of all, to someone who has been a consistent participant in these discussions we've had, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. Thanks for your leadership on the issues, as we know, we have been really faced with as we move into this next congressional session.

It was interesting. A week ago, most of us were at home, speaking to people in small businesses, speaking to homeowners. Many of us do Congress on Your Corner, which is an idea where we just meet at the local supermarket or local drug store or local 5 and 10 and just have a chance to talk to people about what they're really thinking about right now and how we can solve these problems that our country is looking at. You know, it breaks down into three things:

One is: What can we do to stimulate the economy? What can we do to generate consumer interest and business interest? Because, if we produce more, people will buy more and demand will go up, all those kinds of things. What do we do about the mortgage crisis? It's not just the people who are sort of in foreclosure. There's a very large number of people who are at jobs where maybe they're earning \$50,000.

I was just at a car dealer's the other day, and they were telling me that the owner of the company came to the 140 employees and asked them to vote on whether they wanted to reduce their salaries. He, himself, the owner, had taken no salary in the last year, but he literally asked them if they'd be willing to take less compensation in order to avoid people being laid off. They took a vote and they did it. The reality is someone who's earning \$50,000 may be earning \$40,000 or \$35,000, and someone who is willing or is able to pay \$750

for a mortgage maybe now can afford \$600.

Well, there are simple solutions to that, and I'm very gratified that Congress is moving forward. The Obama administration has put out a number of proposals which, I think, need quick movement because they're just commonsense, and they make sense.

Everyone understands it's not in the best interest of a street for a home to be foreclosed on on that street. The better way to deal with that is to keep that person in the home. If the person is earning a little less than he was earning before, or that \$50,000 to \$35,000, and he can afford \$600 versus \$750, well, it's simple enough. Take the difference and defer it to the end of the mortgage or amortize the mortgage 40 years instead of 30 years. Get the payments to where the person can still afford to stay in the home and can take care of that home and can have a roof over his head. Add value to the community versus having that home boarded up and having it depress every other property on the street.

That's the kind of work that we need to encourage the banks to work on with our local community folks, with our homeowners, and those are some of the proposals that are out on the table today. I think those are the kinds of things that I've been hearing from our communities. We need to know that the government is working on encouraging banks and on finding incentives to get the banks to work with us.

Of course, other than the stimulus, which is already in place—and it's going to begin to filter into the communities over the next number of weeks—the last thing, of course, is fixing the banks in a way that they will lend to small businesses. I know we're going to talk about that tonight because we're a country of small businesses. We understand that's the lifeblood of our communities—to create jobs, to create wealth and to support local communities. I know that there are a number of ideas we're going to discuss which will help get those small businesses back on track because we know that we need to get the banks to help out with that.

So, with that, I'll turn it back to the gentleman. I'm looking forward to this good discussion on how we're going to move forward over the next number of days.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

One of the great things about having these discussions is we get perspectives from all over the country, not just from different, more conservative, more aggressive districts but, rather, geographically and demographically. There are a lot of important perspectives that help shape the context of this discussion.

I would now like to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman, and I thank my colleagues for

joining us tonight in this important discussion.

I want to focus on the President's budget and, in particular, on what is different about this budget in that the President has looked in a comprehensive way at our economy, not just at the crisis that we find ourselves in today, at this moment in time, but also at how to get ourselves out and where we want to be a year from now, 5 years from now, 10 years from now. We all understand that.

What the President has done with his budget is include within it segments of our economy that have been ignored in budgets over time—things like health care, like energy and like education—because what we understand in this Congress is we cannot move forward as a nation; we can't solve our economic problems, and we can't move this country forward and continue as the pre-eminent Nation on the planet in this global economy unless we reform our health care system, unless we find a way to get ourselves off of our addiction to foreign oil and unless we continue to improve the quality of the education available to all students in this country and make education more accessible so we can continue to be competitive in the global economy.

What we have set before us is the realization that every family, every business and every individual in this country is impacted by the cost of education, by the cost of energy and by the cost of health care, and we are going to talk about those issues tonight and certainly going forward.

I want to focus specifically on health care. The President has laid out an ambitious agenda, and he has done something that is unique. He has allowed Congress to have a say in it in a way that has not been the case in previous health care discussions. The President has said, "These are my priorities, and while I'm willing to work with the 435 Members of the House and with the 100 in the other body, let's work with the American people," because, in heart, that's what we are. We are Representatives. Let's put together a plan that can solve this crisis that we face, not just with our economy but in the health care system.

So what are some of the things that we hear when we go back and we have Congress on Your Corner?

Well, when we talk about the cost of health care, I often hear people say, "Well, why are you taking my money? I'm happy with my insurance. I'm covered. I have a job. I'm fine." Somebody will say, "Why are you taking my money and giving it to somebody else who doesn't have health care? I understand that that's a problem and that that's unfortunate, but why are you spending my money on them?"

What I try to explain to people is they're already paying for the costs of that person's health care. The most obvious example that you've heard many times is, when that person needs health care, he goes to the emergency room,

which is the least effective, the most costly and the most inefficient setting that you can possibly get for primary health care. So we're forcing them into that setting to begin with, and they get covered, and they get reimbursed, if you're the hospital, because that's our money. If you go to the hospital, the reason an aspirin costs \$10 is because of the cost shift that takes place. When you have someone show up who doesn't have insurance, the hospital or provider will shift that cost to somebody else. That's an obvious way.

What people don't think about is that your State taxes are higher because of exploding Medicaid costs all around the country. States are forced to pay for the Medicaid program. They shift that to the costs of the State taxpayers. Think of the delivery chain, the supply chain. At every level, health care costs impact the cost of the consumer. You've heard many times with regard to the auto industry, which is certainly struggling right now, that \$1,500 from the price of every car made in this country is due to the health care costs of the automaker.

Think about that. For every good and service that the American people buy on a daily basis, there is the cost to manufacture it, the cost to ship it, the cost to store it, and the cost to sell it. In every segment of that supply chain, there is a component that adds a premium for the cost of health care for the employers and for the employees who are involved in that little piece of the supply chain.

The salary and wages of the American people are lower because of the health care costs of the employer's, because they're offering health care to their employees. Therefore, the salaries are lower. We as an American people are already paying in a variety of ways for the people who don't have health insurance. We hear about the 47 million Americans who lack health insurance. We also need to remember the tens of millions more who live in fear every day of losing their coverage. They are one accident or illness away from losing everything. Less than half of small businesses in this country are able to afford to offer health care to their employees, less than half, because of the double digit increases that we've seen year after year after year.

This is simply an unsustainable course that we're on, but rather than looking at this in isolation as one problem that's separate from the economic situation that we face, the President and this Congress are going to work together and are going to look at those items together, along with energy independence and along with education, in a way that we haven't done before in taking a comprehensive look at it. These are the things that we're going to be talking about moving forward, and these are the things that this group is going to continue to discuss in these forums.

So I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I look forward to continuing the debate.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

I just have to add one thing because I think what he has done has brilliantly answered one of the charges that's always leveled about government action and its involvement in health care, which is, "Oh, we don't want socialized medicine."

What Mr. ALTMIRE has so intelligently recognized is that, whether it's in an organized way or in a disorganized way, we do socialize the cost of medicine across society. Right now, we do it in a very disorganized way, which, unfortunately, leads to both the inefficiencies, the added expense and the fact that many people fall through the cracks and are not covered. So I thank him for his comments.

Now I would like to yield time to my good friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH. It's a pleasure to be here with all of you tonight to talk about what's going on in Congress and about a change that's coming in this country—a needed change, a change from the direction that was taken in the prior 8 years.

I don't have to tell anybody in this room or anywhere else across the country that somebody drove the car into the ditch, and we've got to get that car out of the ditch in terms of the economy—in terms of the financial and housing systems across this country. We are grappling with an economy that's struggling at best and with a deficit that we've inherited from the Bush administration of well over \$1 trillion. What are we going to do about it?

The first thing you have got to do is stabilize the financial and housing markets. Those two things are being done through recapitalizing the banks and by giving them the ability to stay on their feet. The housing market we need to stabilize, and the administration has a complete program as to how to do that:

One in terms of interest rates that good and creditworthy borrowers can take advantage of like they haven't been able to take advantage of in years and years and years. I mean solid loans that aren't fly-by-night, phony baloney types of loans but 5 percent interest rates available to good and creditworthy customers.

Second, for people who find themselves in markets that are difficult, where the prices of the houses have dropped but they're paying their way and they're struggling, there is an ability for them under the administration's proposal to refinance so that they, too, can take advantage of low mortgage rates that are available today. For those who have been laid off or who are otherwise having trouble with their homes and their mortgages, there are other avenues available to them.

So, first, we have got to stabilize the marketplace. That's happening. Second

and more important is rejuvenating and invigorating the economy. We did that 2 weeks ago with the President's major recovery act.

□ 1745

There are components in that of investing in America like we've never done before or we haven't done for years and years and years.

And that investment costs money. There is no question about it. Whether you're a family or a business or a country, there are times you have to invest. And we have invested, and those returns we're going to see in a new energy economy, in a change in how we deal with our health care system and rebuilding our infrastructure. Those returns are going to be long term, but they are jobs today. Jobs in America today. Jobs that we need desperately from coast to coast.

The third piece in getting this country back on track and changing its direction, and getting that car out of the ditch is to restore confidence in both the economy and the financial systems. And we are working to see which regulations, which laws that were eliminated that should be reinstated, and which laws or regulations have compounded the problem and should be eliminated so that we can restore confidence, reinvigorate the economy and stabilize the markets.

All of this is going to be done starting with a tremendous deficit in this country but reducing it by half over the next 4 years in a fiscally responsible fashion.

There is a lot of hard work for us here in Congress, but even more hard work for people all across this country. But this country is capable of doing it, has done it time and time and time again, and we will get the car out of the ditch. We've got an administration and a Congress that is dedicated to doing that. And so we will change the direction of this Nation and get it back on track.

With that, to my friend from Kentucky, I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend, and I'd like to ask a question of the gentleman from Colorado who has done such incredibly important work on the Financial Services Committee and on these issues of which he spoke.

One of the things that we face, I know in terms of the housing situation, is that we have a very different situation from place to place in the country. We know certain areas of California and Nevada and Michigan have suffered to a far greater extent than many other areas. And in some of these areas, where housing values have not declined as much, and some other ones, I know some of the citizens wonder, "Why should I worry about helping the people in California or Nevada? What's in it for me?"

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. I'm asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. That's a great question because, in Colorado, we sort of went into the downturn of the economy before the rest of the country, and we've been climbing out. We had a much smaller drop in property values, our employment rate has been higher, but if the job layoffs were to continue, we would be falling into the same ditch as the rest of the country.

