

But what we will give people is something as good as Congress gets, and I think better, if there is this choice of a public option.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I echo Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, so I don't have to take up your time. So you can ask another question.

Ms. HIRONO. Ditto for me.

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to put this one out to you. What is it going to take for you—I think they mean us—to wake up and smell the catastrophe that profit health care is?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me just say, first of all, I don't know what a catastrophe smells like. But I think a lot of people out there are getting that whiff of what a wreckage the current so-called—we don't really have a health care system. It is kind of a hodgepodge.

I did want to say, talking about even our Federal plan, between 2007 and 2008, 14 different insurance plans dropped out of the Federal employees plan. And so thousands of Federal employees who have a plan like we do had to look for new coverage. And so when you have got a public option, it is going to be there. It is not going to go out of business and you have to search around for something to replace it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Because for senior care, when HMOs took on senior care, Medicare Advantage, et cetera, I went to one of my providers in my district, and they were telling me about this wonderful plan that was very good. And I said, Well, what are you going to do when people start using it? And they looked at me like I was just a nut on Earth. And guess what? In 2½ years, when seniors started using the plan that they had purchased, this group went out of business, and those seniors had to find someplace else in the district because people were using the plan.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, if the gentle lady yields back, it is a lot easier to make money when you're just collecting the money as opposed to when you actually have to pay it out.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. There are a lot of people who, quite correctly, feel as if health insurance is for the healthy, that if you get sick, forget it. It is not always there for you. We all know that.

Mr. ELLISON. The fact is that many insurance companies, I think the whole industry identifies when a person goes to a doctor and needs to actually use that coverage, they call that a medical loss. They see that as a loss to them. That is messing with their money when somebody says, Hey, I actually need to use the coverage that I'm paying you an arm and a leg for. That is why some of these companies go out of business. It is not designed to do that.

The fact is we talked about how medical expense costs families tremendously and also ends up people having to declare bankruptcy so often. The fact is that is one side of the coin.

The other side of the coin is the overwhelming amount of profit that the industry makes. And I just want to point

out that in an industry where you have CEOs making \$1.6 billion like Bill McGuire of United Health Group made, how can you get that kind of money unless a whole lot of people are not getting the health care that they should get? How can you have these exorbitant profits that people are turning over and still cover everybody? Well, you can't do it. You either have to cut people out of coverage, you have to deny claims, and then you can pay exorbitant profits. Or you have to actually run a decent system that extends coverage, but in that case you don't have people making goobers of money, and so you really do have to make a basic and essential choice.

Ms. HIRONO. As I had mentioned earlier, it is generally the States regulate, so-called regulate, insurance companies. So most States do not have the kind of resources or even the laws that allow them to look at what the health care insurance companies are doing, how they are basing their cost increases or their premium increases. So there really is a lack of transparency and accountability. And when you don't have the ability to look at the relationship between the rates they are charging and what the claims are, how can you even begin to say that people's needs are actually being met or that cost containment is actually occurring? You can't.

□ 2220

You can't.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, if the gentle lady yields back, let me tell you. Cost containment, remember, any time I charge you and you paid me, I now made some money, right? I'm not against making money. This is America, and we have a free enterprise system. But there is such a thing as abuse.

Let me point out, profits at 10 of the country's largest publicly traded health insurance companies rose 428 percent—I'd say that's pretty good—from 2000 to 2007. In 2007, alone, the chief executive officers at these companies collected a combined total compensation of \$118.6 million, an average of \$11.9 million each. And if it's an average, you know some made more and some made less. And the fact is that that is 468 times more than the \$25,000 a year that an average American worker makes. So the fact is, these folks are making 468 times more than the average wage of an average worker in the United States. And we're wondering why we've got problems. There's no wonder why we have problems. That's why we need a universal, single-payer system. But if we can't get it now, let's get a system where you keep your insurance, and we have a public option.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. You know, we've heard horror stories for years about how insurance companies hire people who are essentially told, at least on the first ask, just to deny the procedure, to just say no. And there was, I remember a very brave doctor who ended up working for an insurance

company and denying a procedure for somebody who actually died. And she came to cleanse her soul, to essentially apologize; left that company with enormous amounts of guilt, and said that that's how the business operated.

And what we're trying to create is a health system, a health care system, not one that is designed to make anybody a profit. It's to keep people healthy. And that's what I've said to an insurance company that said, well, you know, how are we going to compete?

I said, look, the object of this policy discussion is to figure out how are we going to provide health care to Americans. The goal, you know, if companies can make money doing that and working within the system that we prescribe, God bless them. That's what we're heading toward right now. But the goal is not to figure out how to maintain their high profits when it's done at the expense of the health care of millions and millions of Americans. That's the bottom line.

Ms. WOOLSEY. And if the gentlewoman will yield. Insurers have increased premiums 87 percent over the last 6 years. And the premiums have doubled in the last 9 years, increasing four times faster than wages. So, what for? To pay the high salaries of the CEOs and to hire more bean counters.

Mr. ELLISON. I do have to say, let's get the last one, because we've got about 30 seconds to go, and I think Congresswoman HIRONO is going to get the last word. And this has been the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and you're going to take us out.

Ms. HIRONO. Health care is a right, not a privilege, and everyone in our country deserves quality, affordable health care with choice.

Mr. ELLISON. And I think that pretty much does it. This has been the Progressive Caucus with the progressive message, and we'll see you next week.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMAN PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, my name is Cynthia Lummis. I am the Member of Congress from Wyoming. I am a freshman and a Republican.

This is the first time that the freshman Republicans have engaged in a Special Order, and it's my privilege to be joined by members of the Republican freshmen. This is our opportunity to share with you our perspective on these first 5 months in Congress that we have shared together as freshmen, to tell you a little bit about ourselves and about our views about this process, about where we have been in the last 5 months and where we think, as fiscal conservatives, the Nation should be going instead.

