United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2009 No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
June 19, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY D. WEINER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, Father of all, as we approach the weekend, we praise You and we bless You, for our fathers, both living and dead.

Their very presence or their memory may endow us with strength wrapped in gentleness, forbearance revealed in practicality, and a self-giving love which is a reflection of Your creative life and goodness.

May the fathers of this Nation be the first and best teachers of their children to find satisfaction in hard work, greatness in moral character, and faith in powerful ways.

May all fathers be blessed in their work, in their games and sports, and in the joys of family life.

This we ask of You, Heavenly Father. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. HALVORSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FIX COVERAGE GAP IN MEDICARE PART D COVERAGE

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

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the urgent need to fix the coverage gap in Medicare part D's prescription benefit plan, especially as we take up health care reform legislation this year.

The coverage gap, better known as the ''doughnut hole,'' is getting worse each year. This gap is tied to health care costs, which are increasing at a rate much faster than inflation. In fact, the costs for people that fall into the doughnut hole are expected to more than double by 2016. In my State of Illinois, 32 percent of Medicare part D beneficiaries fall into this gap, and only a small fraction ever make it out.

Mr. Speaker, in America, no senior should have to choose between their meals and their medication. If we don't solve this issue, this situation will only continue to get worse. We must take the time to address this serious gap in coverage for our seniors.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue as we continue the health care reform debate.

TRIBUTE TO FULLER KIMBRELL

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate, pay tribute and honor a great Alabamian on the occasion of his 100th birthday, which will be this Saturday, a milestone that very few individuals get to reach.

Fuller Kimbrell was born on June 20, 1909, in Berry, Alabama, and was one of 10 boys. As a young man, he was quarterback and captain of his local football team, as well as helping his family on the farm. He traveled across the country during the Great Depression and returned home to Berry, Alabama, and then on to Fayette, Alabama. Today he resides in Tuscaloosa.

Mr. Kimbrell entered politics and served in the Alabama State Senate for the 12th District of Alabama, and he also managed Big Jim Folsom's gubernatorial campaign in 1954. Additionally, he went on to serve as an adviser

Printed on recycled paper.

to several successive governors in the great State of Alabama.

Until his retirement in 1984, he owned and operated Fayco, which was located in Fayette, Alabama, which is in the district I am privileged to represent.

Mr. Fuller Kimbrell has served on various civic and committee organizations such as the Lions Club, the Fayette Chamber of Commerce and the Alabama Farm Equipment Association, as well as the Alabama Road Builders Association, just to name a few.

Mr. Kimbrell has made so many great contributions to Alabama and our Nation. It is an honor to pay tribute to this great Alabamian and this great American. I am thankful to know Mr. Fuller Kimbrell, who is an inspiring example to all of us. I look forward to having the benefit of his wise counsel for many years to come, and I wish him a very happy birthday this Saturday.

A SORRY DAY IN THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a sorry day in the history of the House. Repetitious, unnecessary, unwise votes set about to obfuscate the business of this body was the order of the day. We set a record for the number of votes cast in a single day, but we also set a record for irresponsible, mischievous and obfuscatory behavior. It was a sorry use of the time of this institution.

The time of this institution is a public resource during which we are supposed to do the Nation's business. We are supposed to conduct that business on the floor, in the committees and in our offices. No opportunity was made available for the Members of this body to do that. The institution has not been helped by that behavior, nor has its reputation been helped.

I say that if this kind of behavior persists, we will fall lower in the respect of the American people, as very well we should.

Yesterday was a sorry event. The business of the Nation was obfuscated. The necessary actions that need to be taken on important concerns of the Nation, like health care, like the economy, like the budget, like some 12 or 13 appropriations bills that need to be addressed, were not done.

There are hundreds of items upon which the committee and the Congress could well be using its time. Yesterday we could not because of willful, obfuscatory and mischievous behavior by Members of this institution. It is time to bring that to a stop.

MIRANDA RIGHTS FOR ENEMY COMBATANTS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has ordered Miranda rights to be read to terrorists captured on the battlefield. The administration is confusing constitutional rights of arrested criminal defendants in the United States with acts of war by terrorists against the United States in foreign lands.

Miranda rights ordered to be given by the Supreme Court do not apply to a group of people who have a worldwide mission to murder in the name of religion who are captured by our military in Afghanistan.

Never mind, sayeth the administration. Enemy war combatants must be told: ''You have the right to remain silent. You have the right to a lawyer. If you cannot afford a lawyer, we will provide one for you. And anything you say may be used against you.''

This new policy is misguided. Never in history have captured war combatants overseas been treated with such an overflow of privileges. They have been dealt with by our military, especially regarding interrogations.

But now I guess we are changing all that. But that ought not to be. I guess next we will have a whole battalion of lawyers going into the battlefield to tell our troops if and when they can shoot back. Have we gone a bit too far?

And that's just the way it is.

URGENT NEED TO FIX HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. We urgently need to fix health care. Every day Americans worry not simply about getting well, but whether they can afford to get well. Millions more wonder if they can afford routine care to stay well.

Premiums have doubled over the last 9 years, three times faster than wages, and the average American family already pays an extra $1,000 in premiums every year for a broken system that supports 46 million or more uninsured Americans.

We have the most expensive health care system in the world. We spend almost 50 percent more per person on health care than the next most costly nation, but we are no healthier for it.

We need a uniquely American solution that builds on the best of what works—to foster competition among private plans and provide patients with quality care, ensure that every American child is covered, invest in prevention and wellness to help every American live longer and healthier lives, and ensure that doctors and nurses get the information they need to provide you with the best individualized care.

Never again will coverage be denied if you allow that we go forward with this plan. Never again will one have to make a life or job decision based on coverage. Never will anyone have to let your family suffer financial catastrophe or bankruptcy.

''No'' is not the answer.

LET'S USE OIL SHALE

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, energy prices are a vital concern to all Americans. As gasoline prices are edging up and as the economy is in a recession, we all need a policy of making energy affordable and available.

Oil shale is a promising source of energy for America's future. I am holding in my hand a piece of oil shale from western Colorado. My State, along with Wyoming and Utah, have an estimated quantity of 1 trillion, with a ''T,'' barrels of oil products within our oil shale.

Unfortunately, this administration put oil shale development on hold almost as soon as it took office. This is unfortunate, because we should not be importing oil products from the Middle East if we have it here at home. On top of that, the cap-and-tax policy that this administration is pushing will also drive up the cost of energy.

Mr. Speaker, let's have an energy plan that uses American energy without needless taxes and costs piled on.

CREATING COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. 47 million. 47 million is an absolutely unacceptable number of Americans who go every single day without health insurance, who when they are sick can't afford to go to the doctor, which means that when they do have an ability to access the health care system, they have to wait until they are so sick that they use the emergency room as their primary access point, which makes health care astronomically more expensive.

When a child in America is 5 years old, American families don't have to wring their hands every day wondering how they are going to pay for a child's education, because it is universal. You go to kindergarten starting on the first day that you are 5 years old.

That doesn't happen in America when you turn 5 years old and it comes to health care. Parents all over America have to worry when their child gets sick whether they are going to be able to take their child to the doctor, is their problem going to get worse.

Parents and families in America have to worry about whether they are going to continue to have their coverage if they don't have a job. They have to worry about being able to get coverage when they are sick. Those are worries that are unacceptable in the most prosperous, most democratic nation in the

world. We must find a solution and create comprehensive health care reform for all Americans.

□ 0915

TAX-AS-THEY-SPEND

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have announced they plan to actually use pay-as-you-go budgetary rules. You may remember how House Democrats have often cited PAYGO, while simultaneously finding any and every opportunity to disregard it. The zeal to spend taxpayer dollars is just too much. This would account for the fact that since Democrats have assumed control of Congress, the annual budgets deficits have ballooned over 11 times, from $160 billion to $1.8 trillion.

It is clear that PAYGO, as proposed by our Democrat colleagues, is not so much about limiting the size of government as it is paying for a larger and more intrusive big government. This is entirely against the fiscal spirit of responsibility because it means Congress can continue to spend recklessly, as long as they find new and burdensome ways to tax more American families. Under this administration and their allies in Congress, pay-as-you-go should be more correctly called tax-as-they-spend.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, the House leadership will unveil a uniquely American solution for health care reform. It will build upon existing programs like Medicare and Medicaid that will be improved significantly. It will say to employers that if you like the health insurance you're providing your employees, we want you to keep it, and we will certainly encourage more employers to provide health insurance for their employees.

But for those Americans who have no health insurance, or those Americans who have difficulty affording health insurance because they have to go out on the individual market, or have a small group plan that becomes very expensive, those individuals will be able to buy cheaper health insurance, much more low-cost health insurance through what the Federal Government would provide. There will be competition between public and private plans, and that will be our way of reducing costs. Because what this plan will do primarily is to reduce costs for most Americans and, at the same time, make sure that every American has health insurance.

I can't tell you how important that is. It is so important that every American know that they can have quality and affordable health insurance. It basically allows them to have peace of mind to not have to worry about whether they have one job or another, and this is what we're doing because we believe it's important for the average American.

INCREASED SPENDING FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last night the Democrat-controlled Congress decided to prohibit any amendment that would have reduced spending for today's legislation that funds Congress.

That's right. At a time when the American taxpayer, the American families, American small business owners are tightening their belts, the Democrat-controlled Congress would not allow any reduction in what it spends on itself.

This is an outrage. Families are tightening their belts; small business owners are tightening their belts; American taxpayers are tightening their belts. And this Congress wouldn't even allow an amendment to be made in order which would say, let's live on what we lived on last year. Let's not increase spending for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage, and should not be tolerated.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2918, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution H. Res. 559 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 559

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2918) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative McCarthy of New York or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlelady from North Carolina, Dr. Foxx. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2918, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 2010, under a structured rule.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act provides $3.7 billion for key investments in the legislative branch, not including Senate-related items for fiscal year 2010, including funding for the Architect of the Capitol, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Printing Office, the Capitol Police, and the Open World Program.

This bill provides a pragmatic and fiscally responsible approach to funding our legislative branch. Actually, spending is increased only by 7 percent, less than half of the 15 percent increase requested.

The funding provided in this legislation will help us do our jobs better and faster. It increases funding for the Congressional Budget Office by $1 million, making it easier for Members to obtain PAYGO analysis of their proposals, a vital service, given our need for responsible government spending.

This bill also allocates funds for a complete overhaul of the House of Representatives' antiquated voting system, which, after 33 years of good use, has become increasingly unreliable.

Further, this measure increases the Members Representational Allowance to ensure that we're able to adequately serve our districts, and increases our funding of standing and select committees by 3 percent to accommodate the increased legislative and oversight workload typically seen in the second session.

These funds will provide us with the resources necessary to carry out the

sweeping legislative initiatives of President Obama and Democrats in Congress and to better retain our most experienced and talented staff.

In addition, this bill will also help protect and preserve the Capitol complex, both from physical decay, and from the security risks it obviously faces in this post-9/11 world.

It includes $60 million to establish a Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund in order to more evenly spread out the cost of large-scale historic building projects within the Capitol complex, including the repair of the iconic Capitol dome and the revitalization of the 100-year-old Cannon House Building.

It also provides an increase in funding of 6 percent for the Capitol Police—and if I had my way, that would be more—who work day and night to ensure that the U.S. Capitol complex is secure for not only Members of Congress, but for our staffs and the millions of visitors that come through each year.

Finally, this appropriations bill helps make the work of the legislative branch more accessible to people throughout our Nation and across the globe.

I'm encouraged through this bill. The Appropriations Committee has helped to ensure that all visitors touring the U.S. Capitol have equal and adequate access, whether they be part of a tour led by our talented CVC tour guides or by our hardworking staff and interns.

Additionally, this bill increases funding by $40 million for the Library of Congress, an institution which not only provides a vital resource to Congress, but also preserves a universal collection of knowledge, history, and creativity for current and future generations.

$15 million of these funds will help modernize the Library's information technology infrastructure to make the library and its unique resources more widely available to Congress and the broader public.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill strikes a pragmatic balance between the growing demands upon this Congress and the legislative branch, and the economic realities this Nation is facing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time for us to discuss the rule.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have a situation here that partly was demonstrated yesterday in terms of the Republican concern on how we are going to do business in the House. Yesterday the Democrats made in order only one amendment which had been offered to this rule. Twenty total amendments were submitted, 14 by Republicans, four by Democrats, and two that were bipartisan. Two years ago, they made three of 23 amendments in order, which is three times as many as now.

Last year we didn't even consider appropriations bills on the floor, so maybe an argument could be made that that was even worse. And even though the Democrats were in charge last year, they blame Republicans for the fact that we couldn't deal with the appropriations bills on the floor and the fact that there was a Republican President.

But, in 2006, the last year Republicans were in the majority, we made all seven amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order. That's the way it should be. We should be debating these bills on the floor.

Earlier, our colleague from Michigan implied that requiring debate and voting on issues before the House is dysfunctional. It is exactly what the people of this country have sent us here for. They want us to take positions on these issues and not hide behind them.

We keep wondering what the Democrats are afraid of. Why do they not want amendments on the floor? They have a majority, a fairly large majority, but they refuse to debate these issues.

I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, which proposes a $300 million increase over last year for the operations of this House. That's a 6.3 increase at a time most Americans' budgets are shrinking. $51 million of this increase goes to Members Representational Allowances, or the MRA, which we all use for operating our offices and keeping in touch with our constituents.

Now, I'll be the first to tell you that my office could use an MRA increase. My district is 105,000 square miles. I fly several hundred thousand miles every year, I probably drive another 50,000 miles in my district. Traveling my largely rural district and staying in touch with thousands of Nevadans takes a significant amount of MRA funds. But I am always mindful of the fact that MRA funds are simply taxpayer dollars by another name, and I have a responsibility to use those funds wisely.

□ 0930

Many of my constituents and many of yours are making due with less than they had last year. As public servants, we have a responsibility to make similar sacrifices. Some counties in my district are facing 15 percent unemployment. Statewide unemployment is hovering around 11 percent, well above the national average of 9 percent. Nevada's current unemployment level is at the highest rate of joblessness since they began keeping track, or keeping record, in 1976. Our State budget crisis led the Nevada legislature to cut back services some 20 percent. Meanwhile, Nevada has been hit the hardest by the wave of foreclosures sweeping the United States.

Those lucky enough to have jobs are also making tough decisions. Moms and dads across the country are sitting around their kitchen tables, deciding what must be cut from their family budgets to ensure they can pay their bills and feed their children as the cost of living continues to skyrocket. Meanwhile, as a whole, our Nation faces an $11 trillion debt.

Last night, in spite of irresponsible journalism this morning by the Politico to the contrary, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee that would simply retain the fiscal year 2009 funding level for the MRA. This amendment is simple. I believe it shows the Americans, who are figuring out their family budgets at their kitchen tables this morning, that they are not alone and that someone in Congress understands that these difficult times call for shared sacrifice.

We who have been given the honor of serving in this body must be part of the sacrifice, and that should start here in our offices, and it should start now. Unfortunately, my amendment was rejected by the Rules Committee.

I urge this body to reject this restrictive rule so that my amendment can come to the House floor. Give this Congress a chance to lead by example with commonsense fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), with whom I serve on the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this morning to speak about technology assessment as a tool for our legislative work. This bill funds the tools that allow us to do our best on behalf of the 300 million Americans.

Every issue that comes before us, virtually every issue, has some aspect of science and technology. Yet this Congress has not brought great credit to ourselves for our ability to deal with science and technology issues or to recognize emerging trends or the implications of technology. Fortunately, we do not have to reinvent a tool to help us in this.

Four decades ago, Congress created the Office of Technology Assessment, a congressional support agency with a professional staff. It produced reports that were noteworthy for their factual bases, for their balanced and impartial presentations, for their nonpartisan framing, and for their forward-looking perspectives. The OTA, as it was known, functioned well for 25 years.

It produced reports on such topics as retiring old cars, a program to save gasoline and to reduce emissions. That was in 1992. There were reports about bringing health care online, about electronic surveillance in the digital age, about impacts of antibiotic-resistant bacteria, and on and on. The OTA study of Alzheimer's, ''Losing a Million Minds,'' became the bible for Alzheimer's policy in America. The OTA

study on Social Security computer systems resulted in changes, saving hundreds of millions of dollars. The OTA study on synfuels resulted in policy changes, saving far more money than was ever spent on the Office of Technology Assessment, itself. The OTA study on the use of genetic testing in the workplace, as a tool of discrimination and bias, laid the groundwork for the excellent legislation that Representative SLAUGHTER, the Chair of the Rules Committee, developed in the Genetic Nondiscrimination Act. An OTA report on the electronic delivery of Federal services led to the Food Stamp Fraud Reduction Act, and on and on.

In a fit of budget cutting, OTA's work was stopped 14 years ago with the explanation that the work could be obtained elsewhere—from other government agencies, from other congressional agencies, from interest groups, from universities, from our friends back home, from some other sources. Well, we've done the experiment. It didn't work. We have not gotten what OTA provided in the 14 years since OTA stopped operations.

Stopping OTA's functioning was a stupendous act of false economy. We have not gotten the equivalent, useful, relevant work—not from think tanks, not from interest groups, not from our universities, and not from our friends back home. A former Member of Congress described stopping the funding for OTA as a congressional self-imposed lobotomy.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to provide ourselves this useful tool. Yet the rule before us today does not allow the funding of this agency. It could have been done. It could have been done for a pittance. When OTA was fully functioning, it was far less than a percent of the budget of the legislative branch.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. If I may finish a point here.

So what are we missing?

Well, let me postulate that, if OTA had been functioning in recent years, we could have expected helpful, relevant reports on preparing for global pandemics. Congress might well have required that there be communications in mines, such as in the Sago Mine.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional minute in the hopes that he will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida at some point.

Mr. HOLT. We might have had communications in the mines, such as the Sago Mine, that would have allowed the miners to get out alive. I expect that we would have had better legislation dealing with corn-based ethanol. Through OTA studies, I believe that we would have recognized the overdependence of the financial sector on mathematical models.

We are missing out on a lot, Mr. Speaker. In my exasperation, I wonder why in the world Congress would deprive itself of this useful tool. I've decided that the very reason we need OTA—our discomfort with matters scientific and technological. Our inability to deal with such things is exactly what makes it difficult for us to recognize that we need it. I regret I have no time renaming to yield to the gentlelady for Florida.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we do need to fund adequately our offices; the Capitol Police, for whom I have the greatest respect; and the Library of Congress, a real jewel for our country. As my colleague from Nevada said, American families are hurting, and we have been increasing spending by 16 percent in this area over the past 2 years. Here are the problems that we are facing in this country right now, which the American people are beginning to truly understand.

We will have a $2 trillion deficit for fiscal year 2009. The second tranche of the TARP was allowed to be spent, which was $350 billion. The stimulus package, which was H.R. 1, was $787 billion, which was really over $1 trillion with the debt cost. There was the omnibus bill, which was $409 billion. That was the bill that funded appropriations for this year, which the Democrats said they couldn't pass last year in individual appropriations bills even though they were in charge of the Congress. The budget increased total spending to $4 trillion in 2009, or 28 percent of the GDP, the highest Federal spending as a percentage of the GDP since World War II. Now we have this additional increase which they're asking for.

Federal spending is out of control. We have got to put a stop to this somewhere. The day before yesterday, Republicans offered 94 amendments in the Rules Committee, which were designed to cut Federal spending, but we couldn't deal with that. The Democrats cut off debate because they said it was going to take too much time to deal with this. Apparently, Democrats can't spend the American people's money fast enough. Republicans think it's time that Congress started practicing fiscal discipline. This is a good place to start.

I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Iowa, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding to me and for her stalwart representation on the Rules Committee of her constituents and of all Americans.

It is a difficult place to serve when you find yourself outvoted almost 2–1 and when you're back in a corner of a room, up on the third floor, where the press seldom goes, where the cameras almost never are, where behaviors that are not consistent with the balance of the committees on this Hill are common, and where the rights and the franchises of the elected Members of this Congress are diminished significantly by the most recent behaviors, over the last 2½ years, of the Rules Committee. This is where this Congress is controlled.

I rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to rule after rule that comes out of that little room up there on the third floor. For example, there was the previous bill, Justice appropriations, the one that the gentlelady mentioned. Out of all of the amendments that were offered, Republicans, I believe, were offering 94 amendments. I recall that the Rules Committee wrote a rule. It was unprecedented. It wasn't an open rule for appropriations the way we thought we might get back to.

Even though Democrats were afraid to have appropriations votes in 2008, we did have some in 2007. We have always fought this through. We'll stay late at night if we need to. Leadership can get together if it gets too long and if we can't get our business done, and we can negotiate unanimous consent agreements. That didn't happen. I've been what I thought was a victim of negotiated unanimous consent agreements that were struck quickly, where the bargain was met before we really got a chance to catch up with what it all was, but that was at least leadership coming together, compromising, negotiating and agreeing.

This was the Rules Committee, I suspect directed from above, that had written a modified open rule that required us all to print our amendments into the RECORD. Once those amendments were printed, then, of course, the other side of the aisle had the opportunity to read through all of the amendments and to understand the strategy of the Republicans. Then, having written the rule to produce a certain result, they decided it probably would not produce the result that they'd intended, so they shut down debate after the very first Republican amendment, 20-some minutes into that debate, and they went back to the Rules Committee.

I sat there until nearly 1 o'clock in the morning with a number of my colleagues who had offered constructive amendments, amendments that were designed to perfect this legislation. I saw Member after Member have to ask the Rules Committee, Will you please make my amendment in order so that my constituents can be heard? They didn't say it, but it was also so that the American people could understand the shenanigans that had been going on here. We were afraid to say that because they were afraid that their amendments wouldn't be made in order. I watched that parade in front of the Rules Committee, and I will tell you it's unprecedented that Members of Congress are reduced to having to beg, in a little room on the third floor, to be heard.

Each of us has a franchise: 1/435 of the United States of America is embodied in each one of us. Speaker PELOSI said—I believe the date was June 14, 2006—that every Member has a right to be heard and, on a different date, that

this would be the most open Congress in history.

□ 0945

Well, it's anything but that. It's becoming more and more closed—even to the point where we lose the right to offer a motion to rise or adjourn, the right to offer an amendment on an appropriations bill.

And so I had offered six amendments up there. I didn't ask the Rules Committee to make my amendments in order; they had already made my amendments in order. Every single one of them complied with the rule that was written and had been made in order. But when the majority understood that they were going to have to take some votes, some tougher votes on some subject matter that they had been ducking from, then they changed the rules.

I just said, Keep your word. You set the standards to begin with. We all met those standards. And then you made our amendments in order. We shouldn't have had to do that. It should have been an open rule to allow any Member to offer an amendment down here at the well unless that title of the bill had passed. That's the standard that's here. That's what the Founding Fathers imagined and envisioned. But we get anything but that.

And so, this Congress doesn't get to debate on important topics. We have to have a motion to recommit in order to discuss the issue of giving Miranda rights to enemy combatants in foreign continents. That's what it takes. And that little window will be closed, too, if it makes the majority uncomfortable.

We don't get to debate on the very critical national security issue, Mr. Speaker, of the Speaker of the House declaring the CIA to be a group of felonious liars and having lied to the Congress of the United States of America and then stated that she's going up to receive briefings after this.

The United States of America's national security has got to be put at risk when the person third in line for the Presidency declares our intelligence community to be lying to Congress. Decisions get made, on this floor, in committee, behind the scenes—sometimes by staff—based upon the allegations made by the Speaker. The staff wants to please the Speaker. The Speaker is ducking this issue. We need to have a vote, and I offered an amendment to get a vote on the CIA. We aren't going to get that vote because the Rules Committee shut it down.

I offered an amendment that would also clean up some of this—amendment No. 2 increases and decreases standing committee by $1 million—so that we can broadcast the activities in the Rules Committee. When you go into a committee and you realize that you're sitting in front of a camera, it causes people to have a little better demeanor, and the decisions are there accountable to the public and some of that actually ends up on YouTube. But the Rules Committee doesn't have that. The room is too small and it's too secret what goes on up there.

We need a big room for the Rules Committee because that's where the decisions are made in the United States Congress today, Mr. Speaker. So I offered an amendment to do that.

As I moved through this process—and by the way, not only the criticism of the intelligence community came from the Speaker but now she's taken on the Congressional Budget Office and said, Well, no, they're the most pessimistic group that there are. We always overestimate things that work against us.

Well, if you challenge the integrity of the Congressional Budget Office, it isn't long before you have intimidation of the Congressional Budget Office. When you challenge the CIA and you control their purse strings, it isn't long before you have intimidation of the CIA. You don't get the same information if you have a trust relationship going on.

And by the way, the legislation, the appropriation that passed last night was managed by an appropriations subcommittee chair that by all the news reports is under investigation, and he received the gavel from the Speaker of the House. She knew he was under investigation, and 2 years ago he recused himself from the discussions. But we've not heard any announcement as to that investigation being lifted or any of the subpoenas that may have been served have been withdrawn or that had been shut down. There was no announcement whatsoever.

How can we have confidence in this Congress if the Speaker declares the intelligence community to be lying to Congress, if the Rules Committee shuts down the debate, if this House is recessed in the middle of important business, if an impeachment of a judge is shut down so you can go raise money, or if the chairman of the subcommittee who is managing the funding for the FBI, is being investigated by the FBI? This Congress has a long way to go to get where they're going.

I would just conclude with this, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to paraphrase Joe Welch, Let us not assassinate this process further. You've done enough. Have you no sense of decency at long last? Have you no sense of decency left?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after that speaker, I find it necessary to correct him with regard to a portion of his screed.

Please know that in the process that he referenced one of our Members, who is a subcommittee Chair of Appropriations, the committee Chair, Mr. OBEY, handled the matter, when the Member referred to by the previous speaker recused himself. And on the floor, when the matter was brought here, the committee Chair handled that matter.

Now, I heard that gentleman talk about shenanigans. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. What happened in the House of Representatives yesterday—and I've only been here 17 years—but the dean of the House of Representatives, Mr. DINGELL, was down here this morning for a 1-minute and spoke of the disgrace that took place yesterday. And someone would come in here and talk about shenanigans? What was that yesterday? How could we possibly have gotten about the business of dealing with the Nation's business when repeatedly what we saw was people coming in here delaying the process?

I have been here 17 years. We cast 54 votes yesterday. We spent more time casting votes on nonsense than we did on any substance that was being sought.

Now enough already. People have a right to their views. They have a right to their political shots. But the Rules Committee operates this body. And if they want the business of the American people done, then they wouldn't conduct the kind of shenanigans that they conducted yesterday.

I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the chairwoman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, which I thought was what we were here to talk about.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS. I appreciate that.

It is important that we get back to the business at hand, and I simply wanted to address the gentleman from New Jersey's remark about the Office of Technology Assessment, which is an important agency of the legislative branch that remains authorized in the U.S. statutes, but that currently does not receive funding. Especially given the age of technology and the advent of scientific progress that we are in the 21st century, I think it is incredibly important that we begin to reestablish or explore reestablishing that legislative branch agency, and I look forward to working with the gentleman and with my colleague, Mr. ADERHOLT, the ranking member, and Mr. WAMP and a number of other bipartisan members that are interested in doing that over the course of the next year.

Mr. HOLT. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. I appreciate the gentlelady's use of the word ''bipartisan.'' In fact, the amendment that we had hoped would be made in order today was brought forward by three Republicans and me, a Democrat.

This is an agency that would benefit all in Congress. It has the support of many on both sides of the aisle.

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Reclaiming my time, just to point out for the Members, we do have $2.5 million that we have carried in the legislative branch bills for the last 2 fiscal years. It is there in the GAO for technology

assessments. But we do recognize that the gentleman and many other Members on both sides of the aisle believe that it would be far better and more effective if we conduct those assessments with a staffed agency of experts and bring in the expertise that the Congress currently lacks.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to our colleague from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I, too, went to the Rules Committee to testify last night to try to have an amendment ruled in order, an amendment that was germane; there was no problem with its relevance to the bill. It was not dilatory, it wasn't seeking to delay anything. It was to address a very real problem that we have.

The problem that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that we have, that we know of, a number of investigations from the Justice Department going on right now examining the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. They're looking at the process of circular fundraising where Members of Congress will secure earmarks, or in other words, no-bid contracts for their campaign contributors. The money goes out, taxpayer money, campaign money comes back in.

Now, whether we want to admit it or not, the Justice Department is looking at this. We can talk until we're blue in the face, say there is no quid pro quo here. We're giving earmarks to those that we think need them. These no-bid contracts are going to companies that really need them. And whether or not they turned around and individuals from that organization or the lobbyists that represent them, if they contribute tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars back to my campaign committee, that's okay because it's not a quid pro quo. Whether we say that until we're blue in the face doesn't change the fact that the Justice Department seems to feel differently, and they're conducting investigations.

Now I think we do feel differently because just a few weeks ago, we authorized or instructed our own Ethics Committee to reveal whether or not they were conducting an investigation that essentially looks into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. They have since indicated that they are.

So now we have the Justice Department looking into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. We have our own Ethics Committee looking into that relationship, and yet we have, Mr. Speaker, our own Ethics Committee still issuing guidance to the Members of this body that campaign contributions do not constitute financial interest. In other words, whether or not you can contribute or give an earmark to a company, that company's executives and their lobbyists can turn around and give you campaign contributions the next day or the day before. That's okay according to guidance coming from our own Ethics Committee—the same Ethics Committee that is investigating the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions.

The purpose of the Ethics Committee, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the dignity of this House is maintained, that we rise above it all, that we have a standard that is perhaps higher than perhaps others have. We should have a standard that's higher than whether or not Members can be indicted or convicted over behavior that takes place here. Yet, we're allowing the Ethics Committee to issue guidance that says, It's okay. That, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

What this amendment would have done is said that no money could be spent in the bill to implement that guidance. I can't think of many more pressing issues in this House than that. It's germane. There is no reason that it couldn't be brought up and be part of the amendments that were offered today, but the Rules Committee said ''no'' for no other reason than they didn't want to stop the practice.

We have come to rely on earmarking to raise money around here. That's the bottom line. And we can't continue it if we're going to uphold the dignity of this body.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we will decouple the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. We have to. I just hope that we do it sooner rather than later and not have to wait to uphold the dignity of this body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend from North Carolina if she has any additional speakers. I will be our last speaker.

Ms. FOXX. We do have additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I now would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER from California.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, for yielding me the time, and I appreciate her service on the House Rules Committee.

It is absolutely true. We could move the appropriations process through the House of Representatives much more easily if the minority party didn't exist. If we weren't here creating what my friend from Fort Lauderdale has called ''shenanigans'' or using terms like that, we could move this process along very easily.

□ 1000

Unfortunately, the minority party, the group that represents almost half the American people, is being treated as if they don't exist. And this rule is a perfect example of just that, Mr. Speaker.

I know that people are saying that yesterday was a history-making day because there were more recorded votes on the floor of the House than have ever been held in modern history. But the real history that was made yesterday was the fact that we saw the volume that was put forward in the 108th Congress by the now-Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, described as the ''death of deliberative democracy,'' actually implemented here for the first time in the 220-year history of the United States of America. For the first time ever we saw a process begun which is in fact creating a scenario where the majority is ignoring the minority and doing what the American people do not want.

I do not believe that the American people want us to continue down the road towards a dramatic increase in Federal spending. People want to get the economy back on track, people want to make sure that their jobs aren't lost, but they're really wondering whether or not the way to do that is to have a huge increase in Federal spending, and yet that's exactly what is happening. And this rule is a perfect example of that.

Now, I was harshly criticized by Members of the now-majority when I had the privilege of chairing the House Rules Committee. But I will tell you the last time that I chaired the House Rules Committee there were seven amendments to the Legislative Branch Appropriations bills submitted to the Rules Committee, and I was pleased that I could make every single one of those in order. Every single amendment that was submitted was made in order. And as has been pointed out, 20 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee for the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, and only one amendment was made in order. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? Not one single amendment was made in order that would do what the American people want us to do and, that is, to reduce the size, scope, and reach of the Federal Government.

A 16 percent increase in the level of spending under this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill—and we all recognize that the need for Capitol Police and staff and oversight of the executive branch are all critically important things—but our colleague from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) offered an amendment that would simply provide a one-half of 1 percent reduction—one-half of 1 percent reduction—and yet the majority chose not to make even that amendment in order. Yes, there were larger proposals for cuts. And we know there is a tendency on this bill—that's why we've had a bipartisan agreement that this is the one of the 12 appropriations bills that we do have a structured rule on—but with a 16 percent increase in the bill, to not allow the House to work its will and have a chance for even a one-half of 1 percent reduction in that rate of growth, that's not what the American people want. That's not what the American people want.

And so the death of deliberative democracy was the history that was made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, because this is, in fact, the first time that this kind action has been taken and, unfortunately, it has begun a pattern. It's begun a pattern.

As I listened to my friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) refer to the fact that he was victimized by the bipartisan leadership when we in fact had said to him that we wanted to come to a time agreement on consideration of appropriations bills, it is evidence that we can at the leadership level—maybe not every rank-and-file Member—but that the leadership level worked together.

That is why I am very happy to see my very good friend from Wisconsin, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, here. And I would ask my friend, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, whether or not he believes that we could in fact come to some kind of agreement if we were to proceed with the appropriations process under an open rule. And I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, if he would engage with me on this.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman's time has expired, but I can answer what he asked, and I can also tell him I don't have time to yield.

We began in the Rules Committee with me asking the previous speaker whether or not his side had offered a time agreement. He looked at me as if I was talking about something that was foreign.

What I knew, and what I believe the leadership knew on both sides of the aisle, was that for a protracted period of time the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the majority leader have been meeting with their counterparts in the minority with reference to time agreements.

Now, I sat here when that bill began its debate and the first question out of Mr. OBEY's mouth to Mr. LEWIS, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the first question out of his mouth was whether or not they were going to be able to get a time agreement, and Mr. LEWIS' reply was that he could not give that assurance. So for somebody to come down here and talk about whether or not the Democrats tried to get a time agreement and then to spend time yesterday agreeing on nothing and accepting no more than foolishness on the House of Representatives, whether it was history making or not, is just plain absurdity.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member from California, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to yield to my friend from Florida to say to him that what I was proposing that bill-by-bill we begin with a process, as has been done for the decades that I've been privileged to serve here, and make an attempt to work together to bring about some kind of agreement. No attempt was made to do that. The request was unprecedented in that it was a sweeping request made at the beginning of the appropriations process before we had even come to the floor and started working on this.

I would be happy to yield to my friend to respond to that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Most assuredly.

I would ask that you and I look at the RECORD when these proceedings conclude. And I can assure you that what Mr. OBEY asked Mr. LEWIS was whether or not they could get a time agreement. I was sitting here——

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, having participated in this process in the past, agreements are worked out, as Mr. KING said, between the two leaderships. And if we begin with the work of an appropriations bill and Members are in fact offering dilatory amendments, there is an effort made at the leadership level to bring about an agreement at that time. The notion of trying to impose that constraint before the process has even begun is wrong and it is unprecedented and it has been part of what has killed deliberative democracy under the leadership of this majority.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I have been told that when he was ranking member, Mr. OBEY would never agree to a time agreement before a consideration of a bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of the time of debate on this rule. I think we have had some very important issues brought forward by my distinguished colleagues who have come to share this debate this morning.

This is a bad rule because it does not allow for amendments to be offered on the floor for people to work their will here.

I do want to correct a couple of things that were said earlier this morning by my colleagues in terms of uninsured Americans. I think we have to do this every single time it's brought up.

My distinguished colleague from Florida said this earlier: there are 47 million uninsured Americans. There are not. Despite those claims—and I am quoting from ''Crisis of the Uninsured: 2008'' by the National Center for Policy Analysis—we have 12 million illegal aliens here. We have 14 million uninsured adults and children who are qualified for programs but have not enrolled. We have 18 million people who are uninsured who live in households with annual incomes above $50,000 who could afford it. We have 18 million who are uninsured, but most of them are healthy and don't need it. Eighty-five percent of U.S. residents are privately insured and enrolled in a government health program. Therefore, 95 percent of U.S. residents have health coverage or access to it, and the remaining 5 percent live in households that earn less than $50,000 annually. That is about 7 million people.

I am getting so tired of hearing these misstatements made all the time. It's day after day after day that we keep getting these figures put out that are wrong.

But let's go back to this bill and to what's in this bill that we find really egregious. I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and ''no'' on the bill because we have in here $9 million for the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund. That's just one of the items that's in here that we don't need to be funding. It would be great to be able to have better relations with young people in other countries who come here; but, again, the American people are hurting.

The Republicans are on the side of the American people who are hurting here. We want to slow down the spending. There is a statement that came out yesterday about the difficulty we're having in selling bonds and the amount that we're selling. We are going into debt greater and greater in this country, and yet the Democrats seem to see no end to spending. They can't spend the American people's money fast enough.

There is money in here to do studies on demonstration projects to save energy. You know what? I look around this place every night; we can save lots of money on energy by just turning out the lights. The lights are left on all over the Capitol complex. We don't need to spend millions of dollars on studying what we can do to save energy. Just use common sense and cut down on the use of the energy that we have now. We're going to be wasting a huge amount of money.

Yesterday, the Treasury announced a record $104 billion worth of bond auctions for next week, part of its Herculean efforts to finance the rescue of the world's largest economy. This was in the news today. It will exceed the previous record of $101 billion set in auctions that took place in the last week of April.

We are spending our country more and more into debt. And why are we pushing things through? Why are we not allowing amendments? Because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee says we have to stick to his timetable. And yet, since the beginning of May, what have we dealt with here? We've had over 101 suspension bills, things like recognizing the Winston Churchill Memorial Library in Fulton, Missouri, as American's National Churchill Museum. Really important work——

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I shall not use all that time, but I do yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard so much revisionist history put forward here, not the least of which just came from the distinguished colleague of mine from North Carolina, with reference to previous periods having to do with whether or not the minority requested time agreements.

One thing I've done since I've been in the House of Representatives is spend a lot of time on the floor of the House of Representatives. And that isn't looking to cause any praise to be directed to me. It became, over time, a part of my responsibilities that I assigned to myself to kind of know what was going on in this institution.

During that same period of time when Mr. OBEY was the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been on this floor when Mr. OBEY has requested time agreements when a bill is in progress and have participated in the discussions regarding it when the majority said no. So to come here and say that you always allowed for time agreements is just simply not the case.

The other thing that is ignored is the fact that the majority and the minority meet with regularity. I rather suspect that what's going on here, with nobody having said a word to me about it, is that there has been a little bit of a strategy by my friends on the other side to ensure, among other things, that they will slow down the process and that we will not be able to get the business of the people done. The greatest evidence of that was the transpiration of events here yesterday.

Now, another gentleman here spoke, my friend from Iowa, with reference to the Rules Committee being upstairs in a small place. That's where it was when I got here, that's where it is now, and I rather suspect when he and I leave, that's where it will be. But to suggest that the media does not cover the Rules Committee evidently ignores the fact that everything that we say is transcribed by these people that are reporters, who we overwork and abuse well on into nights when we could have been saving taxpayers money by letting them get about their business and all of the staff related around here that this legislative branch is about. All of what we do is recorded.

□ 1015

In addition to that, no reporter is refused to be there, and C–SPAN often chooses to cover the Rules Committee dependent upon whether or not there is a matter of substance that they would want to cover.

Now, my friends on the other side have had 12 years of rulemaking. I served on the Rules Committee in the minority a lot of that time. During that period of time, you didn't regulate financial services. You didn't provide a sensible health care plan. You didn't give our children what was needed. You said what you were going to do is leave no child behind. And you did not only leave children behind; in certain places in this country you lost them and couldn't find them. Our parks, our environment deteriorated and were plundered and abused and used in a way that was beyond the pale, and yet we come in here and talk about spending.

What would you say to all of the people that work in a bank that got saved? They're Americans. What would you say to all of the people in the financial services and on Wall Street that found themselves employed? They're Americans. What would you say to the automobile industry employees and their directors that have their limited jobs saved and too many gone because of mistakes that were made by government and industry? What would you say to those working people? They're Americans.