So for somebody from Colorado, the ability to maintain and build jobs—good energy jobs, health care jobs, jobs in rebuilding our highways, our transit, our electric grid—that will keep my State from driving into the ditch. So we're focused more on the jobs piece, but obviously having a strong and healthy financial system, as well as a housing market, is key as well. So this affects all of us, and we've seen it kind of roll across the country.

So even if in Colorado we have it better off today, we want to keep it that way. We don't want it to fall farther behind. So all of us are in this together.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

It now gives me great pleasure to introduce my colleague from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleagues and the Majority Makers Caucus on this March 4, 2009. It's been 76 years since Franklin D. Roosevelt took his first oath of office. March 4—which was then in past history when the President took office—March 4, 1933, and he said, "The only thing the American people have to fear is fear itself."

President Roosevelt took office after President Hoover, and Mr. YARMUTH discussed some things that were about the Detroit Lions, and you don't have to go back as far as the Detroit Lions. You can look to what the Republicans said about Mr. Roosevelt's attempts to bring us out of the Depression. And they caused the Depression, President Hoover and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau of that Congress. And President Roosevelt brought us out of the Depression. He created work programs that put money in the economy and put people to work. And he made a major difference. He transformed this American economy.

Once again, the Republican responses are similar to what we saw pre-1933. They're similar to what we heard in 1993 when President Clinton was looking at bringing about a balanced budget and the Republicans said that wouldn't work. And the Republicans have said many of the same things about this proposal depending entirely on tax cuts and entirely on the same type of issues and policies that have gotten us into the ditch that we're in now.

The fact is we need to move forward and the leader of the Republican Party's philosophy is none other than Rush Limbaugh. And Rush Limbaugh has said he wants this American President to fail.

Now, I can understand people wanting to have power for their party, but when you want a newly elected President of the United States—with a tremendous majority vote and majority support in this country—to fail, you are basically suggesting that the United States of America should fail. Because if President Obama fails in this most unusual time, when economic crisis has gripped this country—we're in a recession that is, in fact, probably is a depression, but we've kept the linguistics of a recession—you're suggesting that the American economy and the American Government should fail.

With the Republicans up here talking constantly against what President Obama has done and voting against it lockstep in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we saw a party that's not only being negative but is being, in my opinion, un-American. They've offered not new ideas but negative thoughts to question anything that's being done. They offer only the old and failed tax cuts.

We had the privilege today to listen to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and he said, and I may quote: But sometimes the reality is that defining moments of history come suddenly and without warning, and the task of leadership then is to define them, shape them, and move forward to the new world they demand. An economic hurricane has swept the world creating a crisis of credit and of confidence. Credit and confidence. History has brought us now to a point where change is essential. We are someone not just to manage our times but to transform them. Our task is to rebuild prosperity and security in a wholly different economic world where competition is no longer local but global, and banks are no longer national but international.

What Prime Minister Brown said, and said so well, is besides the fact that we have to restore confidence—and that's what I hear from every economist that I talk to is that's one of the problems right now is the American public needs to have confidence.

We came out of the Great Depression. We've come out of smaller depressions, recessions, and we'll come out of this one. But we won't do it with naysayers saying that it won't happen and this plan will fail and not offering an alternative.

And it's a worldwide problem. And what Prime Minister Brown said to us is basically his government and the governments of the world are doing the same thing that our government is doing and doing it together in a united front: stimulus packages, reforming banks and making sure that we can go into a new economy and create jobs.

The President's plans create new jobs by going into broadband and extending broadband into rural areas and inner cities to create jobs and give people access to the Internet; seeing that health care costs are controlled, which is taking a larger and larger percentage of

our budget and threatens American industry that has to bear those costs, while, in most other countries where they have national health care, the government bears it and not the industry. And we're competing against foreign producers who don't have that as part of their costs, so it's a disadvantage that we have. And General Motors and Ford and Chrysler have that disadvantage.

But we're trying to control health care costs, and we're trying to invest in education. We're putting more money into Pell Grants and giving people an opportunity to get better jobs to compete on the world scale where it is global and not local for competition for jobs. Investing more and more in science.

And in the previous discussion to this hour, we heard people on the Republican side talk about science. They talked about stem cells. We put over \$10 billion into the National Institutes of Health. I was really pleased that happened. I'd offered an amendment to do something similar, and it was passed by Senator HARKIN on the Senate side.

That's going to be putting scientists to work finding cures for the illnesses that they were talking about but refused to fund: heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's, AIDS, diabetes, Parkinson's. Those illness can be cured or treatments can be found if we give enough opportunity for scientists to do their studies, and the National Institutes of Health is the organization from which those funds come.

There have been so many falsehoods put out about this bill, and I would like to share a few with the American public here. One is—and I found this most interesting. The Republicans have claimed that under this bill—and many people have probably heard this—that each job will cost \$275,000 per job. Paul Krugman, a Nobel Prize winning economist called that a "bogus charge." He said, "Why is it bogus? Because it involves taking the cost of a plan that will extend over several years creating millions of jobs each year and dividing it by the jobs created in just one of those years. It is as if an opponent of the school lunch program were to take an estimate of the cost of that program over the next 5 years and divide it by the number of lunches provided in just one of those years and asserts that the program was hugely wasteful because it cost \$13 per lunch while the actual cost of lunch was \$2.57."

There have been so many false figures put out and accusations concerning different programs in the bill and the different economic plans that have been put forth by the Obama administration.

We know from Larry Summers and others that stimulus moneys need to be timely, targeted, and temporary. And they voted against giving the people who are on the front lines, the Purple Hearts of this recession, more extended unemployment compensation. They

voted against giving States moneys for Medicaid when we know we're going to have more and more need for Medicaid because more people fall in that category and can't afford their health care. And they voted against extending people food stamps, and those moneys, particularly food stamps and unemployment, are the most timely.

Those people are in desperate need, targeted to those who will spend it immediately because they don't have resources otherwise, and temporary because it's a short-term amount of money that's expended. And those people spend it immediately. They won't spend it on their condos and vacation vistas that they might go to someplace else, but they will spend it in their neighborhoods and their communities. And they'll be taxed, sales taxed immediately and put money into State and local governments who need that money to provide law enforcement and other services.

So, Mr. YARMUTH, my friend from Kentucky, and the other sophomore Majority Makers I have joined here, I think we need to think about Franklin Roosevelt and the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. That was kind of what President Obama talked to us about in his State of the Union and addressed us about when he was sworn in. A confidence that this country is a great country and this government will overcome the obstacles that we face, though they be great, and we will be the greatest country on the face of the Earth in the 21st century as we've been in the past.

But we need to think in new ways. We need to invest in new sectors to provide new jobs and to give our people the resources and tools they need because we're a great people. And I think you can usually see history repeating itself. You see it being repeated here with Franklin Roosevelt, that Congress; President Obama and this Congress.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend.

I want to tag along a little bit about the tax discussion because, it's interesting, there's an old saying that when all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. And what we've seen out of our colleagues on the other side is the only policy that they even think about when it comes to the economy is tax policy and the need to cut taxes.

The Republican-run Congress, controlled Congress, in 2001 and then 2003 cut taxes. Most of that tax cut went to the very wealthiest people in the country. That tax cut was scheduled to expire in 2011. And now that the President's budget would allow those tax cuts to expire for the very wealthiest Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year, our colleagues on the other side want to say we're raising taxes, which is not true at all.

□ 1800

In fact, the way I look at it is, if you go to a store, and the store says we've

got 40 percent off today and you happen to miss that sale and you go back the next day and it's back to regular price, you can't say the store raised prices, you just missed the opportunity. Well, in this situation, the wealthiest Americans did not miss the opportunity, they took full benefit of those tax cuts for the last few years. Meanwhile, the great disparity between the wealthiest Americans and everyone else continued to grow to unprecedented levels. And now that this President—and I assume this Congress—will say, let's restore some more fairness to the tax code, let's let those tax cuts expire, the rich can pay marginally more than they have been since the Bush administration cut taxes, and now they're complaining that that's a tax hike, which is frivolous.

Mr. COHEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. I would yield to my friend.

Mr. COHEN. Is it accurate to say that 95 percent of the Americans—and nobody with an income of a quarter of a million dollars a year or less—would see a tax increase and, in fact, would get a tax cut under this plan?

Mr. YARMUTH. That is clearly the effect of the President's budget, and it was clearly the effect of the recovery plan that we passed recently. And I think it was well justified. And I think the American people appreciate it and understand that—they know a tax cut when they see it and they know a tax hike when they see it. And 95 percent of the people in this country will see their paychecks increase, and they know that that's not a tax increase. So I thank the gentleman.

Now it gives me great pleasure, we've been around the country from Florida to Colorado to Tennessee and Kentucky and Pennsylvania, now it gives me great pleasure to introduce my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you for organizing this colloquy.

As Congressman COHEN said today, this Chamber earlier today was a place of a historic event where the Prime Minister of England, Gordon Brown, addressed the people of our country as well as both Chambers. And he, I think, did a magnificent job about, number one, talking about the economic crisis that we're in in global terms, the numbers in terms of lost jobs—lost wealth that has taken place over the last 6 months is historic and staggering—but reminded us that the focus has always got to be on the impact, person by person, in terms of jobs that are lost.

In this country, where we have lost, as of the end of January, 3.6 million jobs, because of our health care system being tied to employment there is an added blow that families suffer when there is a layoff, which is that people are confronted with the almost impossible choice of maintaining their health insurance by paying for COBRA premiums—which in a State like Connecticut, for an individual that is

about \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, \$12,000 for a family—or letting their health insurance just lapse.

One of the things that was included in the Recovery Act—and it has now been 2 weeks since the President signed that measure in Denver, Colorado—is that we have seen, I think, Member offices, have a chance to sort of see our constituents vote with their feet in terms of the interests that they've expressed about different components. And in my office, certainly, the COBRA subsidy, which was a measure that was included in the Recovery Act—again, a historic effort by the government to step in and provide families with 65 percent of the premium costs if they are laid off—again, something that has never happened in any prior recession or economic downturn—is the piece of the Recovery Act that's gotten the most traffic in terms of phone calls and inquiries into my office.

I'd like to, again, as Prime Minister Brown indicated, share a story in my district of a guy, Tim Jensen, he's a reporter for a small weekly newspaper, got laid off last September. He's one of these guys that would show up with a camera and a pad and pen at any event, supported every parade, community event, veteran ceremony. And unfortunately—as we know, the newspaper business has suffered along with many, many other industries in our country—he lost his job in September. To compound that, as I indicated, he had to foot the bill for COBRA extension, and to compound that even further, he was diagnosed with cancer later this fall. So now he's in a desperate Hobson's impossible choice of whether to maintain his health insurance, depriving his family of literally food on the table, or give up his health insurance at a time when he literally has a life or death need for medical treatments. The Obama plan, which is to provide a 65 percent subsidy for people like Tim Jensen, is literally a life saver. It is going to provide him and his family with the means to maintain that health insurance coverage and avoid, again, just a total catastrophe for him and his family.