And I'm so pleased to be joined, first of all, by one of my freshmen colleagues, who has a very interesting background. GLENN THOMPSON, from Pennsylvania, is in addition to his professional career a volunteer firefighter and has volunteered for the Boy Scouts for 30 years. I yield to him to talk to you about why he chose to run for Congress and what he is accomplishing here, and how he feels that if this Congress could work together more closely on fiscal conservatism, how this Nation would currently be better off and on the road to recovery.

I yield to Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming, and it's a pleasure to be with you tonight here and sharing our reflections on these first 5 months as Members of the 111th Congress. It's an honor to serve in Congress. It's an honor today.

In health care, my background was health care. I always had one boss. And today I consider that I have 660,000 very smart people that I work for in the constituents of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, and frankly, it's an honor to serve those individuals and this great Nation.

And I'm proud to be a part of this freshman Republican class. We come with diverse backgrounds, as you began to talk about, but we have a common characteristic of bringing real change to Congress. And it's change that the American citizens deserve and need to have. It's a vision of fiscal accountability, of preserving individual freedom and liberty and returning America to the values that this country was built upon.

And you touched off, the gentlelady has really touched off with the first one for this evening for our discussion, fiscal responsibility. And I would put in with that, fiscal accountability and transparency in terms of how the taxpayer dollars are being spent. We are guardians of, we are trusted. We have a responsibility to make sure that those dollars that the American citizens work hard for, that they are spent wisely here in Washington, and only on those things that they should be spent on and not wasted and spent in a way that's transparent and that's accountable.

You know, Washington, DC, really doesn't have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. We hear time and time again with the legislation being proposed, well, you know, under the last administration we had a spending problem. Well, as the freshman class we recognize that. I think we agree with it. That's one of the reasons we came to Washington, because we knew that there was out of control spending here and that the American people deserved better. They deserve the same fiscal responsibility from their Federal Government that they exercise in their own household budgets every day.

American families make tough decisions when things get tough fiscally.

You know, they don't go out. They don't put more money—they know enough not to go out and do deficit spending and fill up all the credit cards and take out loans where they have no idea who's going to be able to afford to lend them the money, if somebody will. But the Federal Government has been doing that.

You know, the freshmen, the Republican freshmen, all came here to restore fiscal accountability and responsibility. And that's why we're united in opposing the massive waste-filled stimulus, or as I prefer to call it, "stimulusless" bill that we had.

And I don't think it's a reflection on my public education, but I have to say before I came to Congress I had no idea how many zeros were in a trillion.

□ 2230

The fact is I really didn't think it was physically possible to be able to spend almost \$2 trillion in 3 months, but frankly, my friends and colleagues, Democratic colleagues, proved me wrong with that. In the President's first 100 days, it's estimated he spent \$11.9 billion for each day he was in office. That's a number that's very difficult to wrap our brains around in terms of that amount of money. That means more new debt will be created under this one budget than all the combined debt created by the previous 43 Presidents, going all the way back to George Washington.

That's a lot of debt, and that's debt that the American people do not deserve to have. It's debt that I don't consider I will be in a position to pay back, my children, my grandchildren I don't have yet, great-grandchildren—I don't know how many greats we're going to have to go out in order to get enough generations to be able to satisfy that debt that we've wracked up just in 5 months here in Congress.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I have the privilege of serving on the House Budget Committee, and yesterday Dr. Bernanke testified at our hearing and expressed his concern over the need for Congress to develop a plan to come up with a way to deal with these debts and our deficit issues. They are part of a risk that is presented to our country long term if we don't begin to address them now, and after passing a \$700-plus billion stimulus package, over \$1.1 trillion when you consider the interest on top of that; also, the \$410 billion budget for the current fiscal year; and then approving in the Budget Committee, over the objection of all of the Republicans a nearly \$3.6 trillion budget for the next fiscal year, I firmly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the concerns that we all have as freshmen, Republicans, for the tremendous debt and the tremendous deficit that is being undertaken.

I would like to ask a couple of other colleagues to join in this conversation. Next, calling on BLAINE LUETKEMEYER of Missouri, who is another member of our freshman Republican class who is

the rarest of rare commodities in Congress in that he has operated and continues to operate a small business. He currently operates a 160-acre farm after serving as a leader in a number of other small businesses. And if any entity within this Congress does not get the attention it deserves, I would suggest that it is small business.

And I yield to my colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS). It's a great evening that you've put together for us here.

You know, we've been here a little over a 100 days, about 120 days now, and we've all got some first impressions of what this body is all about, what our work is all about, and it's been kind of an eye-opening experience for me coming from the Midwest.

My little community in my district I think is a true slice of Americana, in that it's full of small towns and it's where you know your neighbors and where you wave at them as they go by. You know, we still have gun racks in the back of pickups where I come up. But we also have some great people, and that's the reason that I was excited to be able to represent those folks.

You know, where I come from people still believe in limited government, lower taxes, self-reliance on the individual, common sense, and balanced budgets, whether they're their own or the local political entity.

It's kind of ironic, though. When you get here, things seem to change. In my mind, what a difference 2,000 miles make in the way governance takes place. Coming from the statehouse in Missouri, I know it's completely different, but yet it's the same type of process; although that kind of seems to be completely different.

You know, here, instead of limited government, we seem to be content and intent on expanding government by leaps and bounds into every aspect of people's lives, into the businesses.

Instead of lower taxes, we're about to consider the largest tax increase in the history of this country, which I think will push us off an economic cliff. I have some grave concerns about it. As I go home and talk to my constituents about the carbon tax, the cap-and-trade bill that's coming up shortly, they're alarmed and they're very concerned.

Another one that I mentioned was self-reliance. It's interesting that today we passed another bill which adds to the government payroll, the government bailout, the government, people on our payroll, instead of allowing people to be able to take care of themselves.