You're telling me that when we spend money, we are not spending that money in a way that's helping America. What do you say to your communities like mine that are finding themselves in the position of having to cut services with regularity and it usually starts with the poor and the disabled? They're Americans.

And somewhere along the line, I would ask you the question, what would you have this President that's been in office now nearly 5 months not do? Would you have him not do health care? Would you have him not do anything about climate change? Would you have him not do anything about the fact that you didn't regulate the industries that needed to be regulated appropriately during the time that you were in the majority?

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we are here on provides for consideration of the legislative branch appropriations. We've heard the measures, and all will be able to see that this bill provides a pragmatic and fiscally responsible approach to funding this legislative branch.

Footnote right there: the fine young people that work with us. When I came here I was permitted, as every Member, to have 18 full-time staffers, and I haven't always had 18 full-time staffers. But from 1992 until now, it's been that many staffers with an increase in the workload. Now, some of you all don't pay these young people well enough and you know it, and you need to pay attention to that. And if you do get an increase, give it to the children that work with you and you might have a better-run office.

The funding provided in this legislation will help us do our jobs better, faster, and it increases funding for the Congressional Budget Office that we continue to use, rightly so. Particularly, the pay-goers need their analysis done.

Mr. Speaker, I will stop now by saying that this appropriations bill helps make the work of the legislative branch more accessible to people throughout our Nation and the globe. I'm encouraged that through the bill, the Appropriations Committee has helped to ensure that all visitors touring this Capitol have equal and adequate access to this facility.

With that in mind, I just urge my friends to remember that while they are making up their history, there are some of us that remember it well, and I can assure you that the things that I have said can be documented from that record.

I would hope that we would know that this bill honors our history and prepares us for the future. It invests in the preservation and protection of the Capitol complex and makes more efficient, more accessible the opportunities for the people that we serve.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly directed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 question will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TODAY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 560.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR IRANIANS WHO EMBRACE DEMOCRACY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 560) expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 560

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law;

(2) condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro-government militias, as well as the ongoing government suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cellphones; and

(3) affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Every day since Iran's election, the streets of Tehran have been filled with demonstrators, and each day this past week the number seems to be growing. Even state-run media in Iran has put the number of demonstrators in Tehran at ''hundreds of thousands.'' One British newspaper reports that there were a million demonstrators in Tehran yesterday.

What do these demonstrators want? Are they simply in favor of the candidate Mir Hossein Mousavi? Or are they making a more profound statement about the Iranian regime?

Nobody knows exactly. We do know one thing, though: The demonstrators feel their intelligence was insulted and their dignity assaulted by the high-handed manner in which the results of the June 12 election were handled. They want justice. This morning the Supreme Leader offered none.

It is not for us to decide who should run Iran, much less determine the real winner of the June 12 election, but we must reaffirm our strong belief that the Iranian people have a fundamental right to express their views about the future of their country freely and without intimidation.

The Iranian regime is clearly embarrassed by the demonstrations and has not shrunk from using violence to stop them. At least eight demonstrators, and quite likely a number more, have been killed, and hundreds have been injured. The regime has also tried to ban media coverage of the demonstrations. Foreign journalists are consigned to their homes and offices. Several have been expelled from the country. Cell phone coverage has been frequently blocked in order to limit communication among the protesters, and the regime has interfered with the Internet and taken down many opposition Web sites.

We cannot stand silent in the face of this assault on human freedom and dignity. I repeat that we have no interest in interfering in Iran's internal affairs. That era has ended. This resolution affirms the ''universality of individual rights'' as well as ''the importance of democratic and fair elections.'' Beyond that, it simply expresses its solidarity with ''Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law.'' I don't know how many of the demonstrators fall into that category, but I do know that many of them do.

This resolution also condemns the bloody suppression of freedom. It is not a judgment on who won the Iranian elections; it is an acknowledgment that we cannot remain silent when cherished universal principles are under attack.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just offer my appreciation to our ranking member and to the gentleman from Indiana for working together on a resolution which puts the House of Representatives on the side of the people of Iran, and with that, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start out thanking our esteemed and distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN, for working with us in a bipartisan manner, reaching out to our side to bring this timely resolution to the floor. I especially want to thank our Republican Conference Chair and a great member of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. PENCE, who authored this legislation.

I rise in strong support of the fundamental, universal human rights and civil liberties to which the Iranian people are entitled. For 30 years, these rights and freedoms have been denied again and again by an oppressive Iranian regime which uses a sham process with candidates handpicked by the ruling apparatus to create the illusion of political participation.

There was no election in Iran this year. There has been no election, no democracy in Iran for decades. The candidates and the winners were again picked in advance by the regime. Real reform, real democracy were never an option. This repressive regime relies on so-called elections to provide a veneer of legitimacy, but that facade has been shattered by the protests taking place in Iran this week. The brutal nature of the Iranian regime is well-documented.

On Tuesday, I had the honor of attending, with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the release of the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which again cited Iran as a Tier 3 country, among the worst, as the regime that does little, if anything, to prevent men, women, and children from being trafficked for sexual exploitation and involuntary servitude, slavery. Likewise, as the State Department's human rights report for 2008 noted: ''Iran's poor human rights record worsened and it continued to commit numerous serious abuses. The government severely limited citizens' right to change their government peacefully through free and fair elections. Authorities held political prisoners and intensified a crackdown against women's rights reformers, ethnic minority rights activists, student activists, and religious minorities.''

It is a pattern for decades. So we must look beyond the past week, which was only the most recent demonstration of the regime's brutality and authoritarianism.

But the Iranian regime is not just a threat to its own people. We cannot afford to lose sight of the threat that it presents to our own national security interests and, indeed, to global peace and security. Iran draws even closer to crossing that nuclear point of no return. Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated that Iran has likely enriched enough uranium to make an atomic bomb. International inspectors also report that Iran has enough low-enriched uranium to achieve nuclear weapons breakout capabilities and that issues about possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program remain unresolved. Yet Iran is allowed to continue its nuclear pursuit virtually unchallenged.

Additionally, Iran continues to develop chemical and biological weapons and ballistic missiles while arming and bankrolling violent Islamic extremists worldwide. We must bear this in mind when we determine what is the appropriate response to the Iranian regime's policies and actions.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we must focus on the hopes of the individual Iranians who have been robbed of a better future for almost 30 years by a regime which only promises nothing but misery and malaise. Now is the time for all responsible nations to stand foresquare with the people of Iran as they seek freedom, as they seek true self-governance at home, as well as to live at peace with the world.

□ 1030

We must send a clear signal today to the Iranian regime and all of its proxies and affiliates that free nations will not tolerate further efforts to silence the voice of the Iranian people through violence and coercion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

My friend, the ranking member, correctly cited a whole series of very important issues that we and the United

States has with the Government of Iran; and she is correct. Just this quick note about what the gentlelady from Florida pointed out at the end of her comments. The reason I worked to bring this resolution up—this resolution is not about a recitation of all those issues. It's about an affirmation of something that this House of Representatives has done in places all over the world, whether it is in Tibet or in Cuba or in Eastern Europe or in the Middle East or any other region, to reaffirm our commitment to stand for certain fundamental universal principles involving human rights, participatory democracy and the affirmation of the rights of the people of any country. Today it's about the people of Iran.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we have an impressive lineup of speakers on our side. I would like to start by yielding 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the author of the bill, Republican Conference Chair and an esteemed member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise with a great sense of humility and a great sense of moment before this body but also a great sense of gratitude to the ranking member for her extraordinary leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor, a resolution which, as the chairman of the committee just stated quite eloquently, will give the American people, through their elected representatives, a clear opportunity on this day, after a week of violence and tumult in the nation of Iran, to express the American people's support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties and the rule of law.

I am especially grateful for the leadership and the spirit brought to this legislation by Chairman HOWARD BERMAN, with whom I don't agree on very much; but I am grateful that he demonstrates today a public mindedness that I think is in keeping with the best traditions of this institution.

Ronald Reagan would say in 1964, ''You and I are told increasingly that we have to choose between a left or right, but I would like to suggest that there is no such thing as a left or right. There is only an up or down: up to a man's age-old dream, the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism.''

Today the leadership of Chairman HOWARD BERMAN demonstrates that on the issue of speaking a word of encouragement to those who would stand with extraordinary valor for their own liberty, there is no left or right in this body. It has been, as has been stated before, an extraordinary week in the life of the nation of Iran. On 12 June, just one week ago, from the very moment that the presidential election results were announced, the international community and the international press called the results into question. Chief among the reasons for that was that even before the extraordinary demonstrations had begun, millions of paper ballots had apparently been tallied and counted within a matter of hours. The official government results of the election were met with public consternation among the people of Iran; and while the defeated candidate launched a legal appeal, as the western media has reported, what has ensued on the streets of Iran has been the biggest demonstration in the Islamic Republic's 30-year history. And most sad, following that election day, the actions by the government and militias that support the government have turned to violence. Pro-government forces have attacked demonstrators over the past week, causing fatalities, resulting in the arrest of dissidents. We have heard of foreign reporters prevented from making their way into the public. We've heard of the jamming of electronic communications. For all the world, we may well be witnessing a Tiananmen in Teheran.

It seems to me that in this moment, the people of the United States of America long to be heard; and by dint of House Resolution 560 today through their elected representatives, the American people will have had that opportunity. This resolution simply states that it is resolved that the House of Representatives expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties and rule of law. It also condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro-government militias, as well as the ongoing suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cell phones. And lastly, it affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

I have said many times this week, and it has been echoed by my colleagues, like the Republican Whip ERIC CANTOR, that the cause of America is freedom; and in this cause, the American people will not be silent. There is no intention here to pick sides in the Iranian election. There is an intention here, in a true spirit of bipartisanship, to allow the American people to be on the side of liberty and to be on the side of freedom. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation because the voice of the American people has before and, I believe in my heart of hearts, will again make a difference in the advancement of human liberty in the world. I urge its support.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my dear friend, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding and for his steady leadership on this and so many other issues, the ranking member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for his leadership on this and so many other Middle East-related issues as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and in support of the people of Iran whose voices deserve to be heard in a free, open and democratic way. We are not here today to discuss the outcome of this election or involve the United States in the internal politics of Iran. The American people, through their elected representatives, are here today to stand with the people of Iran and people all over the world who yearn to express their opinions and to exercise their right to free speech and fair elections.

It takes an enormous amount of courage to stand up to your government in a repressive society, and the American people applaud those heroes who face intimidation and oppression for expressing their views. I am personally in awe of the Iranian people and hope others will learn by their example. I also support President Obama, who I believe has steered an excellent course for dealing with this situation. While some have called upon him to condemn the Iranian government more forcefully, I believe it is essential that the United States not interfere in this remarkable debate and public demonstration. What the world is watching unfold in Iran is condemnation enough of what is happening in that country. We should, however, encourage free speech, free elections and nonviolence for all the parties involved. It's a wise course, and I believe it is one we would have benefited from in years past.

I thank the gentleman from California once again. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation. I support it totally.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), our esteemed Republican Whip, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and a leader on issues related to Iran.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian regime's brutalities are on full display for the whole world to behold. I rise today in sympathy with the victims of Iranian political oppression who have been injured or killed, protesting the outcome of their election. I salute the leadership of the gentlelady from Florida and the gentleman from California for bringing this resolution forward, as well as the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership on this and so many issues, and the way that the gentlelady from Nevada spoke.

It is America's moral responsibility to speak out on behalf of the protection of human rights wherever they are violated. And regardless of the outcome of the Iranian election, make no

mistake where the power in Iran lies. It lies with a clerical regime who conducts its most egregious activities in the dark, hidden from the world's eyes and, thus, escaping media attention. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps quietly funnels weapons and funding into terrorist groups from Iraq to Afghanistan, from Lebanon to Gaza. Iranian centrifuges enrich uranium at nuclear plants often hidden from weapons inspectors. And terrorist groups make voyages to Iran to receive training at unspecified locations. This is the regime we are talking about, and this week the true colors of that regime are on broad display. We must rally the world around the cause of the Iranian people. I urge the administration, I urge President Obama to follow the lead of this House, to speak out on behalf of the Iranian people and their quest for freedom and human rights.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman for whom I have great respect, the minority whip, spoke about America's moral commitment to speak out on behalf of people yearning for freedom. We have an even higher moral commitment, and that is to do the things that help expand the extent of human freedom around the world. And it is in that context that I know that this House and this administration are pursuing this mission, that higher authority to do the things that produce the greatest likelihood of the expansion of human freedom.

I now yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, a great Member from the State of Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1045

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Chairman BERMAN, and to Mr. PENCE, for this very timely resolution.

This is a time of great thought and deliberation and concern of what the United States must do and say. Our words have got to be carefully calculated to make sure that they are seen as not meddling, as not trying to tell the Iranian people what to do, because, quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, the Iranian people have already spoken. They have decided, and I believe that is our responsibility, if we hold true to the principles of our Founding Fathers.

As I was coming over on the floor, I was thinking what I could say, and the words of one of our great founders and patriots beams very deep in my heart as I think and I watch the news reports of what is happening in the streets of Tehran, when that great patriot said, Give me liberty or give me death. That is why the United States of America cannot be silent. It is our foundation.

I was reminded of the words of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote that, All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and among those life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is what we stand for. So it is important that we put this resolution forward, and it is important that the world understand that America is indeed that shining light of liberty and of freedom that Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson spoke so eloquently about.

We are proud to support the Iranian people, and we condemn the violence.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight on our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Today, I rise in strong support of this resolution which ratchets up, to a degree, America's willingness to express its heartfelt support for the Iranian people and their struggle against the mullah dictatorship that oppresses them.

Now, it has been said that you cannot champion the oppressed unless you are willing to take on the oppressor. America should not intervene in every struggle taking place, but we should be unapologetically on the side of those who are in desperate battle for their own freedom.

Tempered rhetoric can be interpreted by tyrants as weakness. We need to send a strong message to those tyrants and a strong message to the people who are willing to risk their lives on the streets of Tehran that we are on the side of the people and the side of democracy and freedom. Any other message would be a betrayal of our fundamental principles, the principles of liberty and democracy that so many Americans have sacrificed to give us and to pass on to other generations.

Yes, we should not intervene, but it is up to us to make sure those people struggling throughout the world know we are on their side. We must be bold in our words of support.

I was honored to be one of five speech writers serving Ronald Reagan. He too was told to tone down his rhetoric. He too was told that strong words would be interpreted as belligerence. But with his strong words, he ended the Cold War, without the conflagration that hung over our heads for decades. He made it a better, a more peaceful and a freer world with a strong message and no apologies.

We should follow the lead of Ronald Reagan. It will make this a better world if we side with the people in Tehran who oppose their mullah dictatorship.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to my legislative brother, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), a member of the powerful Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the so-called ''supreme leader,'' is the ruthless dictator of Iran. Ahmadinejad is his puppet. In this farcical election, Khamenei overstepped blatantly. The others in the dictatorship who aspired to the puppet presidency are upset.

The Iranian people are utilizing this moment of division in the dictatorship to heroically express their opposition to the dictatorship. The issue is not one of who is entitled to be the puppet president in the Iranian dictatorship. The issue is the Iranian people are entitled to an end of the dictatorship and to live in self-determination and freedom and democracy.

The President of the United States has been silent and confused. The Congress of the United States clearly stands with the Iranian people, and they will prevail.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Florida, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 560 and would like to thank our chairman Mr. BERMAN and my colleague Mr. PENCE for bringing this bipartisan statement forward which supports our American view of the events in Iran.

The Iranian people deserve a democracy that counts every vote and treats its citizens with the utmost dignity. They deserve to trust their own government. However, these are not free and fair elections by any stretch of the imagination, and it is our imperative to speak out whenever and wherever freedom is suppressed, whether by our allies or by our foes.

Frankly, we have honest differences with the Iranian government, no matter who is elected. Any Iranian government that seeks a nuclear weapon and spreads state-sponsored terrorism is a threat to the United States and our allies. That is why the United States has not taken either side in this conflict. It is for the Iranians to choose who leads them. Indeed, this struggle belongs to them.

However, the message we send today is the world is watching. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a member of the Budget and the Financial Services Committees.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

This country has always stood with those around the world yearning for freedom, a voice and a better future. Whether those people were in Nazi Germany, Communist Eastern Europe, apartheid South Africa, or any other number of places around the world, we have stood with the freedom fighters. It is now time for us to stand with those in Iran who seek freedom from one of the world's most oppressive, most dangerous and most dictatorial regimes.

I hope this resolution is not the end, but is just the beginning of the support that this government, both in Congress and the White House, gives to those people.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, could I get an assessment or calculation of the remaining time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I can give you that with precision. The gentleman has 9½ minutes remaining; the

gentlewoman has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I stand with my colleagues in this Congress, I stand with President Obama and Vice President BIDEN, in support of the Iranian people, their right to express themselves, their right to have peaceful demonstrations, and I stand in support of this resolution.

I hope that the ayatollahs understand that these demonstrations are about the future of Iran and the right of their people to have a voice in their government. Young and old, liberal or conservative, all ages, all economic groups are part of these demonstrations.

As President Obama has said, the entire world is watching, and the world is inspired. We applaud your efforts to move your country toward a more democratic, peaceful country.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nonviolent movement for social change in Iran. I have always maintained that the Middle East is in need of a nonviolent movement for social change, not only in Iran but also in the Gaza Strip, a nonviolent movement in Syria, a nonviolent movement for social change.

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, ''Nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time; the need for mankind to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to oppression and violence. Mankind must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression, and retaliation.''

Today we are not only supporting democracy in Iran, we are also supporting the nonviolent thrust for democracy in Iran, so the conflicts may be settled, Mr. Speaker, without resulting to weapons, to violence and conflict, not only within that country, but among nations.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, we rise today to support the proponents of the nonviolent movement.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we just have one additional speaker, and I would like to call on the author of the resolution, a great member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee and our conference chair on the Republican side, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 4¼ minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and again reiterate my gratitude for her expeditious work in bringing this important resolution to the floor on a timely basis, and commend again Chairman HOWARD BERMAN for the spirit and thoughtfulness with which he brought this resolution to the floor.

Today, in the wake of a week of extraordinary public demonstrations, violence, and tumult across the nation of Iran, the American people through this Congress will condemn that violence and the suppression of the free and independent press in Iran, and, as the American people have done throughout our history, we will proclaim liberty by supporting all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law in this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and join us, and, if reports are correct, our colleagues in the Senate who may well come together and give voice on the world stage of the character and compassion and commitment to freedom that is at the heart of every American.

Now, some observers say that America should remain silent in the wake of this violence and the suppression of free speech and the intimidation and suppression of a free and independent press in Iran. But let me say from my heart, the American cause is freedom, and in that cause we must never be silent.

The Iranian regime would do well to note the words of President Ronald Reagan from his first inaugural address 20 January, 1981, where he said, No arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women.

Today this Congress, in a true spirit of bipartisanship, will come together on behalf of the moral courage of the men and women of Iran who have tasted freedom and have been willing to risk their liberty and their lives to advance it.

□ 1100

It is my hope and it is my prayer that this word of encouragement from the American people to the Iranian people will be to good effect for that nation and for freedom in the world.

I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to an excellent member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the drafters of the resolution. I think it is carefully drafted, and I think it is clear that the universal values of freedom that are expressed in the resolution are done with a great amount of prudence, and I think that's right.

I think it is also important to understand that when the Congress of the United States speaks a lot of people listen, and so it's important to not allow the Congress to be used as a tool in what was essentially an internal fight in Iran. And so I would urge caution and urge the United States Congress to stand up and speak about the universal values that we care about: Democracy, freedom, due process of law, lack of violence in terms of solving political disputes, and not allow ourselves to be used as a weapon against the people who we are, in fact, trying to help, which is the people of Iran.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I'm proud to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear today that some would have us be silent as to the aspiration of the people risking life and limb on the streets of Iran today. We cannot and should not be that way. Yes, it's an internal matter, but it's an internal matter in a country which has been ruled by theocrats for so very long who have denied real free elections, and even when the will of the people was obvious, in fact, want to overturn the will of the people for a President who could be a reformer and give opportunity, particularly to women in this country.