And it does tie in to the issue which I know we've been talking about here today, which is the impact on the public finances of this country. The fact of the matter is that people who do lose their health insurance end up being a public cost later down the food chain of our health care financing system, either in the form of uncompensated care in the emergency room if there is a health care crisis, or they lapse and end up in a publicly financed program like Medicaid or some form of public assistance program for single adults, which many States operate. It is far more cost effective and rational to provide those individuals with a subsidy to maintain their existing health benefits while hopefully they will transition back into the workforce rather than to just completely abandon them, which unfortunately was the system prior to

passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

So, again, a measure which will provide the individual, which Prime Minister Brown talked about, which always should be our focus, will benefit not just that individual and their family, but also our overall system of public finances and health care coverage; again, hopefully just an appetizer in terms of the main course of health care reform, which this administration is, again, beginning to unfold with the release of its 2010 budget, and a Congress that is ready to roll up its sleeves and go to work in terms of all the key committees.

So this stimulus bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, has many, many components to it, which we've talked about over the last few weeks or so and will continue to do so. But clearly, the COBRA subsidy, a new, unprecedented effort by the government to step in and help unemployed workers—which are, sadly, going to increase at least in the short term—

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTNEY. Sure, I would be happy to.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, Mr. COURTNEY, one of the things that you've made the point so well, and Mr. DREIER, when he and I were arguing about the stimulus bill 2 weeks ago, is the immediacy of this, the urgency of this. The time to act is now, not 10 weeks from now, not 20 weeks from now. I mean, your friend's life was on the line. Mr. DREIER's friend, it was a tragedy because of job layoffs and a number of other things. So Mr. DREIER, explaining it as somebody on the other side of the aisle, but still wanted to vote no.

And what I've seen—and not to really pick on the other side because it's time for us to move forward in a positive way—their position is, just say no, we like the status quo. This country can't afford the status quo any longer. We need to move quickly, we need to move with purpose, and we need to move now. Because whether it's to maintain or create new jobs, provide COBRA where jobs have been lost, maintain State government—backfilling them so we keep the teachers and the firefighters and the policemen and the maintenance workers employed in this difficult time—or to assist people who have suffered, we've got to move now. And this Congress and this President are moving now.

Now, my friends on the other side don't like it, but their old ways—and I'm pointing to the record deterioration of the budget—have just driven us right into the ditch. I said that before. We have to turn this around. And so we will, under the President's approach and the congressional approach, reduce what was a record deficit that we've inherited by almost half or more, doing so in a way that creates new jobs, creates a new energy economy, creates a health care system that works, and at

the same time assisting people who have fallen on hard times. So I just appreciate working with all of you to get going on these problems and to turn this around.

I will now yield back to my friend from Kentucky, or to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Just to sort of close the note there, which is that, as difficult and challenging as the time we're living in for individuals like my friend I just described, or the macro picture, the fact of the matter is we can do this. As the Prime Minister said, we have to maintain our optimism, and we will, because that's the nature of our country. And we're going to get through this and fix this problem. And thank God we've got a President who's ready to work with this Congress and get this country turned around and moving in the right direction.

With that, I yield back to Mr. YARMUTH.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friends. And I think one of the things that is so impressive about this budget that we have had submitted to us is it is unique in so many ways and it is trend setting in so many ways.

I would like to yield once again to my friend from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) to talk about how this budget may differ from budgets we have seen.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well, I thank the gentleman for the discussion today. Because I think if we think about how we plan our family budgets, whether it's sending your kids to college, whether it's planning for retirement, if you're in retirement, making sure that the investments you have, even in difficult times like this, will pay for the expenses that you have, these are all things, it's all about certainty, and it is about trying to know where you will be and plan for the future. I know a lot of small businesses I talk to, they want to know for sure about how they will be in a position to plan their capital budget, cover the expansion, make the investments in their equipment and things like that.

So one of the things we've been working on is this budget. And the budget of course is the plan for this next year's fiscal spending of our government. And of course there are a lot of fixed expenses, there are things like, everything from prisons to roads to our military and defense and veterans, which are so important to us, particularly at a time when we are fighting two wars and we are creating a new generation of veterans. So as they come home, as this Congress has demonstrated, we will make sure that anyone who wears the uniform gets the benefit of making sure that this country stands behind them and their families for all the necessary care that they need in the future, as well as jobs.

But for the rest of the country, this really is a question of times when we do plan the necessary future vision. And I think what President Obama has

offered to many of us that I think is really visionary and exciting—and we're seeing this in the blueprint or what we call our budget—it's a focus on education, it's a focus on health care, it's a focus on energy. Each one of these is a crucial component of moving our economy forward.

Education by far—and I've believed this for a long, long time; my mom is a teacher, she is a public school teacher, she has taught second grade. She absolutely instilled in me the notion of how important education is. And as one of the first people to go to college in our family, it really has given me the opportunity to do things that have allowed me to serve in Congress. But more importantly, education is the best investment as a country that we can make. And between the stimulus plan and the budget, there is investment in college education. In President Obama's speech last week he talked about having every person who wants to be able to get a college education get one.

We see our competition around the world, whether it's Singapore or China, other places, the engineering degrees and other degrees that are coming forward; that's an investment in their future. Well, we have a great education system and a great university system, and community colleges and apprenticeship programs and vocational programs, all of these need to be nurtured and supported. And every student who wants to go to school—and every adult who wants to go back to school, particularly in a time like this—needs to have that support because that will turn into a very high productive economy.

Health care. We know health care is just the Pacman eating up the costs in our economy, not just for government, not just for Medicare and Medicaid, but for private businesses. I know that when I was in a business, we had about 75 employees. Every year—and I know many of the people who are on the floor here understand this from their businesses or people at home understand this—every year you go back and have that conversation of what it's going to cost to renew your health insurance; double-digit increases every single year—whether there has been an experience of sickness or anything in the business, that's exactly what happens, double-digit increases. So you have to make decisions; do you cut back? Do you pass off more of the costs to your employees? And at some point in time businesses say I can't afford it. And we want to give them the opportunity to provide that type of health insurance because it keeps their employees healthy. We don't want people showing up at the emergency room.

So this budget has an investment of changing our health care system to make it more efficient, better quality of medicine. And one of the ways they do this is bringing our health system into the 21st century with health technology. And this is something really

simple. Think of when you go to your doctor's office, and your doctor, and all his good medicine and good advice he's given you, he writes down the information about his observations and your evaluation on a chart in pen, in many cases—not all, but many of them still do—and that's because their systems have just not kept up with. It's not a fault of the doctors, it's just that the systems have really not kept up in this business. Now, every other business in the United States, we pretty much are on computers. Well, you still see large racks of files in a doctor's office. So, God forbid if something happened, let's say I'm at home and I have my personal doctor, and that doctor has my little chart. And he takes some tests, my heart and all the cholesterol and all the normal things, and I get sick as I'm traveling—let's say I'm up here in Washington, D.C. Well, I may go to a doctor up here, and guess what that doctor starts with? Zero. Nothing. No file, no nothing. And if he wants to get information, he has to call and maybe have somebody Federal Express or some type of courier of the record up to Washington and maybe has to take tests all over again. It just adds tremendous cost into the system instead of having a very simple—with privacy, of course, secure—but a simple system to have all of the technology of health care. Plus, certainly the quality of medicine can be improved on as well; I know many of my doctor friends tell me that all the time.

□ 1815

There is an investment, an incentive for doctors and providers, hospitals and others. This is just common sense. Again, if we can save money it can result in better quality of medicine.

Lastly, of course, is energy, and I know many of us in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, most Americans, understand that we have got to get a grip on our energy policy and stop sending billions and billions of dollars to countries that are not our friends but, in many cases, our enemies. We complain about Venezuela and Hugo Chavez, rightfully so, he is very anti-American, and he is a threat. And what do we do? We send millions and millions and millions of dollars daily over to Venezuela and buy their oil.

Well, that makes absolutely no sense to me and, I think, to most Americans. Well, it's not just Venezuela, it's all the Middle Eastern countries and plenty of other places. The sooner we can get into a mode where we can develop alternative energy, and whether it's wind or wave or solar or any combination of electric powers out there, and obviously there is coal and nuclear—and there are probably some answers as we focus our technology on some of those things as well to figure out the solutions to those problems—any number of ways that we need to make this country energy independent.

What President Obama does, and I certainly support, and I know most

Americans do, is to really get our attention focused and make the kinds of investments necessary to get us into alternative energy. For energy conservation, electric grid, make sure that you are home, for example, with a new technology.

I had a small businessman in my area that came to me and said he has created a device which can now purchase and store electricity at the least expensive hours of the day. We know that at nighttime there is a low demand for power and you could, if they start pricing it that way, you could buy it less expensively. Boy, that makes a lot of sense, and then you can actually get more capacity out of our existing electric power plants, common sense. And these are the kinds of things that President Obama and many of us as Americans understand are the kinds of things that we need to do.

So the gentleman from Kentucky, I am actually very excited about the kinds of things that are in this budget. Well, sure, we are going to work on some and make them a little better. Maybe some won't work out, but I think there is a blueprint here for the future, it's a blueprint that will get our budget back in line, put people back to work, make the quality of our education, the quality of our health care, and certainly an energy policy that will put us into the future. This is the kind of leadership that I am really excited about.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague, and I think that is truly one of the special things about this budget, is that it is forward-looking, it is visionary, and it doesn't rely on the tired actions of the past.

And, furthermore, it's such an honest budget. For the first time it is totally comprehensive, so that we don't keep things off the books like we have kept the expenditures for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan over the last 8 years. It puts expenses for those activities in the budget, projects them. It also includes items for anticipating disasters like Katrina or other natural disasters we know are going to occur but we never put those expenses in the budget.

So this is fully transparent, it is comprehensive, it is honest and, again, it is forward-looking, and that certainly is something that I think the American people, as time goes on and we discuss this budget, will appreciate that it is large. There is no question about it. We are spending unprecedented amounts of money and we, unfortunately, are facing some pretty substantial deficits.

But if we stick to this test, the odds of our not just recovering from our current situation, but from setting the foundation for an incredible era of growth and progress in this country, are greatly improved because of this new agenda advanced by the Obama administration.

So, as we get toward the end of our hour, I would like to recognize my friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) who

has also played an important role in one aspect of meeting the challenge of this current situation, and that is an element of the housing problem that he has been particularly instrumental in dealing with.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH.

Tomorrow we will have a vote in this House on a housing bill, and many have said that not only do we have to have confidence in our economy to have it come back, but we have to cure the housing problem first, which has been one of the main problems in causing us to go into this economic recession and the malaise that some say the economy is in and, indeed, it is.