And if you'd mind, I've got a little story to tell about some good folks at home that are just like everybody else's, but it's interesting to see and to note we had a terrible tragedy that ran through my district a few weeks ago. We had a tornado that went through and actually killed three folks, very

tragic, did thousands of dollars worth of damage. It happened during the week when I was here in DC. So I called up my folks at home and asked a couple of my guys to be sure and go out and talk to those folks and give them some help, whatever help they needed, and assure them we'd be there to help them in whatever way we could.

I went there the next day when I did get home and met with the local leaders and it was amazing. All the emergency folks, the community leaders had everything under control, and it was amazing how ordered and how orderly they were. There was no Federal Government running in there to tell them what to do. They were all doing it themselves with their own plans.

Then I went out and talked to the local folks who had sustained the damage, who had endured this tragedy. And while they were upset and distraught and certainly you know, not in the best frame of mind, they still were very thankful because they had a community of folks that was around them, that was giving them the support that they needed to be able to withstand this ordeal and get through it.

And the strength of the community is a thing that really was impactful to me, from the standpoint that that community came together, and there was such an outpouring that there was probably more help than they actually needed to help with the cleanup and to give them the support they needed to get back on their feet.

And that's the kind of people that we have in this country, all over this country. Given the chance, they can be that self-reliant people that can bring this country back to what it is.

With regards to the common sense I mentioned a minute ago, it's one of the most often heard comments I hear when I go back home, What in the world are you guys doing in DC? And of course, my response is, well, common sense is something a little in short supply here in DC sometimes. Just, it's kind of a foreign concept.

Mrs. LUMMIS. That is exactly what I hear when I go home. Wyoming people want Wyoming common sense. It is the same kind of common sense that you discussed was evident among people that were experiencing a tragedy in your district and who got together and solved the problem, and that is something that we as a class of freshman Republicans hope to do as well.

We represent 20 States. We span in age from 28 years old, our youngest Member, to 64 years old. Five are physicians or work in health care, and as Mr. THOMPSON mentioned, he works in health care. One of our physicians is with us this evening, Dr. PHIL ROE, and we will be visiting with him shortly. We have two college athletes, six with military backgrounds among our 22 freshmen Republicans, four former State treasurers and 16 State legislators or statewide officers.

And I know Mr. LUETEMEYER was a State legislator, as was I, as is our next

freshman who's going to visit with us, a gentleman from Minnesota, ERIK PAULSEN, and I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota who first I might mention still finds time to teach Sunday school at his Lutheran church, Missouri Synod, of which I am also a member, and who as State legislator helped eliminate Minnesota's \$4.5 billion State budget deficit without raising taxes. So this is someone that we desperately need working to pull off a similar success story here in Washington.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and organizing our little get-together tonight, and I have to tell you it's been a wonderful opportunity to serve as a freshman Member of Congress, not only with our good Republican Members who are here taking some time on the House floor tonight, but even with some of the Democrat counterparts who have been trying to work on a bipartisan basis. I think a lot of us, to be honest, are frustrated with the leadership around here that doesn't necessarily give us the opportunity to offer amendments, to offer change that Washington in particular I think really does need, the American people more than anything really need right now.

You mentioned small business earlier. I have to tell you, one of my observations here after being a freshman Member, not only being away from family, spending time away from family, but the frustration of trillions of dollars of new spending, driving up the Federal budget deficit at an alarming rate and the Federal debt at an alarming rate.

□ 2240

But it's really a lack of focus on small business. Think of it. Seven to eight of every ten new jobs comes from small business. That is really the engine of economic growth in this country.

Rightfully so, the new administration and this Congress wanted to focus on a stimulus package to help the economy. Unfortunately, I think we really missed an opportunity to help small businesses.

I held some small business roundtables in my district and, boy, some of the stories I heard from those folks were a little bit alarming. One gentleman in particular said he basically felt that high taxes were the hindrance. High taxes were the hindrance to his continued economic growth. He's been forced indefinitely now to delay a multimillion-dollar project.

Another gentleman that came to that small business roundtable, he told me specifically that small businesses should be able to save more of their money for a rainy day. And they're all going through a rainy day right now, like a lot of the American public is going through, unfortunately. But the tax code penalizes them for doing that, so we're not helping small business.

There's one other gentleman who owns a company. He basically was frustrated that the credit markets are hurting his ability to get additional capital. If he could just get a couple more hundred thousand dollars of credit from a community bank, from a bank of some sort, he could hire some more people. He's been hiring brand new employees that have never been employed in the workforce before. So he has got some good success stories to tell. We want to keep that going, however.

So, as a member of the Financial Services Committee, I have been frustrated because it seems all of our discussion here in Washington is about too big to fail; how are we going to help all these big companies. But how are we going to help small business? That's where we really, I think, have to focus our time and attention, because if we're going to pull ourselves out of this economic recession, we have to help the small business owner down the road because that's the person who has put in all the risk, all their individual capital, the entrepreneurship, that spirit of America that founded this country. That's where I think we really need to have our effort going forward.

And you think of the problems we have seen lately with the government now buying the large auto companies and having a stake—60 percent ownership that the taxpayers who are watching us tonight now own General Motors. That's very troubling. Very troubling.

In particular, I have met—and I think all of you, Congresswoman LUMMIS and others, have met with small business people who come and seek our help as they walk the Halls of Congress saying, Here's what you can do to help us get some business tax relief.

This week I met with small business people who are frustrated. They receive a letter of notice in the mail saying they had to close their operation because that was the will of the auto task force from the administration. And I think these auto dealers who have put in so much time and effort—many of these are family businesses and they have, unfortunately, invested their time, their capital. They own the land. They own the company. They're selling cars. They employ people, and they're forced to lay off folks.

And so I'm frustrated. I'd like to see the government not picking the winners and losers here.

So I'm just really encouraged. We have got a good class of freshmen that want to help small business. I know Congressman SCHOCK has an initiative to go forward that will temporarily provide some payroll tax relief for the employers and the employees, which I think is so critical from a real economic stimulus plan.