So I urge support for this resolution because it sends the message that we are, in fact, with the people who want freedom.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, should I by yielding 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina at this point?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes.

Mr. BERMAN. And then if you yield time, he'll have all his time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS), and anytime you would like to.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentlelady and the gentleman for yielding that time, and I saw this morning that the Supreme Leader of Iran said that street challenge is not acceptable. This is challenging democracy after the elections.

Well, we beg to differ and the people of Iran are begging to differ. When you can count paper ballots, millions of them, within a couple of hours, something's funny. And when you declare the results of the election is fine but say there is going to be some investigation, what's the value of the investigation if you've already certified the election?

And so what we're begging to differ with the Supreme Leader of Iran is that it is not challenging democracy after elections. It's saying that the elections were rigged, and rigged elections don't produce outcomes that people can believe in.

Furthermore, what's happening here is we're seeing the real disastrous consequence of having a theocracy, where somebody at the top gets to say—I don't know where he derives his authority—but he gets to say what's what about elections.

We're very thankful, Madam Speaker, to live in a country where that's not the case, where we have elected officials who choose Supreme Court members, who are then confirmed by the Senate and who serve with good behavior. And that is a system that produces confidence among the people, and a free people get to govern themselves.

That's our hope, that's our aspiration for the Iranian people; and we, the people of the United States, should stand boldly with the people in Tehran and elsewhere in Iran who are saying we yearn to breathe free, we want to govern ourselves. This is their moment. We stand in support of them.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I would just yield myself such time as I may consume to once again thank the minority for working with us, my ranking member, as well as Mr. PENCE, particularly to say that my fondest hope is that on these critical kinds of issues we can establish a bipartisan basis for working together.

And then simply to say that there are many American interests in U.S.-Iranian relationships. This resolution is not about American interests. It's about American values, which I believe are universal values: the values of the rule of law, of participatory democracy, about individual liberty, and about justice. And it is on behalf of those universal values, not American interests, that I urge this body to support this resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the Chairman and to Mr. PENCE for the resolution before us. I think it is critical for the House to address the remarkable events that are taking place in Iran.

We are seeing a nation—an entire nation—rise up. What is happening in Iran is an inspiration to all of us who believe that there is such a thing as universal human rights.

We do not want—and we are not attempting—to choose Iran's rulers. Who rules Iran is a question for the people of Iran. And as we expect all nations to respect our sovereignty, so too must we respect the sovereignty of other nations.

But we are not blind. And we must not be mute.

We have seen gunfire and truncheons deployed against peaceful protesters and marches. We have followed the wave of repression against activists, reporters, and all forms of communication. We know about the crackdown and arrests of Iranians who call for freedom and reform. We have watched mobs of thuggish enforcers terrorizing students and citizens in their dorms and homes.

But we have also watched the unbelievable, quiet courage of millions of Iranians marching, and we have watched their numbers growing every day. We have seen them insist on nonviolence in the face of provocation and assault. And we have heard their impatient but persistent call for justice.

And this nation knows what that call for justice sounds like. The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote from the Birmingham jail that "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly."

Bound up in the revolutionary documents of our founding, and in our Nation's unique role in the struggle for human freedom, is a special responsibility. We have an obligation that the resolution before us answers. We are all witnesses. And we are bound to support the courageous and decent people in Iran who are struggling for their rights and their freedom.

This resolution is measured and careful, but meaningful. And it deserves the strong support of every Member.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to H. Res 560, which condemns the Iranian government for its recent actions during the unrest in that country. While I never condone violence, much less the violence that governments are only too willing to mete out to their own citizens, I am always very cautious about "condemning" the actions of governments overseas. As an elected member of the United States House of Representatives, I have always questioned our constitutional authority to sit in judgment of the actions of foreign governments of which we are not representatives. I have always hesitated when my colleagues rush to pronounce final judgment on events thousands of miles away about which we know very little. And we know very little beyond limited press reports about what is happening in Iran.

Of course I do not support attempts by foreign governments to suppress the democratic aspirations of their people, but when is the last time we condemned Saudi Arabia or Egypt or the many other countries where unlike in Iran there is no opportunity to exercise any substantial vote on political leadership? It seems our criticism is selective and applied when there are political points to be made. I have admired President Obama's cautious approach to the situation in Iran and I would have preferred that we in the House had acted similarly.

I adhere to the foreign policy of our Founders, who advised that we not interfere in the internal affairs of countries overseas. I believe that is the best policy for the United States, for our national security and for our prosperity. I urge my colleagues to reject this and all similar meddling resolutions.

Madam Speaker, I urge you to support H.R. 560, expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law and for other purposes. The only effective way to achieve lasting peace and prosperity in the region, along with bringing about reforms in Iran's polity, is to assist the Iranian people in their quest to achieve political, social, and religious liberty. Every government can be judged with the way in which it treats its ethnic and religious minorities, and the current Iranian government gets a failing grade for its treatment of its many and diverse minorities. It is not our position as the United States to determine the outcome of the recent Iranian elections, but as a leader in the international community, we have a responsibility to ensure that the people of Iran have the opportunity to have fair and free elections.

Yet with the results of the recent election, there was no chance for Iranian citizens to participate in democracy. On June 12, 2009 Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was ostensibly reelected to his second term as President, as a result of the tenth Presidential elections in Iran, held and calculated on June 13, 2009. Subject to official results released by Iran's election headquarters, out of a total of 39,165,191 ballots cast in the presidential election, Ahmadinejad allegedly won 24,527,516 votes, which accounts for approximately 62.6 percent of the votes, while his opponent and former Prime Minister of Iran Mir-Hossein Mousavi purportedly secured only 13,216,411 (37.4 percent) of the votes. Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei announced that he envisions Ahmadinejad as president in the next five years, a comment interpreted as indicating support for Ahmadinejad's reelection.

Just 48 hours after Iranian officials announced incumbent President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's landslide 62.6% victory, the situation in Tehran and in regions throughout the country broke out in a wave of violent protests in response to what the people of Iran knew to be a rigged poll.

Yet despite the large-scale civil unrest in response to the rigged elections, the outstretched arm of the Ayatollah extends beyond Tehran. Whereas the size of the crowds protesting reached to more than 1 million people united in outrage at the absence of a fair and free electoral process. Despite the government ban that has been placed on all public gatherings with the purpose of voicing opposition to the outcome of the Iranian presidential elections, the people of Iran have publicly expressed their dissent. Iranians throughout the country have defied Interior Ministry warnings broadcast. Violence has spilled on to the streets of Tehran. To date, 7 Iranians have been killed in violent political unrest. Beyond Tehran, Iranians living in the rural regions are feeling the Ayatollah's pressures to cease all public expression of their discontent with the outcome of the elections. The Iranian people living in the region of Mashad are currently confined to their homes in order to prevent them protesting in the streets. All foreign journalists have now been quarantined and/or made to leave the country.

Following the results of the June l2th Iranian election, President Obama released a statement in reaction to then elections in Iran, stating "I am deeply troubled by the violence that I've been seeing on television," Obama said in Washington. "I can't state definitively one way or another what happened with respect to the election. But what I can say is that there appears to be a sense on the part of people who were so hopeful and so engaged and so committed to democracy who now feel betrayed."

Given the absence of fair and free elections, coupled with the government's poor record for transparency and accountability, we have deep cause for concern about the opportunity for free choices and democratic participation for the people of Iran. Despite intensified inspections since 2002, the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) inability, to verify that

Iran's nuclear program is not designed to develop a nuclear weapon is cause for great concern. While Iran states that the intention of its nuclear program is for electricity generation which it feels is vital to its energy security, U.S. officials challenge this justification by stating that "Iran's vast gas resources make a nuclear energy program unnecessary."

Establishing a diplomatic dialogue with the Government of Iran and deepening relationships with the Iranian people will only help foster greater understanding between the people of Iran and the people of the United States and would enhance the stability the security of the Persian Gulf region. Furthering President Obama's approach toward continued engagement will reduce the increased threat of the proliferation or use of nuclear weapons in the region, while advancing other U.S. foreign policy objectives in the region. The significance of establishing and sustaining diplomatic relations with Iran cannot be over-emphasized. Avoidance and military intervention cannot be the means through which we resolve this looming crisis.

In conclusion, we must condemn Iran for the absence of fair and free Presidential elections and urge Iran to provide its people with the opportunity to engage in a Democratic election process, by demanding new elections, and ensure that all votes are fairly counted. I look forward to further meaningful discussion and a new foreign policy strategy with regard to Iran when the people of Iran are able to participate in a fair and democratic electoral process.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this week the world heard the cry of millions of Iranians who seek the right to a free and fair election. In response, Americans from all walks of life have taken up the cause of liberty for Iranians who crave real freedom and not sham elections.

"I am proud to join the United States Congress to stand with freedom-loving people everywhere in support of the people of Iran and to call for an end to the brutal and violent suppression of peaceful protesters. We will not stand by in silence and watch the forces of radicalism attempt to squelch the public outcry in Iran against last week's election irregularities.

"The Middle East is ready for another real democracy, a nation where the voices of every citizen are heard and where the government works for the people and not against the people. Over the past few years the bellicose regime in Tehran has spewed an endless line of anti-Western vitriol and insists on threatening the existence of the state of Israel—one of the few beacons of real freedom in the Middle East. It is now obvious that the average Iranian has grown weary with their authoritarian leadership.

"The ongoing crackdown on free expression and the rights of journalists along with the censoring of communication with the outside world has simply shown the true colors of the dark Iranian regime desperately trying to hold its grip on power. The people of Iran deserve better. They deserve freedom. And today the House of Representatives has given voice to their historic plea in the hallowed halls of Congress."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 560.

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. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 559, by the yeas and nays;

Adopting H. Res. 559, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 560, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2918, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 559, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 177, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—177

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Adler (NJ)
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Capuano
Conyers
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Fattah
Harman
Heller
Kaptur
Kennedy
Lewis (GA)
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sestak
Shadegg
Skelton
Spratt
Stark
Sullivan
Velázquez
Westmoreland

□ 1131

Messrs. BOOZMAN, EHLERS and CARTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 409, the previous question on the Rule for the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2010, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 179, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—226

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Fattah
Harman
Kennedy
Latham
Lewis (GA)
McCarthy (CA)
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sestak
Shadegg
Skelton
Sullivan
Velázquez
Waters
Westmoreland
Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1139

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR IRANIANS WHO EMBRACE DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 560, 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 California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 560.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 1, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
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
McCollum
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, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Ellsworth
Loebsack

NOT VOTING—25

Adler (NJ)
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Capuano
Carter
Crowley
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doyle
Fattah
Gordon (TN)
Harman
Johnson (GA)
Kennedy
Lewis (GA)
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sestak
Shadegg
Skelton
Sullivan
Velázquez
Westmoreland

□ 1146

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.

Stated for:

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, on June 19, 2009, I was absent for one rollcall vote. If I had been here, I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote 411.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REGARDING SHIPBUILDING

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–167) to accompany the resolution (H. Res. 477) directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REGARDING AVIATION

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–168) to accompany the resolution (H. Res. 478), directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 559, I call up the bill (H.R. 2918), making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). Pursuant to House Resolution 559, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2918

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,375,300,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $25,881,000, including: Office of the Speaker, $5,077,000, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,530,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $4,565,000, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $2,194,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,690,000, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, $517,000; Republican Steering Committee, $981,000; Republican Conference, $1,748,000; Republican Policy Committee, $362,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, $1,366,000; Democratic Caucus, $1,725,000; nine minority employees, $1,552,000; training and program development—majority, $290,000; training and program development—minority, $290,000; Cloakroom Personnel—majority, $497,000; and Cloakroom Personnel—minority, $497,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $660,000,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $139,878,000: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2010, except that $1,000,000 of such amount shall remain available until expended for committee room upgrading.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $31,300,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided,* That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2010.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law,

$200,301,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than $23,000, of which not more than $20,000 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, $32,089,000 of which $4,600,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $9,509,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $130,782,000, of which $3,937,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $5,045,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Operations, $4,445,000, to remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,415,000; for the Office of the Chaplain, $179,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $2,060,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $3,258,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $8,814,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $859,000; for other authorized employees, $1,249,000; and for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Historian, including the cost of the House Fellows Program (including lodging and related expenses for visiting Program participants), $597,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $317,940,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $3,948,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $201,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $278,378,000, including employee tuition assistance benefit payments, $3,500,000, if authorized, and employee child care benefit payments, $1,000,000, if authorized; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $27,698,000, of which $9,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, $2,907,000; Wounded Warrior Program, $2,500,000, to be derived from funding provided for this purpose in Division G of Public Law 111–8; Office of Congressional Ethics, $1,548,000; Energy Demonstration Projects, $2,500,000, if authorized, to remain available until expended; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $760,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (2 U.S.C. 2062), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2010. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2010 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year, the aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for each of the following offices is increased as follows:

(1) The allowance for the office of the Majority Whip is increased by $96,000.

(2) The allowance for the office of the Minority Whip is increased by $96,000.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,814,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $11,451,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including: (1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer; (3) an allowance of $725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (4) an allowance of $725 per month to two assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (5) $2,366,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $3,805,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, $1,314,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the 111th Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, $30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $263,198,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $61,914,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2010 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1001. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2010 for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $4,335,000, of which $884,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance may, within the limits of available appropriations, dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by interagency transfer, donation, or discarding: *Provided further*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $45,165,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101.—MODIFICATIONS TO EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE PROGRAM.—(a) EXPANSION OF NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS.—Section 1201(b) of the Legislative Branch Apropriations Act, 2008 (2 U.S.C. 611 note) is amended by striking ''3'' each place it appears and inserting ''5''.

(b) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 1201 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 611 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(2) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by strking ''Subject to subsection (d), this section'' and inserting ''This section''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislatve Branch Appropriations Act, 2008.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the general and administrative support of the operations under the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $109,392,000, of which $8,950,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS REVITALIZATION TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund established under section 1201, $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $32,800,000, of which $6,241,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $10,920,000, of which $1,410,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $100,466,000, of which $53,360,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $125,083,000, of which $31,560,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That not more than $8,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2010.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $41,937,000, of which $15,750,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $26,364,000, of which $7,750,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $11,263,000, of which $900,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For necessary expenses for Capitol Visitor Center operations costs, $23,166,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1201. HISTORIC BUILDINGS REVITALIZATION TRUST FUND.—(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, as an account for the Architect of the Capitol, the Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Fund'').

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be used by the Architect of the Capitol for the revitalization of the major historical buildings and assets which the Architect is responsible for maintaining and preserving, except that the Architect may not obligate any amounts in the Fund without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1202.—Any individual who is appointed as the Architect of the Capitol after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be appointed in accordance with the applicable laws in effect at the time of appointment, taking into account any amendments which may be made to such applicable laws during the One Hundred Eleventh Congress.

SEC. 1203. SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE DURING EMERGENCIES.—(a) During an emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property, as determined or declared by the Capitol Police Board, the Architect of the Capitol—

(1) may accept contributions of comfort and other incidental items and services to support employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol while such employees are on duty in response to the emergency; and

(2) may incur obligations and make expenditures out of available appropriations for meals, refreshments, and other support and maintenance for the Office of the Architect of the Capitol if, in the judgment of the Architect, such obligations and expenditures are necessary to respond to the emergency.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 1204. FLEXIBLE AND COMPRESSED WORK SCHEDULES.—(a) Section 6121(1) of title 5, United States Code is amended by inserting after ''military department,'' the following: ''the Architect of the Capitol,''.

(b) Section 6133(c) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) With respect to employees of the Architect of the Capitol (including employees of the Botanic Garden), the authority granted to the Office of Personnel Management under this subchapter shall be exercised by the Architect of the Capitol.''

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to pay periods beginning or after the later of October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1205. ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY STUDENT SERVICES.—Section 3111 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

''(e) In this section, the term 'agency' includes the Architect of the Capitol, except that in the case of the Architect of the Capitol, the authority granted to the Office of Personnel Management under this section shall be exercised by the Architect of the Capitol.''.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each such succeeding fiscal year.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; activities under the Civil Rights History Project Act of 2009; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $450,211,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2010, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2010 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $7,315,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $750,000 shall be transferred to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 106–173, of which $10,000 may be used for official representation and reception expenses of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $55,476,000, of which not more than $28,751,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2010 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,861,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2010 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $34,612,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $4,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $112,490,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $70,182,000, of which $30,577,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated $650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 1302. REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2010, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $123,328,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

(c) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—During fiscal year 2010, the Librarian of Congress may temporarily transfer funds appropriated in this Act, under the heading ''LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'', under the subheading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', to the revolving fund for the FEDLINK Program and the Federal Research Program established under section 103 of the Library of Congress Fiscal Operations Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–481; 2 U.S.C. 182c): *Provided*, That the total amount of such transfers may not exceed $1,900,000: *Provided further*, That the appropriate revolving fund account shall reimburse the Library for any amounts transferred to it before the period of availability of the Library appropriation expires.

SEC. 1303. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2010 for the Library of Congress may be transferred during fiscal year 2010 between any of the headings under the heading ''LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'' upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated to the account under any heading under the heading ''LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'' for fiscal year 2010 may be transferred from that account by all transfers made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1304. CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS POSITIONS ABOVE GS–15.—Section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) The Librarian of Congress may classify positions in the Library of Congress above GS–15 pursuant to standards established by the Office in subsection (a)(2).''.

SEC. 1305. LEAVE CARRYOVER FOR CERTAIN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EXECUTIVE POSITIONS.—(a) Section 6304(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) a position in the Library of Congress the compensation for which is set at a rate equal to the annual rate of basic pay payable for positions at level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314.''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to annual leave accrued during pay periods beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1306. (a) Section 4(a) of the American Folklife Preservation Act (20 U.S.C. 2103(a)) is amended by striking ''an American Folklife Center'' and inserting ''the Archie Green American Folklife Center''.

(b) Any reference to the American Folklife Center in any law, rule, regulation, or document shall be deemed to be a reference to the Archie Green American Folklife Center.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $93,296,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $40,911,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

For payment to the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund, $12,000,000 for information technology development and facilities repair: *Provided*, That the Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided further*, That not more than $7,500

may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''Office of Superintendent of Documents'' and ''Salaries and Expenses'' may not be used for contracted security services at GPO's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $558,849,000: *Provided*, That not more than $5,449,000 of payments received under section 782 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2010: *Provided further*, That not more than $2,350,000 of reimbursements received under section 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2010: *Provided further*, That not more than $7,423,000 of reimbursements received under section 3521 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for use in fiscal year 2010: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $9,000,000.

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 202. FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2010 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 203. RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION.—Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 204. CONSULTING SERVICES.—The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

SEC. 205. AWARDS AND SETTLEMENTS.—Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1415(a)) to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 206. COSTS OF LBFMC.—Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

SEC. 207. LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.—The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I–395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 209. GUIDED TOURS OF THE CAPITOL.—

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

This division may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 111–161 if offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 2918.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker and Members, I am very proud to present the fiscal year 2010 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill to the House.

The jurisdiction of this bill is incredibly important. We, as Members, have responsibility not just for the institution, but for the staff that work for this institution, and to preserve the facilities that help support this institution. We have endeavored to do that responsibly, and I believe we have accomplished that goal.

It has been an incredible privilege and pleasure to work with my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT). We have crafted a bipartisan bill and worked together every step of the way. And I just wanted to acknowledge him at the very outset to thank him for all of his good work and tell him what a pleasure he has been to work with.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank, on behalf of, if I may, the House of Representatives, all of the staff that work not just for the House of Representatives, but for every legislative

branch agency because this bill is designed to support them. This bill is designed to make sure that they can do the work they need to do in order for us to be able to serve our constituents in the most effective way possible. So on behalf of the House of Representatives, if I may, both myself and Mr. ADERHOLT, we owe a tremendous debt to the true public servants that work here every single day on our behalf.

We, as Members of the House of Representatives, get quite a bit of the glory and the attention and the focus, but it is our staff, both the ones that work for us in our own Member offices, but also throughout this Chamber and across every legislative branch agency, that are toiling in the wilderness, so to speak, and are the unsung heroes that make the wheels of the legislative process turn, and we just can't thank them enough.