One of the things we are doing tomorrow with the bill is to permanently make FDIC insurance for banks and credit unions \$250,000. That was something that we proposed in the first TARP and we were able to get that passed temporarily.

That permanent amount of money will secure American investors' deposits in banks and assure people they have confidence which they need to have and will have in the banks to know that their money is safe. That's important for our banking system to make it solid and for our constituents' deposits to make them secure.

The bill will also change and allow, for the first time, something that has been long in coming, the opportunity for people who might have to file chapter 13, bankruptcy, not a pleasant subject, not an easy subject, not an easy process but an ordeal where one has to go and show to the bankruptcy judge their need for help, all of their assets, their expenses, and be put on a plan for approximately 5 years on how they would have to spend their monies. And they have to have approval from the court over their finances.

In that process one can have the loans that they have made on a second home, on a farm, on a family farm, on an airplane, on a yacht, just about every type of property, modified by a bankruptcy judge to make it affordable to the person going into chapter 13 bankruptcy. The judge can reduce the principal down to the secured amount, can extend the terms, can lower the interest rate, but the judge has not been allowed, since 1978, because of an act of Congress, to modify a person's principal residence, which is their most valuable possession—maybe not in a monetary fashion but generally it is, at least in a spiritual way.

And in this particular crisis, to allow people to modify their mortgages on their personal residences, is similar to what people can do with secondary homes, vacation homes, yachts, airports, family farms, et cetera. We allow people to stay in their homes to solidify their neighborhoods, to keep houses on the tax rolls, to keep neighborhoods solid where if your neighborhoods aren't solid, you have increased crime, increased vermin, increased problems, and maintain hope for people in their neighborhoods and in their homes.

This will be a first-time activity. We have worked with all elements in this Congress to come about with amendments, there will be a manager's amendment tomorrow, to make it to where it is a last resort, to guarantee that the monies, the people won't be allowed to enter into the bankruptcy or have their mortgages changed unless they meet very strict criteria and provide that relief that we need to help this housing market succeed.

So we help the banks tomorrow and our financial security, really not the banks but the individual depositors with the \$250,000 FDIC insurance, and we help individuals in their homes with the opportunity to stay there and help neighborhoods.

I think this is landmark legislation, and I know that it's been extended to Vermont and Kentucky as well. I thank the anchor of our hour and the former president of this class, the distinguished and honorable gentleman from the former Conference U.S.A. city, Louisville, Mr. YARMUTH.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague and thank him for his work on this very important piece of legislation that we will be dealing with tomorrow, which will be another important component to get the ship of state back on course and to get our economy moving again.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome and recognize our distinguished colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Thank you. I have been listening to some of your comments, and I just want to make a few remarks about the budget. We all know that we have an economy that's facing the biggest challenge since the Great Depression, and what this budget is attempting to do, and a lot of work getting from where we are to where we need to be, is, I think, very simple. It's about trying to revive the middle class.

You know, when you think about the recent history of America in the 1960s, when LBJ took on the challenge of trying to eliminate poverty and was successful in reducing it substantially, it was the right goal. The middle class paid.

And in the past 10 years, and even more, the policy has been, essentially, to lower taxes for very high-income folks, also provide deregulation for corporations, and it has resulted in a significant transfer of wealth. The top 1 percent of our country has enjoyed the greatest explosion of wealth since the 1920s, and, in fact, who paid for that? It was the middle class.

So the middle class paid for the programs that are essential, and I support it, that benefit the poor. The middle classes paid for the programs that were very, very generous to the quite wealthy, and it's the middle class who, in the end, is getting squeezed. This country has always done its best when it has had economic and political policies that have given an opportunity for people who are poor to move their way up into the middle class and for the

middle class to sustain itself and to grow and prosper.

And what the Obama budget attempts to do is redirect our energies and our policies towards rewarding work and rewarding and enhancing the middle class.

Now, if we are going to be successful, we actually do have to pay attention to deficits, and it's a contradiction, so it seems, that on the one hand because of our fiscal situation we have to invest. We also have to commit ourselves to a health care policy that's going to make health care affordable, and to an energy policy that embraces the challenges of a new energy economy as something that can create jobs much. And we, as Democrats, who are supporting a middle class budget also have to embrace the absolute commitment to root out any waste and any excessive spending.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

I would like to conclude this hour of discussion from the Majority Makers, the class of 2006, that as this Congress proceeds and as we work with the Obama administration to set a new course for the country, to lay a foundation for growth and prosperity, a return to prosperity in this country, we look forward to further discussions.

And I think the most important thing we can say in closing is that to repeat the words of Prime Minister Brown this morning, who said, who kept mentioning, "faith in the future." That's what we are about, restoring faith in the future for the American people, and this will be our main mission over the next 2 years as we proceed to help every American realize his or her ambition for a better life.

OPPOSE OVERSPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and it is always an honor to address you, Mr. Speaker.

I have spent some of the last hour listening to my colleagues, whom I appreciate voicing their opinions as well. I would like to take up some of their issues at the beginning, and then I will roll it into the subject matter of this next hour that I have.

But first of all, when a statement was made by the gentleman from Tennessee that Rush Limbaugh wants Obama to fail, he didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. He can't be quoted anywhere as he wants Obama to fail or President Obama to fail. It wasn't his intent at all. You have to listen to what he actually said.

He said he wants his policies to fail. That was a message that's clear. It's been reiterated over and over again across the media and this country, Mr. Speaker. So I have to come here and

raise the issue in the beginning that that was a statement that was made, Mr. Speaker. Rush Limbaugh said that he wants President Obama's policies to fail so that we can go forward and preserve and protect and enhance our freedom and our liberties and our free market economy and perhaps, and I hope it's not so, perhaps our national defense as well.

I will stand with him on that. I have opposed these policies of overspending. I opposed the stimulus plan, and I opposed the bailout plan that came in the previous administration.

It was clear from where I stood that you simply cannot take money from the producers of this country and pour it into a void without a plan or a strategy and how it's going to emerge. Still, the U.S. Treasury couldn't tell us the results that would come from a \$700 billion bailout plan. The President of the United States can't tell us the results that will come from hundreds of billions of dollars, and, actually, more than \$1 trillion when you add the interest stimulus plan.

And so without a definable goal here, except the idea that spending is stimulus—and I disagree with that philosophy, spending is not stimulus. But, believing that, then the people on this side of the aisle have said, well, this is a comprehensive proposal, it's well thought out. We are going to have a more responsible budget than George Bush had, and in the end we are going to have this economy that is going to grow to the point where we will be able to do this magnificent thing called "cut the deficit in half" by the beginning of President Obama's second term.

□ 1830

I heard that over here, too, although he really said by the end of his first term, which I think is more likely if they keep going down this path.

So the words "cut the deficit in half" echo to me. That was a goal that was laid out by President Bush. So it seems to me that President Obama, Mr. Speaker, is following at least one of the patterns of President Bush.

And I will tell you I was not particularly moved by the idea that we could cut the deficit in half in 4 years or 5 years or whatever that might be. I didn't come into this political life with half of a goal. I'd want at least a whole goal. So if we can cut it in half in 3½ years or 5 years or whatever the case may be, why couldn't we just eliminate it? Or maybe we could just double that period of time. If we could cut it in half in 4 years, maybe we can cut it in half again in another 4 years, and then we'll be down to only 25 percent of this huge deficit that we have now.

But, Mr. Speaker, this deficit is breathtaking. We are looking at the current administration's budget of a deficit of \$1.75 trillion. And we heard him speak to us of having to construct one leg of a multi-legged stool to get us out of this economic crisis that we are in. Well, the one leg, you have to add

the bailout money from last fall and the \$1.1 or 2 trillion from the stimulus plan from just a little over a week ago, package that together, and without many of these things that got poured into by administrative action, you're at a \$2 trillion leg for one stool of what, according to the President, is a multi-legged stool. So if a leg costs \$2 trillion and it's multi-legged, I know it's not a milk stool. That would be a one leg. It's not a two-legged stool. I've never seen one of those. It's not a three-legged stool or he would have said so. So I have to presume that this stool that's going to be the rebuilding architecture of this formerly free market economy is going to be at least four legs at \$2 trillion a leg, which nearly doubles our national debt.

I remember the President's media personnel speaking on the morning of the President's address here in the joint session, Mr. Speaker, and he said our national debt is 10 percent of GDP, that we have to do something about that. It's too high.

Well, his current budget, the one that's just been defended by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, takes that share to more than 12 percent of our GDP. In fact, it's 12.3 percent of our GDP. That's the current President Obama budget. So this 10 percent of GDP that is national debt today becomes a 12.3 percent of national debt if this budget is enacted into law, and a lament that comes from his spokesman is we've got too high a percentage of our GDP in our national debt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there's another number that we should be concerned about. I'm concerned about that. I'm concerned about the daily interest rate, that if all of this is enacted into law, the American people will be paying \$1 billion a year just in interest alone, \$1 billion a year.

Now, I hearken back to 1992 when President Clinton was elected. He was elected under the belief of the American people that we were in a recession, and he convinced the American people we were in a recession, and you might go back and look at the definitions and parse that so that it was, I'll say, marginally true. But President Clinton came to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and he asked for a \$30 billion, that's 30 billion with a "b," economic incentive plan, and that was supposed to put money out into the hands of people so they would spend it because the belief was that spending is stimulus. It was going to create, though, jobs like the AmeriCorps is today and put this \$30 billion into this, and it was going to bring us out of this recession that was defined during the presidential campaign of 1992. President Clinton brought that argument to this Congress, \$30 billion. And this Congress, being a Democratic Congress, debated the \$30 billion, chopped it down from \$30 billion, finally got it down to \$17 billion, and then decided, well, we're not going to do it after all. So they

threw the idea of the stimulus plan over the side in 1993, after having taken a \$30 billion idea and reduced it to a \$17 billion idea, and they pitched it overboard because it wasn't a good enough idea. Well, today we have budgets that are proposed by the President of the United States that brings us to the point where we'll be paying \$1 billion a day, not \$17 billion in an economic stimulus plan like 1993 but \$1 billion a day. So, for example, when the fiscal year kicks in—let me say the calendar year. That's a little easier thing to think about, Mr. Speaker. But when the calendar year kicks in, if you want to keep track from the day you're watching your bowl games on how long it takes for the Federal Government to spend as much money on interest as it would take to have paid for the entire Bill Clinton stimulus plan, well, from January 1, 2, 3, 4, on up to the 17th of January, boom, you'd be done. That would be economic stimulus freedom day, the 18th of January, if you're paying this at the rate of this stimulus plan we have today.