And I'm working on an economic plan for small business right now to separate business income from personal

income because, as we all know, many of these small businesses unfortunately pay their taxes at that individual rate. And when they're paying at that individual rate, it's a higher rate, especially under the new tax plan that was passed by Congress.

So now they're going to be paying higher taxes, so they can't hire somebody. They can't buy more equipment. So, if we can separate those streams of income, I think we have tremendous opportunity to help small business.

So I want to keep working with you on that effort

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAULSEN. I'd be happy to yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. You know, that is very much a bipartisan frustration right now. I read of Senators and other House Members who are tremendously concerned about their local dealers, GM, Chrysler, having to give up a profitable business because of this takeover. Both sides of the aisle on both sides of the Capitol building share in their tremendous frustration over the manner in which the bankruptcy of GM and Chrysler are playing out.

I want to give a moment to another member of our freshman class who has joined us, Dr. ROE. The gentleman from Tennessee served as a doctor for 2 years in the U.S. Army Medical Corps and has delivered close to 5,000 babies. He also has been the mayor of his small town and was very successful in using their landfill as a source of energy for that community. And being a mayor of a town of people of very modest means requires an amount of creativity that is unique in this country.

Welcome, Dr. ROE. Please join our discussion.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you. It's great to be here tonight. I, too, echo Congressman PAULSEN. We do have a very, very fine, diverse freshman class. I think we add a lot to the debate.

I guess many of the speakers tonight sort of mentioned why they ran for Congress. I do have one distinct advantage. I delivered a lot of my own voters. So that's a huge advantage when you're out on the trail and you deliver babies.

I ran, really, to serve my country. I have had a very successful medical career in Johnson City, Tennessee, which is where I'm from. And for those of you who don't know, so you can remember, it's the only congressional district in America that's had two Presidents, Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and Davy Crockett served in this body as a Congressman. Andrew Jackson was the first person to sit in this seat, so it's a very historic seat in northeast Tennessee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield? I understand that in the old Senate Chamber that still exists in this building that you can go see Congressman Crockett's desk. Is that the case?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes, that is correct. That is correct. The reason

that I—it was about 10 years ago. I have never had service in the State government or Federal Government before. I really wanted to take this time just to serve my country as I did my patients over the years. So I was asked to be on the city commission and ran and was fortunate enough to win, and then became mayor of Johnson City after my second win.

I brought a very simple philosophy to government, and that is: Spend less than you take in. It's not complicated.

Well, how do we do with that philosophy? Well, we had 6 years ago in our city of 60,000 people, we had \$2 million, approximately \$2 million in reserve. When I last came to Congress, we had \$24 million in reserve. We have not raised taxes, and our bond rating went up during 2008 when everybody else's had gone off a cliff.

The city has a great management, has a great commission. They're going to balance this budget. And every single budget we passed had a surplus.

Now, the philosophy in Washington, D.C., I found, is you borrow more than you take in. You spend that and what you take in also. That's what we've done here this year. As you probably have mentioned, we start our fiscal year on 1 October. And by the 26th of April of this year, we had spent all the money that the taxpayers had sent us for the year. So everything we're running on now is borrowed money.

The folks back home, as they have you all, ask you what is your biggest frustration or surprise or whatever. A lot of them think it's the workload. It's not that. To me, it's the partisanship and, second, it's the spending. I just can't get over the staggering amount of money that we spend up here.

And to give you an example, in our local city, we've put \$120-plus million in water and sewer improvements. Didn't raise taxes. We were able to do that. We paid for it. We didn't have the Federal Government pay for it. We paid for it locally.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. How did you pay for it?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Well, we just spent less than what we took in. It wasn't complicated. In the city where we were, we have one of the lowest tax rates in the State of Tennessee. So smaller government, less people working. We had fewer employees than we had 8 years ago. And lean government. They reward you. The taxpayers like that and they reward you for that kind of work.

The other thing we did was we could see—and all of you all dealt with this in State governments—the new ozone levels that the EPA came down with when they lowered that from 80 to 75 parts per billion, a lot of people around don't understand what that means. Well, if you go into nonattainment, meaning you don't attain those stand-

ards, the EPA has a right to freeze all building permits, so you cannot grow your community.

And we understood where we were. If you had the infrastructure, the roads, water, sewer, and schools, you could grow and business would want to come there. As ERIK pointed out, you want an environment where business can flourish.

And we looked at the challenge we had with energy and said, Okay, how do we manage this energy problem we're having? Did we look at raising taxes on power? No. What we did was this. We had a landfill, as you've mentioned, and we looked at this as an opportunity. And we went into a private-public partnership with a private company, zero tax dollars, and formed this partnership where we went to our landfill, we capped the landfill, drilled wells into it, sent a pipe 4 miles over to our VA, which is a hundred-acre VA, the Quillen College of Medicine, named after Congressman Quillen who served here for 34 years. Huge campus. They heat and cool that campus with the gas, the methane gas, which is the second largest greenhouse gas outside of carbon dioxide.

You, the Federal taxpayer, get a 15 percent discount on your bill. We, the local taxpayer, make money off royalties—about half a million-plus per year—and the private company created jobs and made money. That's the way you do it.

We cut our consumption from a million gallons of fuel a year to 850,000 gallons. And when gas was \$4 a gallon, that's very, very significant.

□ 2250

To give you another example about what you could do: around the country, we did some simple things like just change the lights in a stoplight from the 150-watt bulb to an LED bulb. In every intersection over the period of that lighting, you can save almost \$800 per intersection. Multiply that across the country. It's the carrot versus the stick that we're seeing now.

You all may have talked about this before I got here, but within days of getting here, we were faced with the stimulus package, which arrived as a 450-page document that went to the Senate and came back as 750 pages. It then came back at conference at 1,071. I carry it around in the trunk of my car and show people how big it is. We had 4 hours or 5 hours to read it here on the House floor. We got it, I think, at 9 o'clock on Friday morning and put it on at 2 o'clock that afternoon.