This is a bill that attempts to fulfill our responsibilities at two different levels. We really focused on two main tasks in the legislative branch bill. First, we have tried to provide the right balance of funding in a prudent way for each existing office, agency, and program so that we can support the day-to-day operations of the Congress.

The bill provides a total of $3.68 billion, which is an increase of $37 million, 6.8 percent above 2009 levels. A majority of those funds go to two of our greatest priorities within the bill: life safety issues, because, quite frankly, if we don't address the backlog of life safety and deferred maintenance that exist in all of our facilities, at some point we are not going to have the facilities to be able to work in. And the treasures of the facilities that we work in every single day is what our role is in the legislative branch. We must preserve them through the generations as they have been preserved for us to be able to work in today.

In addition, the bill, as is tradition, reserves funds, $1.025 million, for later action by the Senate on their issues to operate the Senate, and that is customary.

We have been able to provide for all mandatory cost increases and a limited number of program enhancements as well. In spite of the fact that we were able to do that, there were a number of things that we were unable to do because our focus during the markup of this bill was to fund the ''gotta haves,'' not the ''nice to haves.'' There are so many ''nice to haves'' that we could fund and that make sense and that would be appropriate, but we wanted to make sure that we crafted a frugal and fiscally responsible piece of legislation, which is why the bill, as written, is $281 million below the amount requested, which is a source of pride for all of the members of the committee.

Let me just summarize a few of the key amounts in the bill, Madam Speaker. The bill includes $1.4 billion for the operations of the House. This is an increase of $75 million, or 5.8 percent, over the 2009 enacted level, but $120 million below the amount requested. We have appropriated $660 million of this amount for the MRA.

Of interest to Members, and as was discussed during the rule, we also include within the budget an allocation for the Clerk of the House of $4.6 million to finally replace the antiquated 33-year-old voting system that we use here electronically in the Chamber so that we no longer have to have it held together by the duck tape that its inner workings are actually held together by.

$325.1 million is provided for the Capitol Police. That is sufficient to maintain their current officer strength. There was a request that we did not fund to increase the number of officers, the number or FTEs that they carry. It was felt that although the Capitol Police is working diligently towards getting their fiscal house in order—and Chief Morse is to be commended for that—they are not quite there yet. And adding to the strength of their force did not make sense, we felt, until they can make sure that they can get a handle on their overtime and get a handle on who is where in the Capitol Police structure.

$647.4 million is included for the Library of Congress. That is a 6.6 percent increase over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The amount provided includes $22 million for the Library to fund their high-priority initiatives, which also includes $15 million for technology upgrades.

It also includes the full amount, Members will be interested to know, that was requested for the Copyright Office. There is a tremendous backlog in the Copyright Office, which the committee has added report language to address. We are very concerned about that backlog and are going to be pushing the Copyright Office to get a handle on it, as well as full funding for the Books for the Blind program.

The bill also includes $146.2 million for the Government Printing Office, which is a 4 percent increase.

Finally, the bill includes $558.8 million for the GAO. Obviously, they have some tremendously increased responsibilities. That is a 5.2 percent increase. We need to make sure that GAO has the ability to conduct the accountability responsibilities that they have and that they do such a good job doing.

Beyond the core funding for the day-to-day operations, Madam Speaker, of the Congress, we have largely focused on two long-term priorities as well. We are first taking a more aggressive approach to dealing with the backlog of deferred maintenance needs of our aging Capitol complex. As we have said, and I risk saying this on the House floor, this is not the sexiest of committees of the 12 Appropriations Committees, but it is one that is incredibly important in order for us to be able to preserve the institution and the facilities in the institution that we serve in. The bill includes funding for 23 high-priority projects that are requested by the Architect of the Capitol.

Beyond these immediate needs, however, the bill includes—and this is something that is a great source of pride for the members of the committee, and we want to thank Chairman OBEY for his leadership on this—$60 million to establish a new Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund. We have a number of major facilities projects coming up over the next few years, including the renewable of the Cannon House Office Building, which is 100 years old, as well as the restoration of the Capitol dome, which will cost in the range of $100 million. And that is not a hit that this budget can take on a year-to-year basis, so we are going to begin to bank funds that are in that trust fund and only allow the appropriation for those projects out of that trust fund.

In addition, we have tried to deal, most importantly, I think, with the challenge of retaining the best and brightest that have come to work for us in the House of Representatives. We are so fortunate to have young people who are brilliant and who put aside a lot of other opportunities to devote themselves to public service and come to work for us. But what happens is that, inevitably, because we are often not competitive in the benefits that we provide or the pay that we give them, we end up losing them. We train them, we get them ready, and we end up losing them down the road to other career alternatives.

We are committed to dealing with this retention problem in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, and we did several different things in order to be able to do that. We increased funding for the MRA accounts so that we can grow salaries. It is important that we be able to pay, not astronomical sums to our staff, but an appropriate amount of salary so that we can make sure we can hold on to the best and brightest that we are already able to attract.

It includes two additional benefits that are not currently provided that we felt were very important. We have been trying to get a sense from our employees what their needs are, and this bill anticipates two of those needs. We fund $3.5 million for a tuition reimbursement program for all House employees, and $1 million in child care benefits for our lower-income employees because making sure that we can take away the angst of not having quality child care or being able to afford quality child care is an important thing for us to be able to do for our valuable staff.

Again, I want to thank Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. LEWIS, the ranking member of the full committee, for your incredible cooperation. It has been an absolute pleasure to work with them. And I also want to thank both of our staffs, who really work so hard every day to make us look good. These bills are not crafted over night, Madam

Speaker, and there is painstaking effort and detail that goes into them, and so I want to thank Mike Stephens, the majority clerk, Dave Marroni, Matt Glassman, Liz Dawson, the minority clerk, Jenny Kisiah, Megan Medley, and Ian Rayder on my personal staff, each of whom have put in very long hours in support of this bill.

I urge all Members to support this fiscally responsible bill, which I again will remind you is millions of dollars below the request.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

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

Madam Speaker, this is my first appropriation bill to help manage on the floor, and I have very much enjoyed the process and consider it a real privilege to have this honor to do it.

I do want to commend the Chair, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her professional and her courteous manner in the way that she has conducted the process over the last several months for producing the fiscal year 2010 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. We have worked closely and very much in the spirit of bipartisanship to meet the funding needs of the legislative branch agencies. In addition, the Chair operated under an open process and was responsive to the concerns and input of all the members of this committee.

Madam Speaker, I will say it is unfortunate that the bipartisan approach taken by our committee stopped at the doors of the Rules Committee. I understand that the rule accompanying this bill, the Legislative Branch Appropriation bill, has historically been a structured rule. Traditionally, while not all amendments filed with the Rules Committee have been made in order, a much more balanced approach has been taken than what we are seeing today. Twenty amendments were filed with the Rules Committee and only one was made in order. While I may not have personally supported some of the amendments, I do feel strongly that Members should be permitted to debate the issues of concern to them. Members have once again been denied the right to offer amendments to an appropriation bill, a trend that's happening more often than not.

That being said, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, did its work and we addressed the many competing priorities and individual agency challenges.

The committee has reduced the fiscal year 2010 requested increase of 15 percent down to 6.8 percent, a reduction of $282 million. However, it is important to distinguish that nearly one-quarter of this increase, or $60 million, is for the establishment of the Historical Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund. When you take this into account, the agencies will be operating on an average of a 5.2 increase over the last year. This funding allows the committee to continue to focus on critical life safety issues surrounding the Capitol complex and to maintain adequate funding of current staff operations.

Among the highlights of the bill is $1.375 billion for the expenses of the House of Representatives. This provides an appropriate level of funding for the Members' representational allowances, the ability to address the much-needed new voting system, additional benefits for House employees, and a new House I.D. badge system. For the United States Capitol Police, $325 million will be included. This amount supports the current sworn strength at 1,799 positions and fully funds the implementation costs of the merger with the Library of Congress Police. The Architect of the Capitol, excluding Senate items, is funded at $541 million and supports the top 20 construction projects. All life safety projects, significant investment in energy and saving efforts, and almost $70 million worth of deferred maintenance projects have been funded in this bill.

And we have started a very needed new initiative, the Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, to begin to address the Capitol complex's deteriorating infrastructure. For the Library of Congress, $647 million is included, and it includes $15 million for the beginning of needed new technology investments. The Government Printing Office is to continue the development of the Federal digital system and is included at $7 million, and in order to meet the congressional demands, additional workforce is provided for the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office.

In conclusion, H.R. 2918 is a well-rounded bill and adequately addresses the needs of the legislative branch.

Again, I would like to express my thanks to the Chair for her bipartisanship and how she has conducted this subcommittee over the last several months that we've had the hearings and as we have worked together on this bill. I also do want to thank the majority staff, Mike Stephens, David Marroni, Matt Glassman, and Ian Rayder, for their help with this bill; and, of course, on my side of the aisle, on the minority's side, Liz Dawson, Jennifer Kisiah, and Megan Medley with my office to make sure that this bill goes through as it has successfully over the last several months. So, again, I thank all the people who were involved.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise with my friend from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairwoman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee.

Madam Chairwoman, as you know, Mr. WAMP and I worked with you to name the main hall in the Capitol Visitor Center Emancipation Hall. However, we feel the naming of Emancipation Hall needs context and want to work with you, the House Administration Committee, and the Senate Rules Committee to do this.

I yield to Mr. WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, ''emancipation'' means free or equal. There's no greater duty bestowed upon the Congress than to advance the principle of freedom. The process of emancipation liberated all Americans from the bondage of slavery, and Emancipation Hall will tell freedom's story to millions of visitors each year.

But there is a missing element in the hall to educate visitors about the process of emancipation that this great hall was named to honor. We would like to design and construct an educational display in the Capitol Visitor Center that recognizes the naming of Emancipation Hall and provides an historical narrative of President Lincoln's emancipation of the slaves.

Madam Chair, can you work with us to make this happen?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would not only be happy to work with you, I could not agree with either of you more on this very worthwhile endeavor. You are both to be commended for your effort to recognize that slave labor and their hands constructed the great building that we work in every single day, and subject to the authorization of the House Administration Committee, I look forward to working with you towards this goal.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the chairwoman, and while this may not necessarily be part of a colloquy, I would like the gentlewoman to yield me an additional 30 seconds, if she wouldn't mind.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I just wanted to say that on behalf of every Member of this institution, we owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished chairwoman and the ranking member for their extraordinary efforts in wrapping their arms around the Capital Visitor Center, which, since the inauguration of the President and since its opening, has served as a beaming moment of pride for every Member that brings their constituents through that enormous visitor center.

And while it started out, Madam Speaker, as somewhat of a controversial project, the chairwoman and the ranking member have done an extraordinary job on behalf of this institution and all Members are grateful.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. WAMP. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WAMP. Just to add a note of thanks to you and the ranking member for extraordinary work protecting the

interests of the legislative branch. You have been remarkable in your diligence both in finishing the CVC and properly managing the affairs of the House. And I'd also like to thank Representative JOHN LEWIS of Atlanta for chairing the Slave Labor Task Force and working with us all along the way to try to use both the CVC and Emancipation Hall to properly honor the slave labor that did contribute mightily to this great temple of freedom. Also, Chairman BRADY of House Administration and Ranking Member LUNGREN have met with us and agreed to this in principle. We're just working with the Senate trying to dot the ''I's'' and cross the ''T's'' so that we can join up the authorization and the appropriation at the proper time and before it's too late.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the full committee, from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate very much my colleague's yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to say just a few things about the way these two people are working together. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and my friend ROBERT ADERHOLT have done a fabulous job on this bill. Not the most expensive bill of the 12 that are around but probably one of the very most important bills, for it decides whether the legislative branch works effectively or does not work effectively. I want the Members and our public to know that these two people have done a fabulous job in putting us on a course that I think makes sense.

I especially want to express my appreciation for concern about the buildings that are the places where we must work and operate the legislative branch. Those are institutions in the place that are in serious difficulty because of lack of repair, et cetera. They are on a course that will make sure that we extend their life and their service to all of our people in an effective way.

Further, the Capitol Visitor Center has been mentioned by several, but let me suggest that it's a fabulous new addition to the Capitol, but there is an institution developing there as well. We do have a way in Washington to create new bureaucracies almost no matter what, and there are those who believe that they're the only ones that know how to show off the CVC and the Capitol to our public. The long history of Members' staffs developing expertise as well and representing us well by taking our constituents through these facilities is a very important part of our process.

I want to congratulate the ranking member, but especially the gentlewoman, for language in the bill that very specifically tells those who run the CVC that this is a people's institution and the people's elected representatives ought to play the most significant role in the way it is run.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to add I'm new to the Appropriations Committee, new to this subcommittee, and I have to tell you it's one of the most pleasant experiences I have had in 15 years in the United States Congress. I would commend the chairwoman for her diligence and oversight and commend the ranking member for being her partner.

This product truly is a bipartisan result, and unlike some of the things that go on around here, the gentlewoman from Florida did, in fact, include the minority in every decision that was made in the crafting of this bill. And I want to highlight just a couple of things that I'm really pleased with.

One is the increase in the Members' representational account, not that Members of Congress will make more money but that so we can attract and retain, and retention really is the key, quality staff folks in our personal offices. I'm also appreciative to the gentlewoman for including some report language dealing with the Congressional Research Service as a result of the oversight hearing. As was mentioned before by Mr. LEWIS and others, the icon fund, the anticipated repairs to the United States Capitol and the Cannon building are going to be astronomical. Rather than sort of waiting for disaster to strike, squirreling money away now so that we can do it in an orderly fashion, I think, is a great idea.

The only concern I have, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for her willingness to work with us during the full committee markup of this bill, is we did have an oversight hearing and folks are aware that at the historic inauguration of President Obama, a crush of people arrived here. Some people in the purple haze or purple zone were stuck in a tunnel and never got the opportunity to see the inauguration. And the report as currently written correctly indicates that some of the problem was with the planning with the police, the Secret Service, and others. However, in that oversight hearing and why I am grateful to the gentlewoman for indicating she'll work with us, the police and the Secret Service indicated that they were turning away hundreds and thousands of people who had received this very fancy invitation. And the invitation, Madam Speaker, says the honor of your presence is requested at the ceremonies for the inauguration of the President on January 20. And people were coming to the barricades and basically saying, I've been invited.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank you very much, and I won't take a minute.

But thousands of people were coming up to the barricades and basically indicating, Hey, look, I've been invited by Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator REID, Senator BENNETT, Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and Minority Leader BOEHNER to attend the inauguration; so what do you mean I can't get in? And, of course, these aren't invitations.

So I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to also look at the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies and perhaps we all can do better and have a more peaceful inauguration in 2013.

□ 1215

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from Florida.

In my capacity as the cochairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Florida regarding a chronic problem faced by the commission, and that is, access to appropriate space for public hearings, briefings and other events.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I'm very familiar with the outstanding human rights work undertaken by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and his colleagues on the commission. Last year I had the opportunity to participate in a commission hearing on combating sexual exploitation of children and strengthening international law enforcement cooperation. The commission is providing important leadership on this and many other issues at home and abroad, including among parliamentarians, through engagement by Mr. HASTINGS, a past president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and Senator CARDIN, a vice president of the assembly and current Chair of the commission.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Fulfillment of the commission's congressional mandate requires the convening of public hearings and briefings as well as sustained engagement with visiting delegations of senior foreign government officials, including parliamentarians and representatives of nongovernmental organizations. When Congress established the commission, there were 35 countries that were part of the Helsinki Process. Today that number has grown to 56. Additionally, the commission has paid increasing attention to developments in OSCE partner countries, including Afghanistan, Egypt,

Jordan, and Israel, among others. The commission's increased workload has led to an increased number of public events as well as meetings with foreign dignitaries.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I can appreciate the dilemma faced by my colleagues on the commission and the difficulty of securing suitable space for such events and meetings. I am committed to working with the gentleman from Florida in finding a durable solution to this persistent problem. My understanding is that he has identified space in the CVC that might meet the commission's needs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That is correct. I appreciate the Chair's support and look forward to working with her and others to fix this problem.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) who is a member of the full committee and has worked very diligently on a lot of these issues that involve the legislative branch, even though he is not on the subcommittee. He has worked very diligently, especially regarding the Visitor Center and making sure that Members have the opportunity to bring their guests throughout the Capitol and get a quality tour from the State's perspective from where they're from.

Mr. KIRK. I thank my colleague and rise in very strong support for this bipartisan legislation. I particularly want to thank Mr. ADERHOLT and our Chair, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for putting together this legislation. I have worked on this legislation in the past, particularly to build a staff gym, which is now one of the great successes of this institution. But lately was particularly concerned with the decision quietly made that gave the Architect of the Capitol Red Coats apparently the exclusive power to control Capitol tours in the Capitol. It's clear now that they abused this power. They blocked staff-led tours of the Capitol and on Facebook set a record for poor customer service in condemning congressional staffs—politically naively enough majority and minority staffs—and saying what a bad piece of work that they did.

Many Members came together under the leadership of Chairman Wasserman Schultz, concerned about this power grab in the people's House. While the CVC attempted changes, they maintained that they still wanted to control access to the Capitol, turning away one of our Members who had four mayors visiting here, but they only had three tickets.

What this legislation now does, as written by the chairwoman, is that we have fired the Red Coats' ability to control access to the Capitol by Members of Congress and their staff, that if constituents come in from whatever district, that Members should now know that your staff can get your constituents into the Capitol to see it. We have also removed the restraints so that you can see all provisions of the Capitol, especially, for example, my constituents and many others who have seen this institution on C–SPAN and want to look at it. Now we can get them in here.

I particularly want to thank the leadership for this legislation because we have returned a sense of order and control in making sure that the people who were elected to represent them actually can bring them into the Capitol. As I said in full committee, this institution can be quite frustrating—like yesterday; and the one thing that we can guarantee that was under our control is that we could guarantee that our constituents have a good experience in the Capitol. That had been denied by the Red Coats. This legislation returns that control.

I want to particularly thank Jenny Desia and Liz Dawson on our side; and Ian Rader in Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's staff for helping out; and Brette Davis of my staff who helped bring this together. I also want to thank Congressmen DAVE LOEBSACK and JIM MORAN who helped me out so much.

We see ourselves as institutionalists here. I started working here as a staffer in 1984. And while the CVC is quite impressive, its restrictions were beginning to deny a number of Members of Congress the opportunity to show it to their constituents. This legislation restores that access.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes just to agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Illinois. I am so glad that he raised the issue of staff-led tours during debate on this legislation. It is incredibly important, and it was an incredible source of frustration for me as we moved towards opening the CVC to note that it was possible that constituents of ours could come to the Capitol, take a tour, walk through this whole building, watch our proceedings in the gallery, and leave to go home, never having known or been able to identify who it is that represents them in the United States Congress.

Preserving staff-led tours is an incredibly important way for us to be able to do that. And quite frankly, just to promote staff-led tours to anyone who is interested in getting one, you can get a more unique and less homogenized tour. As good as the guide-led tours are, you can get a more tailored-to-your-State oriented tour from your Member of Congress. And I would encourage people who are interested in doing that to go through their own Member of Congress to book their reservation and get a tour of the Capitol from the person that represents you in Washington.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Alabama for yielding me time to speak.

I rise in opposition to this legislative appropriations bill. While I appreciate the work that's been done in putting this bill together, I think it's been a disservice to the American people that the amendments that were filed by so many Members on our side to actually cut the growth of spending in this bill were not allowed to come to the floor, were, in essence, ruled out of order. I think it's a sad day when someone attempts to cut spending in a bill that grows government by the size of 7 percent, in this case, and it is ruled out of order. It's not allowed to be debated on this House floor. I think what's happening right now—and we saw this yesterday—there was a $64 billion piece of legislation that was brought before Congress yesterday, which represented a 12 percent growth—the CJS budget that was brought before Congress yesterday—a 12 percent growth in government at a time when Americans all across the country are cutting their spending because we're living in tough economic times.

I think there's some people in this leadership in Congress that just don't get the fact that people want us to cut spending here in Washington, not spend at record levels.