Now, compare that 17 days at \$1 billion a day to pay for the entire Bill Clinton stimulus plan to just the interest that we'll have here in the Federal Government if we let this all go forward that's being proposed out of the White House today. That's \$365 billion just in interest. That's not a stimulus plan, I'll suggest, Mr. Speaker. I will suggest that's anything but a stimulus plan. It works against us. It drains capital from the private sector. It drains capital from the productive sector of this economy.

So Rush Limbaugh didn't say he wants President Obama to fail. He said he wants his policies to fail because he's about freedom. And I'm about freedom. And we ought to be about quoting people correctly. Maybe if the gentleman from Tennessee actually listened to the words that Rush Limbaugh said, maybe he wouldn't have been so outraged. Maybe he would have just said, well, we have a legitimate philosophical disagreement, *que sera*. It would be okay. But that's not what's happening. They are seeking to criticize a high-profile individual in America in order to demonize him so that that individual can be put up as a poster for the things that they want to claim is wrong with their predecessors.

Well, here's the problem, Mr. Speaker. This has been a Democratic Congress for more than 2 years. The 110th Congress was all in the control of Speaker PELOSI. She received the gavel up here in January of 2007. There's no Federal spending in America that doesn't start in this Congress by Constitution. So any of the spending that's been initiated since that day has been initiated right here on this floor in the end in the House of Representatives. And our budgets and our deficits become the budgets and the deficits of the Democrats that are in charge. That's Speaker PELOSI. That's Leader HOYER. That's the committee Chairs

and the people who have been handed the gavel by the Speaker.

And the American people need to understand that this isn't something that's driven by the minority today. The minority that we have here today has always driven for balanced budgets, fiscal responsibility, strong national defense, strong personal responsibility, strong families, defended the rule of law, protected the borders.

So we are today with a President that's going to cut the deficit in half by the beginning of his second term, but he's got to create this huge deficit in order to cut it in half. So if you go out and start biting off chunks of the GDP and grow from a 10 percent deficit of GDP to a 12.3 percent deficit of GDP, if you have a President's budget that's being proposed that takes a greater and greater share of the GDP of America, it isn't just the deficit that counts here. The share of the gross domestic product that was being consumed by the Federal Government at the beginning of the Depression in the early 1930s was 3.4 percent, Mr. Speaker. By the time the New Deal had been implemented by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and we got into the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, which essentially ended his New Deal, the Federal Government was by then taking over 12 percent of our GDP. It went from 3.4 percent of GDP at the beginning of the 1930s, and under FDR it went to over 12 percent of GDP before you factor in the extra spending that had to take place in the Second World War.

Now, FDR had a significant utility to this country in leading us through the Second World War. I do not take that away from him. I applaud him for that stolid leadership that he provided. But he didn't solve the economic problem. And anybody that can come to this floor and engage in this debate and point out for me some data that shows that the New Deal, which was profligate spending, unprecedented growth in the Federal Government role, consuming from 3.4 percent of GDP up to 12 percent of GDP, and not having anything to show for it, there's not a legitimate debate on the other side. The New Deal did not get us out of the Great Depression.

To be charitable, it may have, and I emphasize "may have," diminished the depths to which we might have otherwise fallen. I'm not convinced of that, but I will just concede that that could be the case. The data may show that if you didn't pour enough government spending in, maybe, maybe things would have completely collapsed and we would have had to build up from almost nothing or nothing as opposed to building up from almost nothing plus one. So maybe the New Deal programs diminished the depths to which we might have otherwise fallen. It certainly provided some soup kitchens and some WPA programs and CCC camps, and the Federal Government stepped in and hired a lot of people, competed directly with the private sector, by the

way. That's what happened with the New Deal. And the recovery process that was needed to take place when capital was willing to take the risk again, when entrepreneurs were willing to take the risk again, that recovery took place through the Second World War.

This is where I don't see it quite the same way either as the President does, Mr. Speaker. I don't take the position that the Second World War got us out of the Great Depression. I take the position that the Second World War started our recovery from the Great Depression. It brought about a massive growth in production in America in our industry, and it positioned us that by the end of the Second World War, we were the world's industrial power because we had ramped up our industrial production here to meet the demands of the world in the Second World War. And at end of the war, we were essentially the only industrialized country that had maintained our industrial base without its being destroyed by war. So we had a comparative advantage, as Adams Smith would say, against the rest of the world. And our economy grew, and America built more things and sold more things both domestically and abroad. And by 1954 the stock market had recovered to where it was on the day that it crashed in October of 1929. It wasn't the New Deal that got us out of the Great Depression. The Second World War gave us a very good start, as tragic as that world event was, but the recovery required another 9 years just to get back to where we were when the stock market crashed in October of 1929. Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years before the stock market got back to where it was. So it's not his achievement necessarily. I think that it actually slowed our recovery.

And now we have, Mr. Speaker, a President who believes that the New Deal was a good deal, that FDR essentially lost his nerve and was too concerned about spending too much money. So he's concerned that FDR essentially backed down, and if he had just kept spending more and more money, then he would have been able to have this Keynesian effect, a real stimulus effect that would have brought us out of the Great Depression before the Japanese attacked us on December 7 of 1941. Well, the world will never know. That isn't what happened.

But the world also knows that there is no historical model for bringing about an economic recovery by taxing your citizens to death and transferring that wealth to other people and paying people not to work and by asking people to go forward and spend money that you hand to them. That's a temporary stimulus, if at all. And we tried that early last spring, a \$150 billion temporary stimulus plan. And you can look for the blip in that. What happened to the consumer spending? What happened to jobs? It didn't even show. In fact, about 70 percent of those \$150

billion that were injected into the economy in rebates were saved or used to pay off debt. They didn't stimulate the economy. So some of it was tax relief and to that extent it was good, but on balance it wasn't a stimulating plan. This is a huge plan based upon the same philosophy. Spending is stimulus is what President Obama has said, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1845

I looked back and I read through some of the documents written by John Maynard Keynes. This is pure Keynesian economics. It was Keynes that said I can solve the world's unemployment problem. We will just do this. We will go out to an abandoned coal mine and I will take U.S. currency and we will bury it in these holes around this abandoned coal mine. Then we fill the coal mine up with garbage, and then we'll turn the entrepreneurs in the country loose to go around and dig it up and be able to pick up this cash and take it out and spend it.

He said he can solve all of the unemployment problem in the country if you just give him enough cash and they could drill these little holes around in abandoned coal mines and then fill the coal mine up with garbage and then let the people dig through it. That would give them a job, of course, digging up the cash, and then they would take the cash out and spend it, and that would solve the economy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to solve an economic crisis until we produce. We have to provide incentives, which means getting government out of the way and reducing taxes so that people will produce. If they produce something that has value, they will take it out and market it and sell it and our economy will grow. And that is how you stimulate the economy, by increasing production, not by increasing spending. And it needs to be competitive production that gives people a comparative advantage against the rest of the world.

Innovations in the area of technology, for example, entrepreneurs that start businesses, people that are trading, buy, sell, trade, make gain, produce market, be smart about it, but do not punish the productive sector of the economy, or you will wait a long, long time for a recovery. We know that they waited a long time for the recovery of the Great Depression, from 1929 to 1939 to '49 to '54. All of that time, a complete and entire more than a generation before they saw the recovery that was brought about by two things, the Second World War and by the industrial productive might that we developed and the effect of that on the world's economy.

So, if you create, as a President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, a huge deficit, and then you say, oh, by the beginning of my second term in office I am going to cut my deficit in half, how would that be? It would be like the family budget, if I would go out and

spend, let's say \$2,000 more per month than I make, I would have a \$2,000 a month deficit. And that would then be a \$24,000 a year deficit.

But I could make my pledge to my financial advisor that I am going to cut that deficit in half and just cut it down to \$1,000 a month. And if I needed to really bite the bullet and say, well, I am going to have to do more than this, I could maybe increase my spending to \$3,000 a month or \$4,000 a month, and then next year it would be easy enough, I would just cut it back to \$2,000 a month and say I cut my deficit in half. I am still spending the same amount I was, and I still have the same kind of deficit I had.

That is the kind of smoke and mirrors language that is coming out of the White House today, and the American people, Mr. Speaker, are sitting there accepting it. They are accepting the idea that if you spend a couple trillion dollars, if the White House spends a couple trillion dollars appropriated here, out of the beginning of the spending into the House of Representatives, and that \$2 trillion in the stimulus plan is going to, get this language, save or create 3.5 million jobs.

All right. Have we lost our senses? Don't we see through that clearly? I mean, this isn't any kind of blurry, opaque lens we are looking through. This is crystal clear in focus. Save or create 3.5 million jobs. Not new jobs, not defined jobs, not in any particular sector. Not create jobs. Save or create.

So, I guess I could go back to a pretty low educational level and ask maybe one of our children, figure this out. If you are going to save or create 3.5 million jobs, and if you have got a workforce of about 142 million here in the United States, let's just say that it is really clear that President Obama is going to accomplish that objective. I can guarantee that President Obama will accomplish the objective of saving or creating 3.5 million jobs, because, first of all, they aren't new jobs, and second of all, if you don't create a single one and you still have 3.5 million jobs left in America, you have met your promise.

These are carefully parsed words and pieces of language. This isn't something he is speaking off the cuff and bouncing around in between other meetings. It isn't like he was ambushed by the press. This is the speech writers carefully putting this language together. It has been repeated over and over again.

As far as I know, the press hasn't said, Mr. President, isn't it true that if there are 3.5 million jobs left in America, you will have kept your promise? That is what the promise is, Mr. Speaker.

There are also many other promises. One of them is we are going to have a carbon tax. So we are going to tax energy. Well, everything that we have in America takes energy to produce or deliver. A cup of coffee takes energy to heat it. It takes electricity to fire up

the coffee pot. It takes energy to transport it. Everything we have takes transportation. It takes trucks, it takes rail, it takes trains. All of that burns energy. Almost all of it takes energy, hydrocarbon energy that comes from petroleum.

So if we are going to tax the carbon that is petroleum, if we are going to tax that we are taxing everybody in America. They are going to tax your light bill and your gas bill. That is your heat bill. Your gasoline bill as well. And this tax isn't going to be something that is put on your invoice. It is going to be something insidious. It is going to be something that creeps and sneaks into your bills so you don't see it. It will be immeasurable.

I can just guarantee you if this happens, there won't be any study done in this Congress or anywhere else that is official at least by government that will tell you what it costs you to pay this carbon tax. But it is so far measured at \$646 billion, the carbon tax.

We are going to pay a tax on carbon. Why? Because we have some scientists who have decided that they want to tell us all that we are suffering from global warming. Climate change now is the word. And I will just say, pay attention to language. We have gone from global warming, well, actually we have gone from ice age. I remember ice age in the seventies. There was one scientist that was a lead scientist on predicting that we had a coming ice age, and he has now shifted over to the other side. Now he says no, the Earth is in global warming and we should backpedal from that as it was as we can.