Then we were faced with the omnibus spending bill. The 110th Congress had 12 appropriations in the bill, and we have them every year. Only three had been passed. Every local government, every business, every State in the Union tightens their belts when their revenue is down. So what did we do? We went up 8 percent. We passed an 8 percent increase. I felt like I was in the twilight zone. Then we got the next

budget after we got a \$1.8 trillion deficit. Guess what? We raised that 8 percent. Then there is this year's budget that's coming along, and that's \$3.9 trillion. People back home—I'm talking about Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and apolitical people—do not understand that, and I don't understand that kind of spending. It is not sustainable.

Now we've got two big issues that we're going to be facing that are coming up ahead of us: our health care—and I'm really glad to be in the middle of that discussion—and the carbon tax.

I yield back.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you.

Let me tell you about a few of our other classmates who could not be here this evening. We anticipated that we would have votes tomorrow and that we would have more members of our freshman class able to join us, but because of votes not being taken tomorrow, some people tried to get home tonight so they could visit with both their families and their constituents.

Among them is CHRIS LEE from New York, who has spent two decades as a business entrepreneur in New York; TOM MCCLINTOCK of California, another of our freshman colleagues, who was first elected to the California State Legislature at the age of 26; PETE OLSON of Texas, a naval aviator for 9 years, who had missions in the Persian Gulf, also a naval liaison officer in the U.S. Senate; another, BILL POSEY of Florida, an accomplished stock car racer. We have all become, of course, Pittsburgh Steeler fans due to our good friend and fellow freshman, TOM ROONEY of Florida, who also played college football and was a special assistant U.S. Attorney at Fort Hood and taught military law.

With that kind of diversity in our freshman class, it has been really helpful to me. For example, between votes, I can sit down on the floor next to Representative ROONEY and ask him about things like enhanced interrogation techniques.

Well, look. He just walked in the room.

I didn't know you were still here. I'm so pleased to see you. It's that kind of expertise that makes our class such a close group and very helpful to each other as we are dealing with the many issues at hand.

So, with the magical appearance of Representative ROONEY, I'm delighted that you have chosen to join us this evening.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, thank you very much.

I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming for giving us the opportunity to reflect on our first 100 days and on, really, where we're going as a country and on the direction that we, as freshmen, when we all ran for Congress, thought we were going to go when we got here and on how we were going to try to make a difference, not only in

our individual communities but in the country as a whole.

I was watching earlier on C-SPAN the former speakers talk about the spending and the size of government. I think that that's really the lighthouse that I use as a direction as to who we want to be as Americans and as to who we want to be as Congressmen. We really have a decision to make here as we move forward with all of the things that we have to consider.

I've got to be honest with you. It's very disheartening to see, as the father of three very young children, what we're leaving them as a legacy so far. Although, I am very encouraged by my fellow freshmen and by the people whom I meet on the treasure coast of Florida, in central Florida, in western Florida, and in the district that I represent, the 16th District of Florida. They remind me of why they sent me to Washington and of why they sent all of us to Washington.

It's never going to fall on deaf ears for me that the American people whom I represent and the American people whom I talk to believe in a strong United States of America, one with a strong military but one that lets the free market dictate who they're going to be without inhibiting where they're going to go.

It just breaks my heart to hear this week that auto dealers that employ hundreds of people and that contribute so much to my community are being closed. For what reason? They're not really sure. It's just because they were the ones picked even though, for decades, they've been profitable companies. People that own certain automobiles—I won't go into what they are—may have to travel over an hour now to get their cars serviced. Really, again, it's who we want to be as Americans.

I just want to thank the freshmen personally. The reason I really wanted to be here tonight was to thank you, personally, for signing up to a letter that I sent to the Speaker of the House today, asking her to not include a global bailout, really, of foreign countries on the backs of our American servicemen and women who are fighting.

As a former Army captain with my fellow colleague, who is a former marine—or a current marine—DUNCAN HUNTER, we asked the freshmen Republicans to ask the Speaker not to include something that has nothing to do with funding our troops in the service that they're providing, which is putting themselves in harm's way for our liberty and for our freedoms, and really holding a military funding bill hostage with this IMF funding bill that has nothing to do with military spending.

To do that, for me, honestly, has been the biggest disappointment in my short tenure here in Congress. I have to explain to those men and women—and a lot of them are still active duty who my wife and I served with—that there is a problem with putting ammunition in their weapons or in giving them the

body armor that they deserve or in up-arming vehicles that they have to drive in because the majority has put into this bill something that has nothing to do with military spending. To try to explain that and to try to even justify to myself that what we're doing is the right thing is very difficult.

As we move forward as freshmen, whatever we decide to do on a lot of these issues, we can never forget why we're here and who sent us here.

Again, I just really thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to reflect and also for giving us the hope to move forward on a lot of the things that we're about to do here in Congress.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Absolutely.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you for your statement.

Now, we have six freshmen here of the Republican class and, indeed, a seventh member in the Chair. Our Speaker this evening is a member of the majority party, a Democrat. It would be really fascinating at some point to have a Special Order some evening with our Democrat colleagues who are freshmen as well, because I think many of us came to Congress with a different perspective, with a new perspective, regardless of party, about how we think America can move forward.

As freshmen Republicans, we did support legislation that would stimulate economic growth. It would have cost \$315 billion less than the bill that Congress adopted, the Democratic bill; and it would have created twice as many jobs.

□ 2300

In my district in Wyoming, it would have created 50 percent more jobs; but in many districts that are suffering mightily, it created twice as many jobs. That because we really targeted and took to heart what President Obama asked us to do, and that was to be targeted and temporary. Unfortunately the bill that was adopted was neither targeted—it was a shotgun approach to economic stimulus—and it is not temporary. Many provisions in that bill are built into the ongoing spending of government and inflate the costs of government, as Dr. ROE pointed out earlier, by adding to the baseline of expenditures that will go up and up and up in the future.