I think it was very sad when just on this House floor yesterday we had a record—8 hours was spent on a bill where $64 billion of taxpayer money was being spent, and we were trying to bring up amendments to cut that rapid growth in spending. People just last night and today in the leadership on this floor actually used the comments that ''delaying tactics''—they called our amendments to cut spending delaying tactics. Some of their Members actually used the term ''nonsense'' and ''foolishness'' when describing our amendments to cut spending. So now some people on the other side want to spend money so fast that if we put up an amendment to cut spending, to cut growth in spending, they call that a delaying tactic.

Well, I think Americans all across this country want more of those types of delaying tactics to slow down this runaway train of massive Federal spending, money we don't have. Every dollar we spend in Congress from today all the way through the end of this year is borrowed money. We don't have that money. We need to control what we're spending. I would urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2010. I want to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and all of the members of the subcommittee for their hard work. It is no secret that we are in the middle of the most trying economic times that we have seen in decades. This has made a hard job even harder for the Appropriations Committee, as difficult decisions had to be made. I commend the Subcommittee for finding a balance that supports the necessities of running the Legislative branch while restraining spending.

A year ago at this time we were still anticipating the opening of the new Capitol Visitor

Center. Today we are seeing it flourish, as it has already welcomed more than one million visitors to the Capitol. I want to commend Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her part in opening the doors to the CVC, and for her work on this bill that supports its continued success and growth.

I am very pleased to see that this bill includes funds to renovate the east underground garage and for design work necessary to renovate the Cannon House Office Building. The garage renovation is a must-fund project for the safety of anyone who uses the facility. Maintenance projects have been deferred for too long and parts of the structure are literally beginning to crumble. Furthermore, the Cannon building has historic significance and we owe it to the institution to preserve the structure. These are just the first elements of long-deferred maintenance of the Capitol complex, and I am pleased to see the initiation of a capital fund to address these multi-year expenses.

I am sure that many members here share in my excitement for this bill's inclusion of funds to modernize the Electronic Voting Display in the House Chamber. The EVS has not been upgraded significantly since it was first installed more than 30 years ago. The proposed changes to the display will not just reduce malfunctions, but also make it easier for Members to read at a glance. It will also remove any confusion about what is being voted on. This upgrade is long overdue and will ensure the system's ability to adapt to advancing technologies.

Additionally, I'd like to voice my support for funding a number of initiatives from the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer. I'm glad to see the continued support for the CAO's greening efforts. These efforts have greatly improved the House's energy efficiency, lowered our carbon footprint, and reduced our costs. In this bill, funds have been specifically set aside for energy demonstration projects. This appropriation will make the House a showcase for the possibilities of a greener, and more responsible, tomorrow.

Another CAO initiative that I am happy to see funded in this bill is the Wounded Warrior program. Wounded veterans face innumerable challenges when they return home. This program is a small way that we can ease that burden for some, and hopefully set an example for other employers to follow.

Finally, I'm pleased to see the inclusion of staff benefits aimed to create parity between the executive and legislative branches. In particular, I am glad to see funds for a tuition reimbursement program and extended childcare benefits. All of the benefits the CAO has recommended already exist in executive agencies, and the Committee on House Administration will soon consider extending them to House employees to retain and recruit the best staff.

Before closing, I just wanted to mention the importance of the funds incorporated in the supplemental for the Capitol Police to upgrade their radio system. Their antiquated radio system has been an ongoing problem that affects the safety of everyone who works in or visits the Capitol. We have increasing security concerns and an expanding campus, making effective communication more important than ever. Including that money in the supplemental accelerated the installation of the new system; otherwise, funding would have had to be included in this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. It represents a wise and careful use of taxpayer dollars in a difficult economic time. Meanwhile, it effectively addresses the necessities of running the legislative branch. These appropriations make it possible for all of us to do our jobs effectively for the American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, at this time I have no additional speakers, but I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, again, it was a great privilege to work with the gentleman from Alabama and his staff. I look forward to continuing to work as we move the legislative branch appropriations bill through the conference process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

In the item relating to ''Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses'', strike the period at the end and insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, $250,000 shall be used to carry out activities under the Civil Rights History Project Act of 2009.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 559, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I thank you, Madam Speaker.

I certainly want to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ranking Member ADERHOLT for letting this amendment come through today. I appreciate all the work that has been done, and I am not going to speak long on this to save time.

I want to thank my lead cosponsor of the Civil Rights Oral History Project, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, himself a civil rights hero, for all of his help in developing and generating support for this program.

All I'm going to say is that I thank everyone for working together to make sure that this amendment comes through. What has happened was—it has passed in the House before. Money had been appropriated for it. But unfortunately by a technical change, there was a delay until the year 2011. We have so many people around this country that are advancing in age who have the history of the civil rights movement, and obviously in the last few years, we have seen some of the great civil rights leaders, unfortunately, die; but it's also those that were the housewives, just the ordinary citizens that really also made a difference.

I would like to thank Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ranking Member ADERHOLT for their help in moving this amendmendment forward and congratulate them for their hard work on crafting the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

I also want to thank my lead cosponsor of the Civil Rights Oral History Project, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, himself a civil rights hero, for all of his help in developing and generating support for this program.

Mr. LEWIS was at the forefront of the battle to end segregation and his contribution to ensuring equality in our country cannot be overstated.

I know I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that we are honored to serve with him and grateful for all that he has done and continues to do for all Americans as a steward of justice and equal rights.

We are fortunate to serve in Congress with several other influential civil rights leaders and I would like to extend a heartfelt ''thank you'' for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of freedom.

The fight for civil rights was one of the most significant social and cultural movements in our nation's history.

H.R. 586, the Civil Rights Oral History Project Act of 2009, was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Obama on May 12th.

It would permit the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Museum to jointly create a comprehensive compilation of audio and video recordings of personal histories and testimonials of individuals who participated in the Civil Rights movement.

It is important that we begin to fund this project now, so we can document the stories of those brave men and women who fought in so many ways to ensure equal rights to all Americans.

Another year is too long to wait.

Unfortunately, with each passing year, our nation loses more and more of the people that played major roles in the American Civil Rights Movement.

Over the last few years, we lost Mrs. Coretta Scott King and Mrs. Rosa Parks, and we will continue to lose more courageous Civil Rights pioneers.

Thankfully, their stories have been well documented in the historic record, but there are many others who have already passed or whose memories are fading.

While we know so much about the lives of the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement, such as Dr. Martin Luther King, our colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and Thurgood Marshall, it is important that we learn about the everyday people of all races who took a stand during a pivotal time in our nation's history.

Many leaders from all walks of life put their lives on the line to make it possible for all people to live freely and have the same fundamental rights.

The workers in Memphis that went on strike and marched in protest with Dr. King, the students that held sit-ins at lunch counters in the south, the thousands of people that marched on Washington and witnessed the ''I Have a Dream Speech'' and the millions of Americans that stood up and worked in their own ways to make our country a better place for all people.

In my Congressional District, there are many important leaders who fought to ensure equal rights for all Long Islanders.

Brave Americans like Irving C. McKnight from Roosevelt, Mr. McNeil from Hempstead, Mrs. Iris Johnson from Freeport, Fred Brewington from Malverne and so many others.

These people are the heroes of the civil rights movement and we need to make sure that their stories are woven into the fabric of the American story.

Without their efforts many of the freedoms we take for granted everyday would not have come to pass.

It is vital that future generations know and understand the struggles and challenges of those that paved the way for us to live in a free nation.

This legislation stresses the importance of capturing the memories and deeds of the Civil Rights generation and will give us a unique insight into the experiences of the people that were really on the frontlines of the civil rights movement.

This bill is based on the successful Veterans History Project and will create a joint effort between the future National Museum of African American History and Culture and the Library of Congress to collect oral histories of the people that were involved in the civil rights movement and preserve their stories for future generations.

The legislation authorized $500,000 for fiscal year 2010, for the purpose of carrying out the project, jointly between the two agencies.

I know that the bill was signed into law late and I appreciate the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee including language in the bill indicating funding can be used for "activities for the Civil Rights Oral History Project." However, it does not appropriate an actual amount.

My amendment simply specifies that $250,000 would be directed from the salaries and expenses account to begin implementing the project in fiscal year 2010.

The amendment would guarantee a specified amount be used by the Library of Congress for this project.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and take the time to acknowledge the contributions of those great Americans who fought to make our nation a more fair and just place.

With that, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding and for her very appropriate amendment.

It is really wonderful to see the progress that has been made on the Civil Rights Oral History Project. We did have language in our bill, preserving the possibility for providing the funding. I'm glad that we've been able to fast forward that opportunity. I look forward to continuing to work with her. I'm happy to accept the amendment.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Thank you.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Let me just say on the minority side, the Republican side, we accept the amendment as well. We look forward to working with you on that.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 559, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kingston of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2918 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the house forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 9, strike "$1,375,300,000" and insert "$1,375,200,000".

Page 5, line 19, strike "$317,940,000" and insert "$317,840,000".

Page 5, line 25, strike "$278,378,000" and insert "$278,278,000".

Mr. KINGSTON (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, what this motion to recommit does is it moves to strike the congressional bicycle program.

When I came to Congress 17 years ago, we actually had a congressional ice program. I want you to imagine, every day 435 offices would get a bucket of ice delivered to them, even though we had ice machines in our refrigerator. It was a long-standing tradition and we couldn't get rid of it. It cost $375,000 a year. Finally we got rid of it.

Not to be outdone, it seems this Congress has started a bicycle program so our staff could have an opportunity to ride a beautiful bike like this. I want to tell you, these are beautiful bikes, not just because they are a pleasant blue color. But I am a bike rider. I ride a bike to work. I take this carbon footprint stuff seriously. I also don't like to pay $2.70 a gallon. So I ride my bike, but I pay for mine with my own money.

Now, these bikes, you don't have to pay for them. You just have to sign up. The problem is, last year $200,000, this year—the chairman would like me to show my colors here. I am a bike rider, and I take it seriously. Mr. JACKSON and Mr. LEWIS, we would love to have you in our caucus.

To get 30 bikes, we have spent $200,000. But only a small number of people have signed up for this, and last year they were only used 186 times. That calculates to $330 a ride.

Now, it is important to give staff employees benefits, and that is why this bill increases the salary allowance. We give them Metro cards. They have a health care plan and a fitness center. They have Federal holidays. They have nurses on the premises. They have a Thrift Savings Plan. There are a lot of good things we do and should continue doing for employees. But the bike program is so silly.

Why is it silly? It is not available, except for on weekdays from 8 to 5. So when I have an employee come to work, I expect them to be working, not riding bikes provided for by hard-working taxpayers.

These bikes are deluxe bikes. You can't quite see them. There is a nice seat, a very nice cushiony seat. They have lights. They have speedometers. I can tell you these bikes don't have any speed to them at all. I ride a road bike. I know. I could take one of these easily. But they have a speedometer, in case they do get up to five miles per hour. Nice thick tires. And you can't quite see them, but they have a mud flap. Now, you know you can't be serious with a bike unless you have a mud flap on it.

I want people to be riding bicycles, but I don't think it is fair for taxpayers in this economy to be spending $300,000 for a silly congressional bike program that is not used.

And, by the way, how bad is it? I would challenge you to do this: Check the Web page out and ask them how to get a bike, and it can't even accurately tell you where to go. It tells you to go to the Fitness Center. You call the Fitness Center, and they say, no, you have to go to First Call. You call First Call and you wait in line. That is where you get your sandwiches and meeting rooms and everything else. You have to be in line for that.

I went over, by the way, to see those bikes. Lots of dust is on them. They are sitting all by themselves in the corner of the parking lot, Ride me, ride me, please, somebody. No, you don't get that opportunity, because you can't sign up for it.

But, again, I want my employees to be working between 8 and 5, and on the

weekend, if they want to ride a bike, they ought to pay for it with their own money. Again, if this program was practical, it would be available to them on the weekends, but it is not.

It is a silly program and it revisits the days of the congressional ice-delivery program. Like the congressional ice-delivery program, it was a good idea, a good intention gone bad.

We need to strike this, put it to rest and say, you know what? We tried it. Let's don't be stupid and continue trying it. Let's accept this language and move the bill and get rid of the congressional bike program.

I would like all of you folks to sign up for a bike program, but not this one. Bring your own bike at your own expense.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit; although I am not opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I do first think it is important to point out that technically the language in the motion to recommit does not specifically reduce the funding for any program at all. It simply reduces funding by $100,000 in this section of the bill. So I do think it is important to point out that the Wheels for Wellness program has not been specifically named in the motion to recommit for reduction.

That having been said, it is also important to point out that included in the report that accompanies the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, we did express our concern about the effectiveness of the program as it is currently constructed. There are very few bikes that have been checked out, and we do believe that there needs to be a more effective plan brought forward by the CAO to ensure that if the program is going to continue to exist into the future, that more bikes be checked out and that they have an effective plan for doing that.

We are looking forward to getting that report language back and to working towards the possibility of reestablishing the funds in this section of the bill, which is all that has occurred.

But with that understanding and in anticipation of receiving that report, and recognizing the good work of our colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and his passionate commitment to ensuring that we get out of our cars and on to our bikes, because obviously that would reduce our carbon footprint and the carbon emissions, that is a worthwhile goal that the American people would greatly benefit from, with that, I would be glad to accept the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the motion to recommit having expired, without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 34, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—374

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—34

Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Filner
Fudge
Hirono
Holt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
McGovern
Mollohan
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Oberstar
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Serrano
Sherman
Tsongas
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—25

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Capuano
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Fattah
Harman
Hoekstra
Johnson (GA)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Pascrell
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Sullivan
Velázquez
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1301

Messrs. MCGOVERN, HOLT, CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms.

FUDGE, and Mr. ELLISON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. REYES, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Messrs. HALL of New York, LUJÁN and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 2918, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

Page 2, line 9, strike ''$1,375,300,000'' and insert ''$1,375,200,000''.

Page 5, line 19, strike ''$317,940,000'' and insert ''$317,840,000''.

Page 5, line 25, strike ''$278,378,000'' and insert ''$278,278,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 178, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kirk
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—178

Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costello
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOT VOTING—23

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Capuano
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Fattah
Harman
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Sullivan
Velázquez
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1309

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 413, I was detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2918, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY 2010, and "yea" on Final Passage of H.R. 2918, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 2010.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

IMPEACHING JUDGE SAMUEL B. KENT

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Judiciary, I call up House Resolution 520 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 520

Resolved, That Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and all of the people of the United States of America, against Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I

Incident to his position as a United States district court judge, Samuel B. Kent has engaged in conduct with respect to employees

associated with the court that is incompatible with the trust and confidence placed in him as a judge, as follows:

(1) Judge Kent is a United States District Judge in the Southern District of Texas. From 1990 to 2008, he was assigned to the Galveston Division of the Southern District, and his chambers and courtroom were located in the United States Post Office and Courthouse in Galveston, Texas.

(2) Cathy McBroom was an employee of the Office of the Clerk of Court for the Southern District of Texas, and served as a Deputy Clerk in the Galveston Division assigned to Judge Kent's courtroom.

(3) On one or more occasions between 2003 and 2007, Judge Kent sexually assaulted Cathy McBroom, by touching her private areas directly and through her clothing against her will and by attempting to cause her to engage in a sexual act with him.

Wherefore, Judge Samuel B. Kent is guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors and should be removed from office.

ARTICLE II

Incident to his position as a United States district court judge, Samuel B. Kent has engaged in conduct with respect to employees associated with the court that is incompatible with the trust and confidence placed in him as a judge, as follows:

(1) Judge Kent is a United States District Judge in the Southern District of Texas. From 1990 to 2008, he was assigned to the Galveston Division of the Southern District, and his chambers and courtroom were located in the United States Post Office and Courthouse in Galveston, Texas.

(2) Donna Wilkerson was an employee of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

(3) On one or more occasions between 2001 and 2007, Judge Kent sexually assaulted Donna Wilkerson, by touching her in her private areas against her will and by attempting to cause her to engage in a sexual act with him.

Wherefore, Judge Samuel B. Kent is guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors and should be removed from office.

ARTICLE III

Samuel B. Kent corruptly obstructed, influenced, or impeded an official proceeding as follows:

(1) On or about May 21, 2007, Cathy McBroom filed a judicial misconduct complaint with the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. In response, the Fifth Circuit appointed a Special Investigative Committee (hereinafter in this article referred to as ''the Committee'') to investigate Cathy McBroom's complaint.

(2) On or about June 8, 2007, at Judge Kent's request and upon notice from the Committee, Judge Kent appeared before the Committee.

(3) As part of its investigation, the Committee sought to learn from Judge Kent and others whether he had engaged in unwanted sexual contact with Cathy McBroom and individuals other than Cathy McBroom.

(4) On or about June 8, 2007, Judge Kent made false statements to the Committee regarding his unwanted sexual contact with Donna Wilkerson as follows:

(A) Judge Kent falsely stated to the Committee that the extent of his unwanted sexual contact with Donna Wilkerson was one kiss, when in fact and as he knew he had engaged in repeated sexual contact with Donna Wilkerson without her permission.

(B) Judge Kent falsely stated to the Committee that when told by Donna Wilkerson his advances were unwelcome no further contact occurred, when in fact and as he knew, Judge Kent continued such advances even after she asked him to stop.

(5) Judge Kent was indicted and pled guilty and was sentenced to imprisonment for the felony of obstruction of justice in violation of section 1512(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code, on the basis of false statements made to the Committee. The sentencing judge described his conduct as ''a stain on the justice system itself''.

Wherefore, Judge Samuel B. Kent is guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors and should be removed from office.

ARTICLE IV

Judge Samuel B. Kent made material false and misleading statements about the nature and extent of his nonconsensual sexual contact with Cathy McBroom and Donna Wilkerson to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on or about November 30, 2007, and to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and representatives of the Department of Justice on or about August 11, 2008.

Wherefore, Judge Samuel B. Kent is guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors and should be removed from office.

□ 1315

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, under clause 7 of rule XX, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 414]

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
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
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the call of the House.

□ 1333

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 395 Members have recorded their presence. A quorum is present.

IMPEACHING JUDGE SAMUEL B. KENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. 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 gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH of Texas, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time on his side for purposes of debate.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we are here today to perform one of the most solemn duties under the Constitution, which is to consider the impeachment of a sitting member of the judiciary, a Federal judge, who, but for the congressional power of impeachment, holds a life tenure on his office.

The judge in question, Samuel B. Kent of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, has already pled guilty to obstruction of justice and has entered into and is residing in a Federal prison at this moment.

The Judiciary Committee's independent investigation, conducted admirably by a special task force established for that purpose and led by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), has concluded that the charge underlying that guilty plea is overwhelmingly borne out by the evidence, as are the related charges of repeated sexual assault against various court employees under his supervision.

Judge Kent's conduct is described in greater detail in the report filed by our committee, which voted unanimously 29–0 to recommend four articles of impeachment to the House. The court documents and other materials are available on the committee's Web site.

Of the three branches of government devised by the framers of our Constitution, only the judicial branch is insulated from the accountability of standing for election. This is by design. The other two branches, the legislative and the executive, are designed to be democratically responsible to the people, but the judicial branch is designed to be independent, to interpret the laws passed by the Congress without favor and without fear of political reprisal.

And so, article III, section 1 provides that Federal judges hold their offices during ''good behavior.'' And when a judge abuses his power, when by his conduct he proves himself unfit to hold his office, he cannot be turned out by the voters; instead, it falls to the Congress to ensure that the public trust of that office is protected through the power of impeachment.

Congress has used this power sparingly. In our Nation's history, only 13 Federal judges have been impeached, and even fewer convicted. Needless to say, the conduct at issue here is both shocking and shameful. In due course, many of the disturbing details of Judge Kent's appalling conduct will more than likely be revealed, but now I want to emphasize for the Members the following points:

The committee is recommending impeachment not merely on the fact that the judge has pleaded guilty and has been sentenced to prison; rather, it is his conduct—making false statements to his fellow judges in an official inquiry and sexually assaulting courthouse personnel—that the committee has independently determined to constitute high crimes and misdemeanors warranting his impeachment and removal from office.

The Judiciary Committee has determined overwhelmingly and unanimously, after most careful examination, that the judge's conduct plainly renders him unfit to remain a Federal judge.