But we have gone from ice age to global warming, and now global warming is kind of hard to hold because the Earth has been cooling for the last 10 years, so we have to change the language to climate change.

Now, if you have to fix the climate change problem, you will be able to do that forever. In fact, we always complain about the climate changing on us on a regular basis, wherever we come from. In Iowa, the climate is changing all the time. Just wait 5 minutes, it will change, we say. I talked to a fellow in Mississippi this morning. He says the same thing.

Climate change is going on all over America in little microcosmic ways. But you can address that and say we are going to fix it with government. We are going to fix it with a carbon tax. We are going to tax your energy.

If you tax our energy, you are taxing every single component of America's economy. You can't turn on your computer without taking energy. You can't light up your BlackBerry. You can't make a cell phone call. You can't turn on your lights. You can't get in a taxicab or on the Metro or drive your car. I suppose you can't ride your bicycle or go out to the farm and pitch a couple bales. But they have already figured out it takes energy to do that, and they are measuring against ethanol. A farm worker takes 4,000 calories a day

to go out there and do the work. Now, I think he is overeating just a little bit. But they have measured it. Calories are energy. Human consumption of food is energy. Everything takes energy. Energy is based on carbon, and they want to tax carbon to the tune of \$646 billion. Then, to make sure it really goes to the right place, the White House wants to tax oil and gas directly, \$31.5 billion dollars.

And, by the way, if you thought you made a pretty good living and maybe jumped through all these government hoops and were able to establish an estate, then we have it set up so we were seeking to get completely rid of the death tax. But President Obama is convinced that they are going to come back with the death tax and eliminate the loopholes, so now you can't even hope to die for free.

That is all going on. And on top of that, we are in two wars, Mr. Speaker. Two wars. There is still a conflict going on in Iraq, and I am transitioning into that, and there is clearly a conflict in Afghanistan which President Obama has ordered a surge.

Now, it seems a little odd to me that the President of the United States would not admit that the surge worked in Iraq, but he would order one in Afghanistan, even though they are two different countries, I agree, and it is a tough battle going on in Afghanistan, and I am going to stand with him on the orders he has given.

There are many more components to it, and I trust the White House is going to build out the State Department side of this, the economic side of this, and the strategic neighbors, and hopefully put together a more cooperative approach to this so that we can have a broad and complete solution in Afghanistan. I will stand with him on that, as tough as it is.

I will not walk away from our military. Not our military. I stand with them and I stand with their mission. Their mission has been in Iraq, and everybody serving there in the last few years not only volunteered for their branch of the service, but they volunteered knowing that they would be likely called up to go to Iraq. Many of them volunteered for that mission. That is our military; selfless, noble, self-sacrifice, bravery like the world has never seen. The best trained, the most disciplined, the best equipped, the best armed military the world has ever seen.

Yet on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, in the 110th Congress, the previous Congress, there were more than 40 votes brought to the floor that were designed to unfund, underfund, or undermine our troops while they are at war under orders to face the enemy. And they face them in a way that was a 360 degree battlefield. You never knew when they were going to be hit, there was no one that was in a safe zone, some safer than others.

Yet in all of this, President Bush took a look and decided he did not

want to capitulate to the other side. And even though the advice that he was getting from many of his top military officers was essentially we are not in a position to win this war, Mr. President, and the implication was that he should just simply order a withdrawal, let me put it this way, a cynic would say declare victory and leave, but you can never declare victory and leave and call it a victory in a war.

In a way it is like a street fight. The person that is standing there when it is over is the one that wins. And if you don't occupy the territory you fought over, you don't get to say we won that war, we just got tired of it and left and when home. The world knows that, history knows that, President Bush knows that.

That is why he had the vision and the leadership to give the order for a surge. It was a well-researched strategy that had many components to it, not just the military tactical, but many the other components to it as well. And as that strategy was put together, and I made a number of trips over there and met with our top officers while this was being put together, I was sold on the strategy before it had a name, I was sold on the strategy before it was actually shaped. But we see now what has happened.

President Bush ordered the surge and we swelled the troops up to over 150,000 there. He made the order. And, of course, our troops nobly complied and they carried out their mission in a fashion that still amazes more than half of this Congress, most the country and even more of the world.

But, today the Pelosi Congress has established 18, 18 benchmarks that needed to be achieved in Iraq before they would be willing to support the efforts and the spending that is going on there. I took this in the middle of those 40-plus votes that were designed to unfund, underfund or undermine our troops, I took those benchmarks that were essentially imposed upon the Iraq effort to be setting the bar so high that it could never be achieved because so many were invested in defeat in this Congress.

Yet of the 18 benchmarks, 17 of the 18 benchmarks have been wholly or substantially achieved in Iraq. And I don't have that list in front of me, but I can tell you the one that is not yet been achieved, and that is the benchmark that requires the Iraqi Security Forces to be completely independent from U.S. military support.

So, that would be that the 613,000 Iraqi Security Forces that are in uniform today that have been trained and equipped by our military, standing up a military from a beginning takes years, but of those 613,000, by that 18th benchmark they would all have to be able to operate independent of U.S. communications, U.S. logistical support, U.S. training, U.S. intelligence, the list goes on of all the things that we are providing them and helping them with today.

I think that is a generation away before they reach that level. I think the 18th benchmark was completely unreachable, although they have made substantial progress. But I won't say it has been substantially completed or wholly completed at this point. So 17 of 18 benchmarks, and the remaining one is an independent Iraqi Security Force. Seventeen of 18 benchmarks have been achieved, Mr. Speaker.

I am introducing, I have today introduced a resolution that addresses this. The resolution is a resolution that acknowledges and recognizes the achievements there. Seventeen of 18 benchmarks have been achieved. That is one point.

Another is American casualties in Iraq. Since the 30th of June, 2008, we have lost more of our military to accidents than we have the enemy; more to accidents than we have the enemy, Mr. Speaker. That is a measure too of a war that is going in the right direction.

The civilian deaths in Iraq have gone down by 90 percent and the ethno-sectarian deaths in Iraq have dropped by 98 percent.

□ 1900

There's a long period there where you had no sectarian deaths, where statistically so low that they were not reportable.

And yet, I remember, some of my colleagues over here and some of our Senate friends saying the war in Iraq is lost. It can't be won. We've been defeated. It's a civil war. There are sectarian deaths. It's out of control, and we need to get out people out right away, just maintain enough of a rear guard so that they don't get shot in the back as they retreat from Iraq. That's essentially the message that came from a good number of people over on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and a number of them in the Senate as well, and that was part of the debate on these 40-plus votes that were designed to unfund, underfund or undermine our troops.

But what's happened is there has been substantial achievement in Iraq. We have achieved a definable victory in Iraq. And I've introduced a resolution today that lays out the history on how we got there, the authority that was invested in the President of the United States by this Congress to engage in military action if he saw fit, and the responsibilities that he accepted and that our military accepted, as well as the things that went wrong, and then the things that went right.

But three elections almost, the last election was so successful there wasn't a single significant security event involved in the last election in Iraq in the last weekend of January, this year. And so they ratified a constitution. They've had three successful elections, they have an effective central government. And Maliki has become a powerful and influential leader that had the courage and the temerity to order his own troop actions to go down into

Basra last year, and that turned out to be something that seemed to be tenuous but turned out to be successful, and it was a key component in establishing Baghdad and the central government as being in charge in the country of Iraq.

So however we measure this, by any complete objective measure, there has been a definable victory achieved in Iraq.

That's what this resolution does, Mr. Speaker. And it thanks and honors our military for their sacrifice of life and limb and blood and treasure and time away from their homes and having their destiny changed. No one served in that country without having the destiny of their life turned in one way or the other. Some of them lost their lives. Some of them lost their limbs. All of them were affected in a way that it changed them, in a small way some perhaps, and in a very large way, others. It caused the breakup of some families. There were divorces because of the long deployments. There was a price paid by wives and husbands and children.

And yet, in this country, we bicker here trying to undermine an effort. And now, this Congress has a chance to say thank you for all of that sacrifice. This Congress has a chance to ratify this resolution and put it into the RECORD, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all time.

And some of the language in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, follows like this: The United States House of Representatives extends its gratitude to all those within the military and civilian departments and agencies of the United States Government who were responsible for directing the implementation of the surge strategy, including General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

The U.S. House of Representatives recognizes the importance and significance of victory in the Iraqi theater of the larger global struggle against radical Islamic jihadists terrorists.

And the United States House of Representatives commits itself to working with President Obama and his administration to continue the progress that has been made on the ground in Iraq since the surge strategy was implemented, recognizing that a definable victory has been achieved in Iraq, and that history will judge President Bush's successor by his ability to maintain his predecessor's victory.

That's what's been achieved in Iraq today, Mr. Speaker. And I stand with President Obama in maintaining and in building upon the achievements that have been made in Iraq.

This resolution is about honoring the accomplishments to this point. And it's about asking and actually challenging all of us to stand with those who have sacrificed so much so that price has meaning, so that the destiny of America, the destiny of every individual that served there was changed by their experience there. The destiny of America then needs to be changed also, as

the benefit from the price that's been paid.

The destiny of America can be defined by the course of liberty and the course of freedom. And we have watched freedom be expanded around the world. I've watched it in a number of ways. Sometimes we've just fought them to a draw, and sometimes we expanded freedom dramatically. Free market capitalism expanded freedom around this world probably more than any war that there ever was. But those things fit in conjunction with each other.

The Second World War expanded freedom. If it hadn't been for that, we would have been either under the control of the imperial Japanese or the Nazis. And yet, we defended freedom. We expanded freedom.

Still, February 11, 1945, at Yalta, Winston Churchill, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin drew a line on a map, and the line on the map was the line west of which people would live in the free world and east of which they would live in the slavery of communism. When that line was drawn, February 11, 1945, that set the destiny for people for more than a generation to come, 2 generations to come.

But by November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall came down. This Cold War that we'd fought for all of those years, along that line that was drawn at Yalta by Stalin, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, that line fell, that was the Iron Curtain. It came down literally with a crash, beginning November 9 when the Berlin Wall started to come down. And freedom echoed for a time, all the way across Eastern Europe, all the way across Asia, all the way to the Pacific Ocean. That was the result of this victory in the Cold War.

And the Yeltsin era came in, in Russia, and the satellite states for the Soviet Union declared their independence, and most of them are essentially independent today. But freedom has diminished back across that vast land of Russia. It's not what it was during that era. Most of the institutions of freedom have been diminished or eliminated by the Putin era within Russia.