One of the things that Representative ROONEY just mentioned that is so frustrating to all of us, I think on both sides of the aisle, is seeing legislation that is not germane to the subject of the bill being attached to the bill. In the case that Representative ROONEY was just discussing with us, it was the funding for our military men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan and in Pakistan, and the addition to that bill would lend money or guarantee money to the International Monetary Fund. No connection whatsoever. And the IMF funding has created a situation

where we're not voting tomorrow on that bill because there are not sufficient votes to pass it by virtue of an amendment that was not germane being added to a bill. In the Wyoming legislature you cannot do that. You cannot amend a nongermane topic to a piece of legislation or it is ruled out of order. If that rule were in effect here, we would see much better legislation. We would see people having a better opportunity to vet that legislation, discuss that legislation and then vote with their heart rather than having to grit their teeth and vote for a couple things that are just not a good pairing.

I can give an example of where it pained some people on the other side of the aisle. I am a big supporter of Second Amendment rights, but there was an amendment put on a credit card bill to allow concealed weapon permits in national parks. I firmly support allowing concealed weapons in national parks because they are so part and parcel to the State of Wyoming and to our right to bear arms, but attaching it to a credit card bill is wrong. It's just wrong.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. The gentleman will remember our first weekend or two here when we, both the freshman Democrats and Republicans—and I might add that I think there are 33 new Democrats and 22 Republicans, I believe, is that correct? We have them outnumbered finally. I will point that out.

You remember, we went there, and the economists told us, if we don't spend this money rapidly, the earth's going to end? I remember saying, Well, that sounds counterintuitive to me to spend your way to wealth. Well, guess what, the economy is beginning to turn around, thank goodness, I think, for a lot of people. The signs are feeble, but it looks like the economy may have bottomed out; and the same people are telling us in the third and fourth quarter that the economy probably will show some growth. We've spent less than 10 percent of the stimulus package. The economy did that on its own without the stimulus package. I think the target is what we were talking about earlier; and if we truly had done this, if we truly had looked at infrastructure. For example, the State of Tennessee is going to get \$55 million in water and sewer projects, and the small city of 60,000 people I am from is already putting \$100 million in the ground. So it was a spending bill that had some little bit of stimulus in it.

Look at energy, for instance. If we had invested \$100 billion, \$200 billion in nuclear power how much further along would we be to energy independence. We chose not to do that. In 2 years the money will be spent, and I don't think we will have much to show for it.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. LUETKEMEYER, this gets into an area that you're involved in deeply now. Any comments on either your service in the State legislature in Missouri and how you would compare it to process here in Wash-

ington and how process here in Washington impedes that or the energy issues specifically? Either one.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Yes. The process in my home State where I served in the House both in the minority and in the majority, and in the leadership and as a committee chairman—so I have a pretty wide background there in the house. It's not unlike Missouri, but yet it's different. Here we don't necessarily run everything through committee. Another thing, it has to be germane. Not always are you allowed to offer amendments. It's an amazing process where I thought that it would be more open, more transparent. That was the promise from the administration, yet we see little of that. During the discussion here, it's been interesting to listen to all my colleagues and yourselves. They've got some great stories to tell and great perspectives on how we should be governing ourselves, how we, as a people, should be governing ourselves. And it's interesting to me that if you look at our Constitution, it says, "We, the people." It doesn't say "We, the government;" and to me, I think that is very important. We stop and think about our framers. When they put this very special document together, this American experiment that they were trying, they said, "We, the people." They wanted the people to be where the power was, to be where the ability to control their lives was, not the government. It seems as though very quickly when you get here, the perspectives are clearly different. Here the government is where the power always emanates from, and they want everybody to be subservient to it. It's that sort of mindset. It's that sort of situation that we find ourselves in here that I think is very frustrating to our constituents. They see this as well; and over the last several weeks as I've gone home, this concern continues to well up with regards to where we're going as a country, where we're going as a government. They don't see themselves as being a part of it anymore, and they want us to be their voice.

It's an honor to serve them, and it's an honor to be here. But I think the perspective of this body needs to be that of serving people, rather than to be served. I sometimes think we get that switched around.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The gentleman from Minnesota also was a leader in his State legislature. Observations comparing the two?

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. One of the biggest surprises and frustrations that I have noticed is that it's been a little bit more partisan than I ever thought it would be; and I can say that, having served in both the majority and the minority in the Minnesota State legislature; and I was majority leader for awhile. I think a lot of being a successful legislator and making yourself a successful State, and now a successful country, is being able to build relationships to get things done and be results-

oriented. In the Minnesota Legislature we were always allowed to offer an amendment to a bill as long as it was germane, just as you were mentioning a little while ago. But here in Congress we have to get permission to offer an amendment from the Chair of the Rules Committee or from the Speaker of the House. So it's a very closed process, and it's not an open flowing process where I think it's easier to breed partisanship. I think if the rank-and-file Members, both Republican and Democrat, can get together to kind of break the grips of that leadership power, I think we could really do great things for the American people.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We have other Members who are not here tonight who I'd like to mention. One was mentioned earlier by Mr. ROONEY. DUNCAN HUNTER, a member of our freshman class from California, quit his job after 9/11 to serve in the Marine Corps. He has served three combat tours, including two in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. And along with Mr. ROONEY and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, who took unpaid leave from the Colorado State House to serve in the first Gulf War and gave up being Colorado State treasurer for a tour of duty in Iraq—and I was Wyoming State treasurer at the same time Mr. COFFMAN was State treasurer and at the same time when another of our fellow freshmen, LYNN JENKINS, was the State treasurer in Kansas. We were proud of our colleague, Mr. COFFMAN, for leaving his job as Colorado State treasurer to do a tour of duty in Iraq. The experience of our servicemen and -women in this Congress is invaluable, and I applaud them and appreciate their efforts.