Entrusted to use the power of his office to dispatch justice impartially, this judge abused his power blatantly, with partiality and favor, for his own personal gain. Entrusted to render justice, he has instead sought to evade it. Only Congress can remove Judge Kent from office. Until we do so, he will continue to draw a salary as a sitting Federal judge, even from his prison cell.

While the executive can prosecute him and the judiciary can impose punishment for his criminal conviction, only the Congress of the United States has the power to remove him from office, and that is our constitutional duty here today.

I bring this resolution to the floor with heavy regret that we are even called upon to take such action. But let it be clear, I have no doubt that this member of the judiciary must be removed from the office that he has so blatantly abused. The evidence is overwhelming and the grounds for impeachment perfectly clear. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider and vote on Articles of Impeachment following U.S. District Judge Samuel Kent's guilty plea and sentencing.

Judge Kent is a convicted felon who pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice and lying to a panel of his Federal judges who were investigating allegations that he sexually assaulted two women on his staff.

Following Judge Kent's guilty plea and sentencing, the House authorized the Judiciary Committee to undertake an inquiry into whether the House should impeach Judge Kent. Recently, the Impeachment Task Force of the Judiciary Committee heard testimony from two women whom Judge Kent sexually assaulted. Their testimony about Judge Kent's conduct was troubling, especially because Judge Kent abused his authority as a Federal judge to intimidate his staff into silence. Judge Kent has refused to appear before the committee. Judge Kent continues to abuse his position of authority by refusing to resign immediately. Instead, he sent a letter to President Obama tendering his resignation effective June 1, 2010.

Last Monday, Judge Kent reported to Federal prison to serve a 33-month prison sentence. By resigning effective June 1, 2010, Judge Kent is attempting to collect his full judicial salary for another year, even while he sits in prison. That's why we are here today, to take the next step to putting an end to Judge Kent's abusive authority and exploitation of American taxpayers.

On Wednesday, June 10, the Judiciary Committee unanimously approved four Articles of Impeachment against Judge Kent. Two of the articles relate to his sexual misconduct, and two of the articles relate to Judge Kent's lying about his conduct.

I am not unsympathetic to the claims that Judge Kent endured difficult personal tragedies and may suffer from mental illness; however, he does not have the right to continue to serve as a Federal judge and collect a taxpayer-funded salary while sitting in prison for felony obstruction of justice.

Judge Kent has remained on the bench long after he sexually assaulted two women and lied to law enforcement officials. It is now time for justice; justice for the American people who have been exploited by a judge who violated his oath of office and obstructed justice by lying, and justice for the victims who were subjected to abuse and humiliation.

Although his attorney claims that Congress has ''better things to do,'' ensuring that a Federal judge convicted of a felony does not receive a taxpayer-funded salary while sitting in jail is important to our system of justice and a priority of this Congress. Every day that Judge Kent remains on the bench is one day too long.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of these Articles of Impeachment to restore integrity to the Federal bench. And I hope the Senate will act quickly to ensure swift justice for Judge Kent, his victims, and the American people.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize one of our most distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee who headed the

task force for impeachment in our committee. ADAM SCHIFF has performed remarkably well. It is a bipartisan committee. And his former experience himself as an assistant U.S. attorney held him in very good stead.

I recognize the distinguished gentleman from California for 10 minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the great leadership of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Today we find ourselves in the regrettable circumstance where we must act to remove a Federal judge from the bench. The task before us is not one we welcome, but it is an important responsibility that has been entrusted to us by the Founders and one which we must not shrink from.

Throughout our Nation's history, we have been fortunate to have a distinguished judiciary that has served as an essential and coequal branch of our government. We owe a great deal to the success of our representative democracy to the positive, thoughtful, and vital role played by the Nation's judges. To insulate members of the bench from political and other pressures, to ensure that judges are free to determine the justice of the cases before them on the basis of the law alone and no outside influence, Federal judges are appointed for life.

Unlike elected officials, who may be removed periodically by the voters or serve a term that comes to an end, the Founding Fathers provided only one extraordinary method of removing a Federal judge, that of impeachment. The President cannot remove a judge he has appointed or any other, and the courts cannot. Conviction of a Federal or State offense is also powerless to remove a judge from office. Only the Congress may remove a judge and only then upon impeachment of the House under article I, section 2 of the Constitution and conviction in the Senate for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors justifying their removal.

Because we have been blessed by an extraordinarily professional judiciary and because the bar for removal is high, the extraordinary remedy of impeachment of a Federal judge has been used only 13 times in the Nation's history. But the matter before us today warrants its use once again.

Last month, the House Judiciary Task Force on Judicial Impeachment was directed to inquire whether Judge Kent should be impeached. As the chairman of the task force, I would like to report on our work and provide the Members of the House with a procedural history of the matter as well as an overview of the relevant facts. As a task force, we were extremely well-served by the very capable ranking member from Virginia, BOB GOODLATTE, and have worked to proceed in a fair, open, and deliberate manner, and we have done so on a bipartisan, really nonpartisan, basis.

Samuel Kent was appointed to the Federal bench in 1990 and served in the Galveston courthouse in the Southern District of Texas. During that time, he was generally the sole judicial officer in the courthouse, an imposing figure who exercised a substantial degree of influence and control both inside and outside of the courtroom.

At some point in 2001, Judge Kent began sexually assaulting at least two women employees who served in the courthouse. These repeated assaults occurred through at least May of 2007, when one of the victims, Cathy McBroom, filed a judicial misconduct complaint with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit alleging sexual misconduct on the part of Judge Kent. In response, the Judicial Council of that circuit appointed a Special Investigative Committee to investigate the complaint.

On June 8, 2007, Judge Kent, pursuant to his own request, was interviewed by the Special Investigative Committee of that circuit. They sought to learn from Judge Kent whether he had engaged in unwanted sexual contact with Ms. McBroom or others. During the interview, Judge Kent made material false statements about the extent of his nonconsensual contact with Ms. McBroom. He was also questioned about another female employee in the courthouse, his secretary Donna Wilkerson, and told the investigative committee that once Ms. Wilkerson informed him that his advances were unwelcome, no further sexual contact had occurred, when, in fact, he continued his nonconsensual sexual contacts with both Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson.

The Department of Justice commenced a criminal investigation relating to Judge Kent's conduct as well. In November 2007, Judge Kent asked for and was granted an interview with the FBI. During the voluntary interview that he had requested, he was asked about his alleged conduct and repeated the same material false statements he had made to the Fifth Circuit.

In August of 2008, Judge Kent, through his attorney, asked for a meeting at the Department of Justice. And at this meeting he sat down with his attorney, an FBI agent, and representatives of the Department of Justice, and again Judge Kent made material false statements about the nature and extent of his nonconsensual sexual contact with Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson.

Intimidated by Judge Kent and worried about losing her job, Ms. Wilkerson was not initially candid with investigators and law enforcement when questioned about Judge Kent's conduct towards her. In fact, it was not until her third grand jury appearance that Ms. Wilkerson was willing to reveal the full extent of sexual assault she endured from Judge Kent.

On August 28, a Federal grand jury returned a multi-count indictment against Judge Kent, and on January 6 the grand jury issued a superseding indictment against Judge Kent alleging counts of aggravated sexual abuse as well as obstruction of justice and abusive sexual contact.

On February 23, the day his criminal trial was set to begin, Judge Kent pled guilty to obstruction of justice. Pursuant to the plea agreement, Judge Kent knowingly, voluntarily, and truthfully admitted having nonconsensual sexual contact with both women and obstructing justice in his testimony before the Fifth Circuit investigative committee.

On May 11, Judge Kent was sentenced to a term of 33 months in prison and ordered to pay fines and restitution. Judge Kent began his term of incarceration on June 15, this past Monday.

The day after sentencing, the House of Representatives directed the Judiciary Committee Impeachment Task Force to inquire whether Judge Kent should be impeached, and the task force held an evidentiary hearing on June 3, receiving testimony from Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson as well as Professor Arthur Hellman, a judicial impeachment scholar. Professor Hellman provided expert testimony that concluded that making false statements to fellow judges, as well as abusing his power as a Federal judge to sexually assault women, were independent grounds that would justify and warrant Judge Kent's impeachment and removal from office.

The task force invited Judge Kent to testify, but he declined our offer. The task force received correspondence from Judge Kent that was made available to all Members and was entered into the RECORD. The task force also invited Judge Kent's counsel to participate in the hearing and present arguments on behalf of his client as well as to provide the opportunity to question any of the witnesses, and Judge Kent's counsel also declined to appear or participate.

Subsequently, Judge Kent's counsel sent a letter to the committee questioning the veracity of the women and making an extraordinary admission that their testimony was unnecessary because, quoting from the letter: Judge Kent's guilty plea to the felony of obstruction presents sufficient grounds for impeachment.

The task force also received a letter from Judge Kent to the White House, dated June 2, stating his intention to resign June 1 a year from now. But neither his surrender to custody nor his stated intention to resign a year from now affect his current status as a Federal judge or a constitutional obligation to determine whether impeachment is warranted.

Our proceeding today does not constitute a trial, as the constitutional power to try impeachment resides in the Senate; rather, the House's role is to inquire whether Judge Kent's conduct provides a sufficient basis for impeachment. According to leading commentators and historical precedent on

the issue, there are two broad categories of conduct that have been recognized as justifying impeachment: serious abuse of power and conduct that demonstrates an official is unworthy to fill the office that he or she holds.

Earlier this month, the Judicial Conference of the United States transmitted a certificate to the House certifying its determination that consideration of impeachment of Judge Kent may be warranted. After concluding that the full record establishes Judge Kent should be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, the House Judiciary Task Force met on June 9 and voted unanimously in favor of recommending four Articles of Impeachment, which have been read before the House today. On June 10, the House Judiciary Committee ordered H. Res. 520 favorably reported by a rollcall of 29–0.

Judge Kent, incident to his position as a U.S. district judge, engaged in deplorable conduct with respect to employees associated with the court. Such conduct is incompatible with the trust and confidence placed in him as a judge. In particular, the record demonstrates that Judge Kent sexually assaulted two women who were both employees of the court. Furthermore, Judge Kent corruptly obstructed, influenced, or impeded an official proceeding by making false statements to the Special Investigative Committee of the Fifth Circuit and again by making false material statements to agents of the FBI and Department of Justice.

These acts of sexual assault and obstruction of justice are, as the judge who sentenced Mr. Kent to incarceration stated, ''a stain on the justice system itself.'' Were the House of Representatives to sit idly by and allow Mr. Kent to continue to hold the office of U.S. district judge while sitting in prison, and after committing such high crimes and misdemeanors, it would be a stain on the Congress as well.

Judge Kent's conduct was a disgrace to the bench. That he would still cling to the bench from the confines of his prison cell and ask the public, whose trust he has already betrayed, to continue paying his salary demonstrates how little regard he has for the institution he was supposed to serve.

I urge the House to approve each of the four Articles of Impeachment set out in House Resolution 520.

Today, we find ourselves in the regrettable circumstance where we must act to remove a federal judge from the bench. The task before us is not one that we welcome, however, it is an important responsibility that has been entrusted to us by the Founders and one which we must not shrink from.

Throughout our nation's history, we have been fortunate to have a distinguished judiciary that has served as an essential and coequal branch of our government. We owe a great deal of the success of our representative democracy to the positive, thoughtful and vital role played by the nation's judges. To insulate members of the bench from political and other pressures, to insure that judges are free to determine the justice of the cases before them on the basis of the law alone and no outside influence, federal judges are appointed for life.

Unlike elected officials who may be removed periodically by the voters, or serve a term that comes to an end, the Founding Fathers provided only one extraordinary method of removing a federal judge—that of impeachment. The President cannot remove a judge he has appointed or any other, and the courts cannot—conviction of a federal or state offense is also powerless to remove a judge from his office. Only the Congress may remove a judge, and only then upon impeachment in the House under Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, and conviction in the Senate for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors justifying their removal.

Because we have been blessed by an extraordinarily professional judiciary, and because the bar for removal is high, the extraordinary remedy of impeachment of a federal judge has been used only 13 times in our nation's history. But the matter before us today warrants its use once again.

Last month, the House Judiciary Committee Task Force on Judicial Impeachment was directed by the House to inquire whether Judge Kent should be impeached. As Chairman of the Task Force, I'd like to report on our work and provide the Members of the House with the procedural history of this matter as well as an overview of the relevant facts. As a Task Force, we were extremely well served by the very capable Ranking Member from Virginia, BOB GOODLATTE, and have worked to proceed in a fair, open and deliberate manner, and we have done so on a bipartisan, really, nonpartisan basis.

Samuel B. Kent was appointed to the federal bench in 1990 and has served in the Galveston courthouse in the Southern District of Texas for most of his career. During that time, he was generally the sole judicial officer in the courthouse, an imposing figure who exercised a substantial degree of influence and control both inside and outside of his courtroom.

At some point in 2001, Judge Kent began sexually assaulting at least two women employees who served in his courthouse. These repeated sexual assaults occurred through at least May of 2007, when one of the victims, Cathy McBroom, filed a judicial misconduct complaint with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, alleging sexual misconduct on the part of Judge Kent. In response, the Judicial Council of the Fifth Circuit appointed a Special Investigative Committee to investigate Ms. McBroom's complaint.

On June 8, 2007, Judge Kent, pursuant to his own request, was interviewed by the Special Investigative Committee of that Circuit. The Investigative Committee sought to learn from Judge Kent whether he had engaged in unwanted sexual contact with Ms. McBroom or with others.

During the interview, Judge Kent made material and false statements about the extent of his non-consensual contact with Ms. McBroom; in fact, he had engaged in repeated non-consensual sexual contact with her. Judge Kent was also questioned about another female employee in the courthouse, his secretary Donna Wilkerson. He told the investigative committee that once Ms. Wilkerson informed him that his advances were unwelcome, no further sexual contact with her occurred, when in fact he continued his non-consensual contacts with Ms. Wilkerson as well.

On September 28, 2007, in an ''Order of Reprimand and Reasons'' signed by Chief Judge Edith Jones, the Judicial Council for the Fifth Circuit suspended Judge Kent with pay for four months and transferred him to Houston. The Order did not disclose the underlying findings of fact or conclusions by the Special Investigative Committee.

The Department of Justice then commenced a criminal investigation relating to Judge Kent's conduct. In November 2007, Judge Kent asked for and was granted an interview with Federal Bureau of Investigation law enforcement agents. During the voluntary interview that he had requested, he was asked about his alleged conduct and repeated the same material false statements that he made to the Fifth Circuit.

In August 2008, Judge Kent through his attorney asked for a meeting at the Department of Justice Headquarters in Washington, D.C. At this meeting, he sat down with his attorney, an FBI agent, and representatives from the Department of Justice. Judge Kent again made material false and misleading statements about the nature and extent of his nonconsensual sexual contact with Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson.

Intimidated by Judge Kent and worried about losing her job, Ms. Wilkerson was not initially candid with investigators and law enforcement when questioned about Judge Kent's conduct towards her. In fact, it was not until her third grand jury appearance, that Ms. Wilkerson was willing to reveal the full extent of sexual assaults she endured from Judge Kent.

On August 28, 2008, a federal grand jury returned a three-count indictment charging Judge Kent with two counts of abusive sexual contact against Ms. McBroom, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2244(b), and one count of attempted aggravated sexual abuse against Ms. McBroom, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2241(a)(1).

On January 6, 2009, the grand jury issued a superseding indictment that re-alleged the three counts involving Ms. McBroom and added three additional counts. Count four charged aggravated sexual abuse against Ms. Wilkerson in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2241(a)(1), a crime punishable by up to life in prison. Count five charged abusive sexual contact against Ms. McBroom in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2244(b).

Finally, the superseding indictment charged Judge Kent with Obstruction of Justice for corruptly obstructing, influencing, and impeding an official proceeding by making false statements to the Special Investigative Committee of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit regarding his unwanted sexual contact with Ms. Wilkerson.

On February 23, 2009, the day his criminal trial was set to begin, Judge Kent pled guilty to Obstruction of Justice. Pursuant to the plea agreement, Judge Kent knowingly, voluntarily, and truthfully admitted having nonconsensual sexual contact with both women, and obstructing justice by testifying otherwise before the Fifth Circuit Investigative Committee.

On May 11, 2009, Judge Kent was sentenced to a term of 33 months in prison and ordered to pay fines and restitution to Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson. Judge Kent began his term of incarceration on June 15th, this past Monday.

The day after his sentencing, the House of Representatives directed the House Judiciary

Committee Impeachment Task Force to inquire whether Judge Kent should be impeached. On June 3, 2009, the Task Force on Judicial Impeachment held an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Judge Kent's conduct provides a sufficient basis for impeachment and to develop a record upon which to recommend Articles of Impeachment to the House Judiciary Committee.

The Task Force received testimony from Ms. McBroom, Ms. Wilkerson, and Professor Arthur Hellman, a judicial impeachment scholar from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law. Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson both testified that they were sexually assaulted by Judge Kent on a number of occasions, and detailed several of these incidents for the Task Force.

Professor Hellman provided expert testimony that concluded that making false statements to fellow judges, as well as abusing his power as a federal judge to sexually assault women, were independent grounds that would justify and warrant Judge Kent's impeachment and removal from office.

The Task Force invited Judge Kent to testify, but he declined our offer. The Task Force received correspondence from Judge Kent that was made available to all Members and entered into the record. The Task Force also invited Judge Kent's counsel to participate in the hearing and present arguments on behalf of his client, as well as to provide the opportunity to question any of the witnesses. Judge Kent's counsel also declined to appear or participate in the hearing.

Subsequently, Judge Kent's counsel sent a letter to the Committee. The letter questioned the veracity of the two women, citing an anonymous caller at length and claiming there are other witnesses who contradict the two women. The letter also made the extraordinary admission that their testimony was unnecessary because, quoting from the letter, ''Judge Kent's guilty plea to the felony of Obstruction presents sufficient grounds for impeachment.''

The Task Force also received a letter from Judge Kent to the White House, dated June 2, 2009, stating his intention to resign effective June 1, 2010, a year from now. Neither his surrender to custody, nor his stated intention to resign a year from now, affect his current status as a federal judge or our constitutional obligation to determine whether impeachment is warranted.

Article III, Section 1 provides that ''The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.''

Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution provides that ''all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.''

Our proceeding today does not constitute a trial, as the constitutional power to try impeachment resides in the Senate. Rather, the House's role is to inquire whether Judge Kent's conduct provides a sufficient basis for impeachment.

According to leading commentators and historical precedent on this issue, there are two broad categories of conduct that have been recognized as justifying impeachment: serious abuse of power, and conduct that demonstrates that an official is ''unworthy to fill'' the office that he or she holds.

The House Report accompanying the 1989 Resolution to Impeach Judge Walter Nixon summarized historical precedents that inform the meaning of the term ''high crimes and misdemeanors'' stating that, ''Congress has repeatedly defined 'other high crimes and misdemeanors' to be serious violations of the public trust, not necessarily indictable offenses under criminal laws. Of course, in some circumstances the conduct at issue . . . constituted conduct warranting both punishment under the criminal laws and impeachment.'' The Report concluded, ''When a judge's conduct calls into question his or her integrity or impartiality, Congress must consider whether impeachment and removal of the judge from office is necessary to protect the integrity of the judicial branch and uphold the public trust.''

Earlier this month, the Judicial Conference of the United States unanimously transmitted a Certificate to the House of Representatives, certifying to the House its determination that consideration of impeachment of Judge Kent may be warranted. The certificate concludes that ''Judge Kent's conduct and felony conviction . . . have brought disrepute to the Judiciary.''

After concluding that the full record establishes that Judge Kent should be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, the House Judiciary Impeachment Task Force met on June 9th and unanimously voted in favor of recommending four Articles of Impeachment for consideration by the House Judiciary Committee.

These four Articles were subsequently introduced in the House in the form of House Resolution 520. Article I focuses on Judge Kent's sexual assault of Ms. McBroom. Article II Article focuses on Judge Kent's sexual assault of Ms. Wilkerson.

Article III focuses on Judge Kent's obstruction of justice by making false statements during an official proceeding of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals regarding his unwanted sexual contact with Donna Wilkerson.

Article IV focuses on Judge Kent's material false and misleading statements about the nature and extent of his non-consensual sexual contact with both women to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to representatives of the Department of Justice on two separate occasions.