But we advanced freedom, we advanced it in the Second World War dramatically. But the line was drawn, drawn between the east and the west, the line of the Iron Curtain. Then the Cold War was won and the Iron Curtain came crashing down, and hundreds of millions of people breathe free that would not have otherwise.

We found ourselves, though, in a conflict in Vietnam, which was the last direct military conflict between freedom and communism.

Now, the problem with losing your nerve and losing your will when it comes to foreign policy cannot be measured in, well, it's no longer convenient to support a war in Iraq. I'm unhappy and uncomfortable with the cost or the casualties that are there, so I'll make an objective decision to rationalize and pull out. That's some-

thing that was going on. That was some of the thought process that's going on by many of the people that are on staff today at the White House.

But there is a destiny of the free world that America leads that has to be attended to. It's our duty and it's our charge, and so, I'll submit this, Mr. Speaker, that America was viewed as the superpower of the world. We viewed the Soviet Union as the other superpower. We called them that. But much of the rest of the world saw us as the only superpower in the world. And we had never lost a war. The world didn't expect us to lose a war.

But when I picked up this book, this is a book, Vietnam's top military strategist tells how we won the war by General Vo Nguyen Giap. This is the general that commanded the North Vietnamese military during the Vietnam War. And General Giap, G-I-A-P, he writes in here some things that are illuminating.

Now, this isn't a very good book, and I don't recommend, Mr. Speaker, that people go out and buy it. I can give you the essence of it here in just a little phrase. And again, the title of the book is *How We Won the War*. The commander of the North Vietnamese, and he says here that the U.S. had already begun its decline from the position as the only superpower. This book is copyrighted in 1976, so it was written right after the fall of South Vietnam. General Giap said the U.S. had already begun its decline from the position as the only superpower. He viewed us as the only superpower in the 1970s and in the 1960s. That's one way to look at it. But he said the U.S. failure to win in Korea was the turning point.

So, Mr. Speaker, here's the lesson. We had a Korean War, and we negotiated a settlement rather than press for an all out victory. I'm not commenting on what was the right thing to do then from a military tactical standpoint. I am commenting on this: Settling for a negotiated settlement in Korea resulted in an inspiration for the North Vietnamese, that America didn't have the will to press for a victory in Vietnam, so they fought a war of attrition. They fought a war of attrition that went on for more than a decade. And the price for that was 58,000 American lives, hundreds of thousands of North Vietnamese lives. And this Congress voted to shut off all funding, not just to support American troops who had already been pulled out of South Vietnam. If you remember Vietnamization. The Vietnamese were taught and trained and equipped to defend themselves, and they had stepped up, and they were doing that.

This Congress shut off all funding. And I went back and read the legislation. And it says, no money, none of these funds or any funds heretofore appropriated shall be spent in Vietnam, North Or South Vietnam actually, and in Cambodia or Laos, on the skies overhead or the seas beside these countries. In other words, whatever money was in

the pipeline to go help the Vietnamese boys defend themselves, as I think that was the language that they used at the time, that money was shut off too. Money that I was already appropriated by a previous Congress and already sent by a Commander-in-Chief was shut off by this Congress, along with any other appropriations. When that happened it starved the defense of South Vietnam. No wonder they capitulated. They didn't have anything to fight with. And the legacy is left that the United States walked away from one of our friends and our allies.

Well, it started with Korea, a negotiated settlement, and we got to Vietnam.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I find myself sitting in a hotel in Kuwait City, waiting to go into Iraq the next day. The date was June 11, 2004. And I didn't know at the time, I don't think, about General Giap's look at Korea as his inspiration. But I was watching Al Jazeera TV, and I couldn't understand what they were saying, but they had English closed-caption. And I heard this, I think, in Arabic, come out of the mouth of Muqtada al-Sadr, who said, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq, the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. And I wrote those notes down when I heard that. But it also was branded into my memory, Mr. Speaker.

Our enemies in Iraq and our enemies around the world are inspired if they see lack of resolve. General Vo Nguyen Giap was inspired when he identified lack of resolve in a negotiated settlement in Korea. And our subsequent enemies in places like Lebanon and Mogadishu were inspirations as well to Muqtada al-Sadr and our current enemies that we have. These are all the terrorists worldwide. They talk about this. I mean, this is not something that is an original thought of Muqtada al-Sadr. This is something that's being voiced around the world to encourage and recruit our enemies.

And I'll say, America didn't, they couldn't win in Korea. They couldn't win in Vietnam. They pulled out of Lebanon. They pulled out of Mogadishu, and they will pull out of Iraq, is what they were hoping.

□ 1915

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no military tactical reason to pull out of Iraq to avoid the conflict that's there, because much of our enemy has been mopped up by U.S. and Iraqi forces working in conjunction with coalition forces that are still there.

We must maintain this victory that has been achieved. I have defined it tonight, Mr. Speaker, for you. We must maintain it because this is the point where we turn the destiny of America again at the price of the destiny of hundreds of thousands of military who have served in that country. Now we can turn the destiny of America toward

the positive side again, and we can hand to the next generations the world's only superpower, who may have lost its will in Vietnam, who should not have pulled out of Lebanon in the stage that it was in, who should not have left Mogadishu, but who did stick it out in Iraq and who did ensure that the Iraqi people had their chance at freedom, that they had their chance at liberty, that they had their chance to be as they are quickly becoming: a moderate Muslim state that is our ally in the Middle East in an ideal strategic location for them to influence the Middle Eastern part of the world and in an ideal tactical location.

The Iraqi people on our side are understanding this: We didn't ever go there for their oil. We didn't ever go there to occupy. We went there to end the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, and that happened.

Whatever you argue about whether the full spectrum of all of the reasons were intact or not, the fact remains that the President had to make a decision based upon the information he had. He made that decision. Once it was made, we stood with our troops and with their mission. Their mission has been wholly or substantially completed and will be, but we've got to remember that this is a fragile definable victory that has been achieved, and we cannot squander it, and we need to honor the Commander in Chief who gave the order of the surge, and we need to honor the people who brought it about. That does include the Iraqi people. It includes the Sunni awakening. It includes the commitment by them in understanding that, again, we didn't go there for their oil, and we didn't go there to occupy. We went there to give them a chance at freedom. They have their chance, and they will continue, and they're actually reaching harder and stronger than maybe they have the capability of doing.

When I sit in these briefings, I get this, and this wouldn't be a classified component. It's a concern that the Iraqis have maybe a little more confidence in their military capability than they actually have. Well, that's the right place for them to be, to be stretching and pushing this thing and to be asking for as much of their own military autonomy as we can give them. We've given them much. We've given them at least all of the security in at least 14 of the 18 provinces and maybe more, and I might have missed one or two. We handed over to them Anbar province, a place where 2½ years ago I couldn't go because it was too dangerous, a place where, in downtown Ramadi, there was not a building that was not shot up. It was a rubble. It was a city of rubble that had been fought over so many times—a city of death.

I went shopping in downtown Ramadi and, additionally, in Fallujah where I've been several times. By the way, the mayor of Ramadi sounds like the mayor of Peoria. He says, "Get Bagh-

dad to send me a little more money down here. I need more sewer, water and lights. We're rebuilding this town. We've got to get everybody off the dime. Why is it stuck? We need to go to work." That's what they're doing and what they've done.

In Fallujah, the mayor of Fallujah says, "We are a city of peace, and we are going to repair every building in this city so there's no sign of war."

If Fallujah is going to be known as the "city of peace," well, Mr. Speaker, that's what has been accomplished over the last number of years and especially since the surge was ordered.

This resolution that I introduced today is a resolution that calls upon this Congress to recognize that and to honor the price, the sacrifice, the accomplishments, and the achievements. It also asks the President: Hold this together. Nurture this along. Let's not make a political decision on the deployment of troops out of Iraq because it's a promise that you made 3½ years ago when you were a State Senator. Let's make sure that this is a tactical decision and also a political decision and an economic decision and a strategic decision. If you're going to make decisions like that, when you make an announcement that all of the combat troops are going to be out by the last day in August in 2010, as a Commander in Chief, you've fenced yourself in politically. What's the point? You can order those troops to be deployed out of this and can have all of our combat troops out by the last day in August of 2010 without having to tell the world. Just start that progression.

We've already started it, and it makes some sense to do that. It may even make a lot of sense to do that. It just should never, ever be a political decision, and there is no need to announce it. Then also to announce that, by the last day of 2011, all of our military will be completely out of Iraq, that's actually what the Status of Forces Agreement says, but it also says that we can renegotiate this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll submit that we've accomplished a lot in Iraq. We have accomplished so much that we've achieved a definable victory there. This Congress needs to celebrate the achievement of the definable victory in Iraq. We need to applaud everyone who has served there in uniform and especially those who have given life and limb and their families. It is a noble, noble act by a noble, noble people.

It is best expressed, I think, at the Korean war memorial where it says, "This Nation honors our men and women who answered the call to serve a country they never knew and a people they never met."

It has happened over and over again from the United States of America. It has happened again in Iraq. It's happening in Afghanistan. We need to preserve those precious victories. We need to end this legacy of not having the will to complete the task that we've started. We need to end this propa-

ganda that's coming out of the mouths of our enemies that says, well, we'll leave Iraq the same way we left Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu. We can't have Osama bin Laden sitting in his cave up there in Pakistan, saying, "Well, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, Lebanon, Mogadishu, and Iraq." If that happens, we've got a much larger enemy that we have to face and a much more determined enemy that we have to face.

They know they've lost in Iraq. They've said so. It says so in this resolution. We have quoted some al Qaeda leaders in this resolution that they have recognized they have lost tactically the war in Iraq. They don't have the ability to engage in any kind of an organized military way. They can cause some trouble, yes. There are a few of them left in pockets, particularly in Mosul, and they're being mopped up as we speak, but there has been a tremendous amount that has been accomplished.

If the President can make the charge that he inherited a \$1 trillion deficit and somehow then the responsibility for this economic crisis that we're in all falls back on his predecessor because he has inherited a \$1 trillion deficit, never mind he has offered a \$1.7 trillion budget—but if he can take that position over and over again that he inherited a \$1 trillion deficit and this economy, by implication, is all going to be on the shoulders of George W. Bush, then at least, Mr. Speaker, he can accept the responsibility of Iraq and the state that it's in and can preserve the definable victory that has been achieved.

That's what this resolution does. That's what it asks for. It's what, I think, the will of this Congress ought to be. I'm going to be asking the Speaker to allow this to come forward to the floor.

Right before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman from Nebraska so much time as he may consume of which I don't think there's a lot.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I always appreciate your passion and your willingness to engage in the most profound issues facing our country. I didn't mean to interrupt. If you were concluding, I was hoping you would yield time to me for about 6 or 7 minutes on another topic that I'd appreciate your listening to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'd be very happy to yield the balance I have.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, today, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Gordon Brown, spoke strongly and eloquently before this body of our Nation's specialness of our shared history, traditions, as well as our values. He also spoke of the past, present and future challenges confronting our partnered nations.