I want to call on Mr. ROONEY one more time to discuss our specific concerns about the issue that prevents all of us from being here tonight, that being the fact that an amendment has been placed on a military funding bill that is not germane.

Would you care to elaborate further? And then I would like to yield to Mr. THOMPSON.

□ 2310

Well, the bill that we had originally sent to the Senate was just a clean war funding bill that the President asked us for and that we delivered as a House of Representatives to the Senate.

I did not serve in politics before running for Congress, so all this is new. But unfortunately, by the time it came back from the Senate to us, it had an additional amendment on it which included funding for the IMF, which is basically our borrowing money from somewhere else or printing money to loan it to another country. And that might seem ridiculous to a lot of people that may be listening, since everybody knows that America is going through tough times right now. People in my district are really hurting. The middle class needs help. They need tax cuts. They need to feel that their job is secure. They need to feel that the Federal Government is helping them, not

impeding them. And to think that we are going to borrow or print money to send abroad, some of it to people that we might not necessarily want to lend money to, and have to put that on the backs of our servicemen and -women, because they know that it will be difficult for us as Republicans to vote against it, is really, in my opinion, shameful in a lot of ways.

I understand there are differences in ideology. There are differences in principles about what governing should be. But if we have a clean military funding bill, then it should stand on its own. If you have a clean IMF bill to loan money to foreign countries, then it should stand on its own. The majority is the majority. If it is a good idea, it will pass. They have the Congress. They have the White House. Why should it be attached to something that has nothing to do with funding our soldiers abroad?

I recently got back from Iraq and Afghanistan. Recently I visited Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. And the one thing that impressed me more than anything else is the men and women that wear our uniform. They never talk about politics. They never talk about policy or how they stand on certain issues. They are there to do a job. They are putting themselves in harm's way so we can stand here tonight and discuss these issues and talk about what we think is best for the future.

To think that politics is being played with the ammunition that goes in their guns or the body armor or the vehicles that they drive or anything that they have to rely on from us as a Congress to pay for what we are sending them there to do is just unconscionable to me. And it is something that I hope, as you said earlier, has been delayed, and hopefully that delay is felt, continues on to next week, and maybe we can reconsider what we are doing and what we talk about. Politics should have no place when it comes to funding what we send our men and women in uniform to do abroad.

Whether you agree with these wars, whether you agree with the war on terror, whether you agree with anything that we are doing, we are sending them there. We should give them a clean bill. And as of right now, we are not. But maybe, just maybe, cooler heads will prevail and we will give them a clean bill for what they are doing and what they are serving us for.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I would like to acknowledge two other Members of our Republican freshman class who have also served in the military: JOHN FLEMING, who is a family physician from Louisiana, was also a medical officer in the U.S. Navy; and BRETT GUTHRIE, one of our colleagues from Kentucky, served as a field artillery officer in the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) at Fort Campbell. And we have other veterans as well.

I want to turn now to a subject that is on the front burner in Congress, House and Senate, both energy and

health care. And we have a wonderful array of talent in our class on both subjects. We have two medical care providers with us to discuss that issue. I know I was listening briefly to the Progressive Caucus before we had this little opportunity to visit this evening, and they were espousing the benefits that they see in providing health care by way of a government-funded option.

I might point out before I turn it over to Mr. THOMPSON that government payers, and this was an independent study, found out that Medicaid and Medicare have shifted a total of \$89 billion per year in costs on to other payers. As a result, families with private health, and I'm quoting from the study, families with private health insurance spend nearly \$1,800 more per year, \$1,512 in higher premiums and \$276 in increased beneficiary cost sharing to cover the below-market reimbursement levels paid by Medicare and Medicaid.

My concern is, if we go to a government option that is side by side with private sector insurance, that it will be less expensive and it will recruit people to gravitate from private insurance to this government system. But the reason that it may be cheaper for the government to provide insurance is that they are continuing to shift costs and to fail to reimburse providers accurately and adequately.

I know in my State of Wyoming, where health care is the number one issue right now, that there are physicians who are no longer accepting Medicare and Medicaid patients. They cannot afford to accept them anymore because reimbursement levels in rural hospitals and to rural physicians are so low. And if that is the manner in which our country intends to get ahold of the cost of health care, we are in big trouble.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. First of all, I would be remiss if I didn't thank my good friend and colleague from Florida and also Mr. HUNTER from California for your leadership in making sure that we don't compromise the bill that funds our troops' needs. As a Member of Congress and, frankly, as a proud father of a United States soldier, I thank you. I know my son, Logan, and his comrades thank you as well.

Health care has been my life. For 28 years, I have worked in rehabilitation. That is how I got involved in public service actually, being frustrated with the Federal regulations that were being piled on the health care system that was decreasing access, increasing costs, and making the health care system more challenging. And that is the Federal system.

We are blessed in this Republican freshman class, as you said, in terms of the tremendous health care experience that we have, and I think we have a lot to offer to this debate. Hopefully we will have access and opportunity to engage in that debate a little more than

what we have had in the past. Huge issues have come before this body.

Health care is a three-legged stool. It is about access, and that is what we hear a lot about today in terms of talking about the uninsured in today's debate. But it is access, affordability, and quality. I happen to believe, and I have seen evidence, that we have the best health care system in the world. I'm not saying that it is perfect and there is not opportunities that we can continue to improve upon it, but the Democratic proposals that are being bandied about and discussed would, in my opinion, in the long run, increase access issues and, frankly, lower the quality of care that we have all come to expect as Americans. This is a place where people come from around the world when they need life-saving, quality health care services.

The other side would argue that this is to provide access to those who are currently uninsured. If we identify those individuals that make a decision to not purchase health care insurance but could afford it, and we eliminate those folks from that number, we are talking about approximately 9 percent of individuals who do not have insurance. And the lack of insurance does not necessarily mean that they don't have access to health care services.