I respect this long, historic relationship that Prime Minister Brown laid

out. There were many principles of his speech with which I deeply agree, such as the defense of human rights worldwide, nuclear security, a sustainable energy future, and human rights in addition to the fact that he also proposed a broad, vast, new array of new ideas that can help bring about a new day and mantle of leadership in this essential area of need for our world's poor. However, he also proposed a "global new deal," a new deal that is not clearly defined but that is pointed toward a vast, new, international arrangement.

With regard to the current financial difficulties in our developing global economy, it is indisputable that our economic challenges affect the rest of the world. America has a long history of meaningful trade with other nations, especially with our partner Great Britain, but America also has an entangled relationship pertaining to our national debt. We have borrowed from the United Kingdom, China, Japan, and from numerous countries in the Middle East to finance our burgeoning debt and to accommodate our deficit spending. Much of this has been discreet and out of the public eye, but the implications of foreign ownership of Federal debt instruments are greatly significant.

Approximately half of the total public debt is in foreign ownership. At some point, Mr. Speaker, global investors may grow weary and may decide not to take the risk of buying our debt. We would consequently be faced with the choice to stop borrowing to finance our deficit spending or to raise interest rates in order to attract investors. If any of these countries chose to quickly sell their U.S. holdings, a tumultuous devaluation of the dollar could quickly ensue.

As Prime Minister Brown said, we are all seeing how certain "financial instruments have spread contagion throughout the world." This is certainly true, and I appreciate the Prime Minister's calls for further transparency and accountability. However, I challenge his presupposition that a greater global consolidation of financial systems is in our national or in the international community's best interest.

Financial consolidation, extreme volatility and speculation in world markets, reckless use of exotic financial instruments, liberalized credit have certainly contributed to the current collapse. The global scale of the credit crisis and confidence should give us pause to consider that our profound economic connectedness may actually cause more problems instead of prosperity. The increasing concentration of wealth assets into fewer and fewer financial institutions will increase our financial vulnerability. One of our greatest concerns right now is how to stabilize banks and financial entities that are deemed "too big to fail."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe we need a paradigm shift, a new paradigm. We should be asking: Are these financial

systems too big to succeed? Now is the time to reconsider an essential component of Western philosophy—the great potential of the individual in solidarity with one's community. I believe that America, the United Kingdom and the other strong financial powers in Europe should take this time to empower individuals and communities to provide for themselves through a network of strong local and regional economies.

As the Prime Minister added, America is a nation of extraordinary capacity, and to spur growth, I believe it is imperative that our government's efforts be targeted toward helping small business entrepreneurs whose successes will be the bellwether of economic progress.

Recent data from the Commerce Department shows that small businesses have generated 60 to 80 percent of new jobs over the past decade. By enacting good commonsense initiatives to benefit entrepreneurial growth, we may create local jobs and new opportunities to stem the tide of economic difficulties in our communities, our State and nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is local financiers and local businesses who best know the needs of their communities and who are, in the very essence, more transparent and accountable. This is the motto we should return to, and it is the proper motto for us to help lead in building sustainable local economic connectedness for the world's developing nations.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF RECOVERY AND RENEWAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman from Iowa was kind enough to allow me to borrow some of his time. And I appreciate, again, his passion and his focus on the essential issues of the day. But I'd like to continue, just briefly, the discussion that we were engaging in at the moment regarding the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom's address before a joint session of Congress today.

And let me add, Mr. Speaker, that Prime Minister Brown rightly warned us earlier of the dangers of protectionism. But in no way is it protectionist, I should add, to want to consolidate our economic recovery efforts on Main Street. More than any bailout crafted by Washington or Wall Street, it is a return to our hard-fought American ideals of responsibility, discipline, entrepreneurship and stewardship that will actually help Americans build a more just and secure future for ourselves, as well as for the world's poor.

Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom has been a stalwart friend of ours throughout our modern history. And after two centuries of partnership, it can be said that we have no greater ally. In no way do I seek in these comments to undermine that. Our two nations will be forever grateful for our aid to one another during times of both war as well as peace.

The United Kingdom is our greatest ally in preserving our long-standing commitment to the inalienable human rights, especially for vulnerable populations. I deeply value the Prime Minister's words that when the strong help the weak, it makes us all stronger. And this certainly rings true with regard to the pursuit of international policies that recognize the inherent dignity and rights of the human person, which are essential to preserve liberty and justice in the world.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear: we should give long pause before becoming more intertwined in an internationalist, industrial financial model for the future. Let us continue our strong relationships of commerce with the United Kingdom and all other nations, but let us not find our financial wellbeing entangled in complex, poorly understood, exotic, international economic alliances. Instead, let us embrace a new philosophy of recovery and renewal based on the time-honored principles and notions of individual responsibility, entrepreneurship and community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 11.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAFFETZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, March 5.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HARPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 5, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

768. A letter from the Chairman, Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission, transmitting the Commission's final report on the 18-month program of commemorative activities and events of Jamestown's 400th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

769. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's first Quarterly Report, pursuant to Public Law 110-389; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

770. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4090 and PW4090-3 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29110; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-15808; AD 2009-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

771. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation AE 3007A1E and AE 1107C Turbofan/Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0230; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-15809; AD 2009-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

772. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Turmo IV A and IV C Series Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-25730; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-15798; AD 2009-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

773. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Wytornia Sprzetu Komunikacyjnego "PZL-Rzeszow" S.A. PZL-10W Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1068; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-15807; AD 2009-04-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

774. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 55, 55B, and 55C

Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0054; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-15802; AD 2009-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

775. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 401, 401A, 401B, 402, 402A, and 402B Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0118; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-073-AD; Amendment 39-15810; AD 2009-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

776. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, and Airbus Model A340-200, -300, -500, and -600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0122; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-15813; AD 2009-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

777. A letter from the Assistant Administrator Office of Policy and Strategic Planning, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's study done of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Small Business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 205. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1106) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability (Rept. 111-23). 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. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1292. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a National White Collar Crime Center grants program for purposes of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal conspiracies and activities and terrorist conspiracies and activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount payable by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to veterans for improvements and structural alterations furnished as part of home health services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 1294. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of bud-

et authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. JONES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 1295. A bill to mitigate mortgage foreclosures, facilitate and include fairness in housing recovery, and combat mortgage fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEW YORK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FARR, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ROSS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1296. A bill to achieve access to comprehensive primary health care services for all Americans and to reform the organization of primary care delivery through an expansion of the Community Health Center and National Health Service Corps programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 1297. A bill to establish the Hawai'i Capital National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1299. A bill to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain administrative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to prevent the use of the legal system in a manner that extorts money from State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and inhibits such governments' constitutional actions under the first, tenth, and fourteenth amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the 180-day period for completion of a like-kind exchange in the case of the bankruptcy of a qualified intermediary or an exchange accommodation titleholder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUYER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 1302. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the position of Director of Physician Assistant Services within the office of the Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1303. A bill to require the Attorney General, through the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice, to establish a 5-year competitive grant program to establish pilot programs to reduce the rate of occurrence of gun-related crimes in high-crime communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 1304. A bill to create a Federal cause of action to determine whether defamation exists under United States law in cases in which defamation actions have been brought in foreign courts against United States persons on the basis of publications or speech in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of

California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 1305. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the armed forces who have been awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1306. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for reassignment of certain Federal cases upon request of a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1307. A bill to authorize improvements to flood damage reduction facilities adjacent to the American and Sacramento Rivers near Sacramento, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. PERRIELLO):

H.R. 1308. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to adopt a program of professional and confidential screenings to detect mental health injuries acquired during deployment in support of a contingency operation and ultimately to reduce the incidence of suicide among veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1309. A bill to codify the definition of terms used in subheading 1604.14 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, relating to tuna products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHULER, Mr.

MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HODES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that fill material cannot be comprised of waste; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts distributed from tax-favored accounts during a period of unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from Federal tax certain payments made in connection with reductions in force; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1313. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 so that any local educational agency receiving funding under part A of title I of such Act or public charter school is eligible for a Troops to Teachers participant; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FILNER, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1314. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for compensation to States incarcerating undocumented aliens charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1315. A bill to prohibit the detention of enemy combatants at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to provide for de novo combatant status reviews by military judges, to repeal the Military Commissions Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1316. A bill to provide for appropriate notification of communities and homeowners

of establishment of flood elevations for purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 1317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to individuals who pay their mortgages on time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1318. A bill to provide duty-free treatment for certain goods from designated Reconstruction Opportunity Zones in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIGHT:

H. Res. 206. A resolution honoring the efforts and contributions of the Montgomery, Alabama, Chapter of the National Association of Women in Construction; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H. Res. 207. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all employers give veterans a holiday on Veteran's Day in honor of their service to our country; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. FOX, Mr. LATTI, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H. Res. 208. A resolution chronicling the efforts of United States and Coalition forces to bring freedom, safety, and security to Iraq and recognizing the importance of the "surge strategy" in completing that mission; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H. Res. 209. A resolution commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Daughters of Penelope, a preeminent international women's association and affiliate organization of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 210. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that providing breakfast in schools through the National School Breakfast Program has a positive impact on classroom performance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY JOHN CONYERS, JR.

Amendment numbered 1 printed in House report 111-21, as modified, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 22: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 23: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 49: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. FOX, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 147: Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 151: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 154: Mr. MASSA and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 179: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 219: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 265: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 270: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 274: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 293: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 307: Mr. INSLEE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 333: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 390: Mr. CARTER and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 444: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 479: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 577: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 579: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 618: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 626: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 627: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 658: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 673: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 678: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 687: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 716: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 722: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 734: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LA TOURETTE, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 745: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 756: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 758: Mr. HOLT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. LA TOURETTE, and Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 759: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 764: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 795: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 808: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 816: Mr. FARR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. REYES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 819: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 832: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 847: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 916: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 930: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 953: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 958: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 964: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 978: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 983: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1016: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 1017: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WALZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1021: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 1023: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

- H.R. 1026: Mr. LATTA, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1040: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1042: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1066: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1121: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1136: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1180: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1189: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. McHUGH.
 H.R. 1197: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1199: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 1201: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
- H.R. 1210: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MACK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TERRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 1246: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1254: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 1263: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SPACE.
 H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. PETERSON.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. KAGEN.
 H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. PITTS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAO.
 Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LANCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 86: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 89: Mr. PETERSON.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. BACA, and Mr. McHUGH.
 H. Res. 130: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H. Res. 155: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H. Res. 156: Mr. LAMBORN and Ms. FALLIN.
 H. Res. 160: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Res. 174: Mr. GERLACH.
 H. Res. 182: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Res. 201: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. MASSA.