In my district, we have agencies such as federally qualified health centers. An agency that was just in to see me today near my home town is called the Tapestry of Health. We have another one called Centre Volunteers in Medicine that stand in the gap. Can we do better in health care? Absolutely. Absolutely. But do we need to ruin our health care system by reducing access and quality for all in doing this? Absolutely not. I think the Republican freshmen stand uniquely prepared to bring solutions based on real life medical experience and health care experience to this important debate.

□ 2320

My district is just like the rest of rural America. You know, our health care debate has to include things that aren't being talked about right now in this body, things like peeling away the regulations on health care that were instituted 40 years ago and have long since outlived their usefulness, and only serve to add cost and decrease access.

We need to reduce the practice of defensive medicine by eliminating the fears of liability that our physicians have where they order tests because they need them as a part of, not the medical record, but the evidence record, should they be sued. And that is so frequent today.

We need to level the reimbursement system, frankly, that I see as favoring urban big city health care over rural America, specifically on issues related to the wage index.

We need to address the health care workforce crisis. I have not heard that addressed at all in this body, and yet

we can redefine the payment system any way you want, but if you do not have qualified doctors and nurses and technicians and therapists to provide the services then there is no health care access. And today we are facing tremendous retirements with the baby boomer generation of those health care professionals.

There are some real health care reform issues that we need to be addressing that just have not been, and I think this class is well prepared to bring that to the health care debate.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I look forward to that discussion. Another of our colleagues, Dr. BILL CASSIDY from Louisiana, in his practice, co-founded a health clinic to match uninsured patients with doctors who provide services free of charge. So we have some very qualified, very caring medical care providers and physicians in our class, and I'm proud to serve with them.

Of course, Doctor PHIL, you are among them. Would you please comment on this subject.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just a couple of things that Congressman THOMPSON talked about. One, is accessibility to care, and that is the crisis of personnel. If you look in the next 20 years, over half of our registered nurses can and will retire. We'll need a million new registered nurses in the next 8 years.

In the next 10 to 12 years there will be more physicians retiring and dying in this country than we're producing in this country. We are not investing in the medical infrastructure to increase the class size, and I don't know where that anybody thinks who's going to provide this care. So that is very correct. It is a huge issue.

The challenge here is affordable health care, and that's accessible to people. It's not going to be easy. I've dealt with this for over 30 years, and this is going to be very, very complicated to do.

We do not need to do this fast. We need to do it right. And I think that's one of the worries that I have is that we're going to go and have this arbitrary deadline of 60 days from now. Who says 60 days from now we should have this right, have it done? We need to get it right. If it takes 6 months we need to get it right because it affects every American.

Let me just give you a couple of little examples. In this country, we have 47 million people that are uninsured. That's about 15 percent of our population.

In the State of Tennessee several years ago, about 15, 16 years ago, we had a Medicaid waiver. And for those out there that understand what Medicaid is for the uninsured and poor in this country, and Medicare is for our citizens over 65, this was a Medicaid waiver to form a managed care plan called TennCare. And what it did was, it was a very rich blended plan that provided a lot of care for not much money. And what we found in the State was that 45 percent of the people who

got on TennCare had private health insurance but dropped it.

Well, then I asked the providers, what percent of your costs does TennCare actually pay in our district, in our area? And I went to several different hospital systems. About 60 percent. And Medicare pays about 90 percent. And as you pointed out very clearly, and then the uninsured pay somewhere in between.

And what you pointed out very clearly was that what happens is that cost is shifted and more cost, so your private health insurance goes up each year, part of it not because of what you do, but because of what the government has done, which is not pay the freight. And my concern is, when we get a public plan that's "competitive", it also will offer a lot of benefits but won't pay the costs of the services, once again, causing a shift to the private health insurer, meaning they will be crowded out. And over time, I'm afraid you'll end up with a single-payer system. And a single-payer system is not what the American people, I think, want. And certainly that's something that's going to be discussed in great detail in the future.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I might mention the three officers of our freshman Republican class who couldn't join us this evening, and two of our more unique members who I hope will be able to join us if we have the opportunity to do this again. Our class president is STEVE AUSTRIA of Ohio. He was a force in getting Jessica's Law and the Adam Walsh Child Protection Safety Act passed into State law. Our representative on the Steering Committee, GREGG HARPER of, Mississippi, is an attorney with a child whom he has brought to share his unique health concerns with us. And we've all learned a lot from him.

And of course, our Policy Committee representative, JASON CHAFFETZ, who is a former Division I football player at Brigham Young University, my University of Wyoming's nemesis, but a dear colleague of ours, and two wonderful freshmen who are plowing new ground. The very first Vietnamese American to serve in the United States Congress, JOSEPH CAO, born in Saigon, Vietnam, escaped at the age of 8 to the United States, lost his home during Katrina, and fought to return electricity and telecommunications to Louisiana residents after Katrina.

We also boast the youngest Member of this U.S. House of Representatives, Aaron Schock, the youngest school board president, Illinois State Rep, and a Member of Congress with whom we are privileged to serve.

I thank the gentlemen for joining me this evening. I thank our Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia, who was very patient with his fellow freshmen colleagues from the other party, and look forward to the opportunity to have a bipartisan freshman discussion at an early opportunity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COURTNEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 3 p.m., June 5 and 8.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COSTA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. GIFFORDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOHMERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, June 9, 10 and 11.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 8, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2014. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services [MB Docket No.: 07-294] received May 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2015. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to License Requirements and License Exception Eligibility for Certain Thermal Imaging Cameras and Foreign Made Military Commodities Incorporating Such Cameras [Docket No.: 0612242573-7104-01] (RIN: 0694-AD71) received May 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2016. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of T 37 Jet Trainer Aircraft and Parts from the Commerce Control List. [Docket No.: 090406632-9631-01] (RIN: 0694-AC74) received May 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.