On June 10th, the House Judiciary Committee ordered H. Res. 520 favorably reported by a roll call vote of 29–0.

Judge Kent, incident to his position as a U.S. district court judge, engaged in deplorable conduct with respect to employees associated with the court. Such conduct is incompatible with the trust and confidence placed in him as a judge. In particular, the record demonstrates that Judge Kent sexually assaulted two women who were both employees of the court. Furthermore, Judge Kent corruptly obstructed, influenced, or impeded an official proceeding when he made false statements to the Special Investigative Committee of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Finally, the record demonstrates that Judge Kent made material false and misleading statements about the nature and extent of his non-consensual sexual contact with Ms. McBroom and Ms. Wilkerson to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to representatives of the Department of Justice.

These acts of sexual assault and obstruction of justice are, as the judge who sentenced Mr. Kent to incarceration stated, ''a stain on the justice system itself.'' Were the House of Representatives to sit idly by and allow Mr. Kent to continue to hold the office of U.S. District Judge while sitting in prison, and after committing such high crimes and misdemeanors, it would be a stain on the Congress as well.

Judge Kent's conduct was a disgrace to the bench. That he would still cling to the bench from the confines of his prison cell, and ask the public whose trust he has already betrayed to continue paying his salary, demonstrates how little regard he has for the institution he was to supposed serve. I urge the House to approve each of the four Articles of Impeachment set out in House Resolution 520.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the ranking member of the Impeachment Task Force.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's a rare occasion when the House of Representatives must vote on Articles of Impeachment against a Federal judge. Indeed, the last time this occurred was 20 years ago. However, when evidence emerges that an individual is abusing his judicial office for his own advantage, the integrity of the judicial system becomes compromised, and the House of Representatives has the duty to investigate the matter and take the appropriate actions to end the abuse and restore confidence in the judicial system.

It is also rare for the members of the House Judiciary Committee to agree on anything. However, the committee voted unanimously last week to report out House Resolution 520, which contains the four Articles of Impeachment against Judge Kent. This vote came after a thorough investigation and much work by the Task Force on Judicial Impeachment. Specifically, the task force conducted an investigation of Judge Kent's conduct, which included working with the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Fifth Judicial Circuit. The task force also conducted an investigatory hearing on the matter, at which two court employees who were victimized by Judge Kent testified about the extent of his sexual abuse. At that same hearing, we heard from a constitutional scholar who testified that Judge Kent's misconduct rises to the level of impeachable offenses. It is important to note that Judge Kent was invited to testify at the hearing. His attorney was also invited to testify and participate in the hearing. Both declined to attend.

As you have already heard in statements today and as you have already seen in the Judiciary Committee report, Judge Samuel Kent's misconduct merits the serious step of issuing Articles of Impeachment. The evidence also shows that he lied to the FBI and the

Department of Justice about the nature of his sexual misconduct with court employees. In addition, he pled guilty to felony obstruction of justice and to committing repeated acts of nonconsensual sexual contact with court employees. He was sentenced to 33 months in prison for committing felony obstruction of justice, and this past Monday he reported to prison and began his prison term.

However, because the Constitution provides that Federal judges are appointed for life, Samuel Kent, despite the fact that he is sitting in prison, continues to collect his taxpayer-funded salary of approximately $174,000 per year, continues to collect his taxpayer-funded health insurance benefits, and continues to accrue his taxpayer-funded pension.

This is the first time that a Federal judge has pled guilty to a felony, has reported to prison, and has still not resigned from his office. This shows how deep Judge Kent's audacity truly runs. In fact, Judge Kent even took the step of sending a letter to the President explaining that he intends to resign 1 year from now. However, this purported resignation is not worth the paper it is written on because nothing would prevent Judge Kent from withdrawing his resignation at any time before the expiration of the year. What it really amounts to is an attempt to extort hundreds of thousands of dollars from the American people.

It is not a pleasant task to impeach a Federal judge; yet when a judge so clearly abuses his office, it becomes necessary to take the appropriate action in order to restore the confidence of the American people in their judicial system. The Constitution gives the House of Representatives the power and responsibility to impeach Federal judges. It is my strong recommendation that the Members of the House adopt these Articles of Impeachment against Judge Kent. It is my hope that the United States Senate will then act to swiftly bring this matter to trial and quick disposition.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank ADAM SCHIFF, the chairman of the Task Force on Judicial Impeachment, for his leadership in this effort, along with all the members of the task force on both sides of the aisle. As ranking member of the task force, I appreciate the fact that this effort has been undertaken in an extremely nonpartisan fashion. And I would also like to thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH for their comprehensive yet expeditious and bipartisan consideration of these Articles of Impeachment in the full Judiciary Committee.

□ 1400

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now to recognize for 5 minutes the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee who served on the task force with great skill, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE from Houston, Texas, who has been an anchor in the proceedings that have brought us to this stage. I also want to commend BOB GOODLATTE for his services during that period of time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think it is important for all of us to recognize the solemnity of this day, and I thank the managers and the task force members that I believe worked in that spirit.

As I come from Texas and Houston, I think it is important to note that the judge, as all people may have in America, has his defenders; and he will have an opportunity for those defenders to continue to raise their voice and to continue to emphasize their beliefs. As my colleague from Texas indicated, he had debilitating conditions, and he had faced tragedy. And so that should be recognized.

But I believe what I've come to acknowledge on the floor of the House and, in fact, I am coming to acknowledge is that there is the responsibility constitutionally to follow the law. So article II, section 4, in fact, says that we are to proceed with impeachment specifically if civil officers have engaged in partly or been convicted of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors. Specifically in count six of the plea agreement, we find language that says that this judge willingly agreed that he had obstructed justice. He admitted to falsely stating to the Special Investigative Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, lying to an official judicial body that the extent of his unwanted sexual contact with person B was one kiss, and that when told by person B his advances were unwelcomed, he then further said they were consensual; and that is to block person A from coming forward or having any veracity or anyone to back up what that person has said. I use A and B because I want to, again, respect that these are more than troubling comments and actions against two women who deserve to have a safe and secure workplace.

Then article III indicates that judges must hold their position and they must, in essence, be persons of good behavior. To create a workplace that does not allow the safety and security of your employee and, in particular, witness A and B, that poses a serious problem. So I am interested in making sure that we track the constitutional roadmap that we are now in and that we are aware of the fact that we can track the constitutional provisions and, in essence, say that this judge is not of good behavior. He now sits incarcerated. He has been convicted of a felony. The felony is obstruction of justice, and he did it knowingly.

I would like a moment to just say that in the proceedings where he had to proceed with his plea, the court specifically said, ''You have the right to persist in the prior plea of not guilty that you have entered in this case. And in that event, the burden is entirely upon this government to prove your guilt''—you don't have to go forward with this—''to a jury's satisfaction with proof beyond a reasonable doubt, which is a very high standard of proof.

''And under the law and the Constitution''—to the judge who was standing there—''you are presumed innocent,'' which means you do not have to prove your innocence or prove anything at all, meaning that the judge was questioned on his plea that involved the obstruction of justice, misrepresenting and denying witness A, who has alleged of his activities with her and person B, that everything was consensual and that person A is not telling the truth. He did not have to proceed.

And so the court says, ''However, if I accept your guilty plea this morning, each of those rights will be denied.''

And after the defendant said, ''Yes, sir,'' the court proceeded and said, ''And knowing that, is it your intent to enter a plea of guilty this morning to this charge?'' The defendant answered, ''Yes, sir.'' That was, in essence, a plea to the felony of obstructing justice.

Sad as it may be, as we proceed to the constitutional procedure of the voting here and then a trial in the Senate, it lays down the framework that we must act. We have no inability to ignore it. We must act. High crimes and misdemeanors, worthy behavior, all of them have been counted by a willing expression of this individual, this judge, that he has committed this offense.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is crucial that we proceed in moving on the articles of impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Impeachment Task Force of the House Judiciary Committee, I rise today in support of a recommendation for impeachment of Judge Samuel B. Kent. First and foremost it is necessary to establish the legal authority of Congress to make impeachment determinations. The Constitution clearly places many of the operations of the Judiciary under the oversight of Congress—a power not granted reciprocally to the Judiciary. This is made clear in the Federalist Papers (described by James Madison as "the most authentic exposition of the heart of the federal Constitution"), which confirm that subjugating the Judiciary to Congress was deliberate and intentional. Federalist #51 declares: "the legislative authority necessarily predominates."

Furthermore, Federalist #49 declares that Congress—not the Court—is "the confidential guardians of [the people's] rights and liberties." Why? Because the Legislature—not the unelected judiciary—is closest to the people and most responsive to them. When the Court did claim that it is the only body capable of interpreting the Constitution—that Congress is incapable of determining constitutionality, the Founding Fathers vehemently disagreed. For example, James Madison declared: "[T]he meaning of the Constitution may as well be ascertained by the Legislative as by the Judicial authority."

After establishing that the Congress has jurisdiction to preside over impeachment proceedings, it is imperative to outline the legal

standard for impeachment. Article II, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution delineates the standard for removal from office of all civil officers by stating that: ''The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.''

The Constitutional Standard is further buttressed by the intent behind Article II, Section 4. The Founders' intent for impeachment was to protect the fundamental principle of ''the consent of the governed.'' The Constitution carries no title but ''We the People,'' and impeachment removes from office those officials who ignore that standard of adhering to the values of the people—that sexual abuse and pleading to a felony is not good behavior. It is important to note that the Constitution does not guarantee a federal judge his position for life, but only for the duration of ''good behavior'' (Art. III, Sec. 1).

For this reason impeachment was used whenever judges disregarded public interests, affronted the will of the people, or introduced arbitrary power by seizing the role of policymaker. Previous generations used this tool far more frequently than today's generation; and because the grounds for impeachment were deliberately kept broad, articles of impeachment have described everything from drunkenness and profanity to judicial high-handedness and bribery as reasons for removal from the bench. Historically speaking, sixty-one federal judges or Supreme Court Justices have been investigated for impeachment; of whom thirteen have been impeached and seven convicted. The noted legal scholar from Yale University Professor Charles Black writes in his Impeachment Handbook that, ''In the English practice from which the Framers borrowed the phrase, 'High Crimes and Misdemeanors' denoted political offenses, the critical element of which was injury to the state. Impeachment was intended to redress public offenses committed by public officials in violation of the public trust and duties, offenses against the Constitution itself. In short, only 'serious assaults on the integrity of the processes of government,' constitute impeachable offenses.''

One of our Founding Fathers, Alexander Hamilton, wrote in the Federalist Papers No. 65 that, ''Those [impeachable] offences which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or, [in] other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which . . . relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to society itself.''

As Hamilton makes clear, criminal conduct alone was and is not enough. The conduct also should involve public office. That should be the standard here as we proceed. Given the context of the Constitutional standard for impeachment coupled with the intent of the Framers, the issue at hand is whether Judge Kent's conduct constitutes high Crimes and Misdemeanors, within the framework of the Constitution. On review of the facts, we find that Judge Kent's obstruction of justice charge based on providing testimony to the FBI and the DOJ on the nature and extent of his relationships with his former employees while the Judge was in office, does in fact meet the standard of high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Furthermore, Judge Kent's felony conviction for obstruction of justice raises issues of fitness to the bench. While Judge Kent's felony conviction on its face satisfies the Constitutional standard of impeachment, the numerous allegations of sexual misconduct on behalf of the Judge made by former employees continue to call into question Judge Kent's fitness for Office.

Pursuant to witness testimony the Impeachment Task Force heard from Cathy McBroom, Former Case Manager for Judge Kent, Ms. McBroom recounted over ten episodes of sexual misconduct she experienced while working for Judge Kent. Ms. McBroom noted that Judge Kent's physical presence was imposing at 6′4″, 260 pounds, and coupled with his frequent self-references to his power, this made it difficult for her to believe that she would be able to prove the Judge's misconduct and successfully pursue outside employment in the Galveston legal community.

Donna Wilkerson, Judge Kent's former Legal Secretary also testified before the Task Force. Wilkerson stated that during her tenure as Kent's legal secretary, she suffered seven years of psychological abuse and sexual misconduct. Wilkerson noted that each episode of sexual misconduct always took place in the office, and seemed to follow lengthy lunches where the Judge returned to work intoxicated.

While the issue of Judge Kent's possible alcohol dependency and the condition of his mental health may be mitigating factors in this Committee's impeachment determination, the real issue is whether Judge Kent is fit for the position he holds. Accordingly, the conduct of Judge Kent while in office as 5th Circuit Court Judge of Galveston, Texas yields him unfit for office under constitutional standards.

Kent did submit a letter to President Obama and to our Task Force requesting permission for withdrawal from the bench one calendar year from now. Pursuant to Judge Kent's felony charge, it would not be appropriate for him to collect a salary and pension over the course of the next year. Additionally, under the guidelines of Judge Kent's proposal, his withdrawal from office would not go into effect until the day of the withdrawal, which means that Kent's decision to remove himself from office would be revocable at any time up until the final date of withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, it pains me to take action against a member of the bench from my own state, but the Constitution imposes upon us a duty that we must uphold. As such, on the issue of whether Judge Kent's conduct constitutes high Crimes and Misdemeanors, I believe that all of us should agree that he has. Given our Constitutional duty, I urge my colleagues to support this extremely important and difficult decision of impeachment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a member of the Impeachment Task Force and also a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to demand a division of the question so as to result in a separate vote on each of the four articles of impeachment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is divisible and will be divided for the vote by article.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, both the Impeachment Task Force and the Judiciary Committee unanimously adopted and reported out House Resolution 520. The overwhelming support for this resolution is indicative of the weight of the evidence supporting the four articles of impeachment against Judge Samuel B. Kent. A Federal grand jury indicted Judge Kent on five counts of sexual assault involving two of his female court employees and one count of obstruction of justice.

In February of this year Judge Kent pleaded guilty to count six of the superseding indictment, obstruction of justice, pursuant to a plea agreement. As a part of the plea agreement, the government agreed to dismiss the remaining five counts at sentencing. At that time I called on Judge Kent to resign and stated that I would introduce articles of impeachment upon his sentencing in May if he did not resign. On May 11, 2009, Judge Kent was sentenced to 33 months in prison. On May 12 I introduced the first resolution calling for Judge Kent's impeachment.

Judge Kent tried to use his knowledge to work the system by requesting a waiver for disability retirement. In February I wrote the court, asking it to carefully consider all of the particulars concerning Judge Kent's request. On May 27, Fifth Circuit Chief Judge Edith Hollan Jones denied Judge Kent's request. The Impeachment Task Force held an evidentiary hearing where both victims of Judge Kent testified as witnesses. In addition to the two victims, Alan Baron, the lead task force attorney, provided an overview of the investigation. As a part of his statement, he identified and introduced into the record a number of documents. University of Pittsburgh Professor Arthur Hellman provided expert testimony that concluded that Judge Kent's conduct in making false statements to fellow judges, and thereby obstructing justice, as well as abusing his power as a Federal judge to sexually assault women employees, constituted independent grounds to justify his impeachment and removal from office. The task force afforded Judge Kent and his counsel unlimited opportunity to participate exhaustively in the hearing. However, both Judge Kent and his counsel declined our invitation. After this objective and definitive review of the facts, the weight of the evidence against Judge Kent was substantial enough that it became quite obvious that he should not remain a Federal judge.

Articles I and II of the articles of impeachment reflect the improper conduct made by Judge Kent toward two of his court employees. On numerous occasions he sexually assaulted the two female court employees by touching their private areas and attempting to engage each woman in a sexual act with him. Article III is an article that incorporates some of the false or misleading statements made by Judge Kent to investigators and the grand jury. It notes that he corruptly obstructed, influenced, or impeded an official proceeding. Our hearing and the record we have compiled produces clear

and convincing evidence that Judge Kent lied to law enforcement authorities during the investigation as well as to the Federal grand jury. Article IV alleges that Judge Kent made material false and misleading statements about the nature and extent of his nonconsensual sexual contact with the victims to FBI agents and representatives of the Department of Justice.

Our purpose for being here today is not to punish Judge Kent. Our purpose is to ensure the integrity of the Federal judiciary. Impeachment is invoked only when the conduct erodes the public's confidence in government. Judge Kent has clearly violated the public's trust and dishonored his role. Judge Samuel B. Kent, who by his own admission obstructed justice to cover his own misdeeds, cannot remain a Federal judge. He is the first judge in the history of our Republic to plead guilty to a felony and refuse to promptly resign his seat on the bench. Other judges have been convicted of crimes and refused to resign, but never has one pled guilty and attempted to stay on the bench. To permit him to retain his position would inflict grievous and, indeed, irreparable damage to the Federal judiciary and, I submit, to the Congress as well.

There are two basic questions in connection with this impeachment. First, does the conduct alleged in the four articles of impeachment state an impeachable offense? Absolutely and without question, it does. The articles allege misconduct that is criminal and wholly inconsistent with judicial integrity and the judicial oath. Clearly, everyone would agree that a judge who lies to a judicial body investigating his conduct or who deceives Federal investigators by lying in an interview is not fit to remain on the bench.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield the gentleman 30 additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The second question is, did the conduct occur? The simple fact that Judge Kent pled guilty confirms that the conduct did, in fact, occur. Today he is sitting in Federal prison, collecting a paycheck from the taxpayers. He is not fit to sit upon the Federal judiciary, and we must perform our constitutional duty to impeach him.

Support House Resolution 520. Send the judge to the Senate for a trial.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize for 3 minutes a former magistrate himself, HANK JOHNSON of Georgia, who is Chair of the Courts Subcommittee and an important member of the task force that was headed by Chairman ADAM SCHIFF.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is not a happy day anytime we have to take this type of solemn action.

I first want to thank my chairman, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS from Michigan, who is the Chair of the Judiciary Committee, for his promptness and his diligence in bringing this matter to us as soon as humanly possible. And we're at this point now because of the chairman. I also want to recognize our colleague Mr. ADAM SCHIFF who, having been entrusted by the leadership to bring this to the floor, has performed admirably. And I lastly want to thank Ms. Cathy McBroom and Ms. Donna Wilkerson. These are the two ladies that took the covers off of this egregious behavior by Judge Kent. The integrity of our judiciary is fundamental to the functioning of our legal system. Judge Samuel Kent's egregious behavior leaves no doubt that he is not fit to remain a judge.

□ 1415

Can you imagine having to go to work every day, having to go back to your job after a weekend, and you know that at any time or any day that you could be subjected to sexual misconduct by your boss? And you have a great Federal job, you need your job for your family, so you just endure it for year after year after year, until it gets to a point where you have to file a complaint and subject all of your personal affairs to the Nation. It took a lot of courage for them to do that, and I appreciate that. I want to apologize on behalf of all males for them having to go through that.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a situation where the judge has committed sexual abuse repeatedly. He has lied about it. He has pleaded guilty to the felony charge of obstruction.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. He lied about it, and he admitted that he was in fact guilty of the sexual abuse.

So this is what we call a slam dunk. There is no reason for this judge to remain on the bench. He should have resigned, but he didn't have the decency to do that, so now we must do what we must do.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on the impeachment.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), a member of the Impeachment Task Force and a former attorney general of the State of California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, article III, section 1 of the Constitution, in describing lifetime tenure of Federal judges, uses these words: ''The judges shall hold their offices during good behavior.'' That is the starting point of our inquiry here in this impeachment.

When you look at article II, section 4, talking about impeachment, it says, ''The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.''

Some people mistakenly believe that you need a criminal conviction as a condition precedent to us acting. That is not true and has never been true. In this particular case we do have a criminal conviction. But the Articles of Impeachment go beyond that to some of the underlying facts, specifically with respect to the sexual assault performed by this judge, Judge Kent.

The question before us is whether or not he is fit for office. The answer seems to be obvious. One who would use their office in this way to commit sexual assault is unfit for any office, but particularly that of a Federal judge. Why do I say that? Because they are given lifetime tenure, and in this circumstance he was the sole judicial officer in this courthouse.

Interestingly, now he says to us we should have some sympathy for him and extend him some mercy because he had no peers to speak with, anybody he could talk with about the serious problems in his life.

The very fact that he was the only judicial officer in that courthouse gave him enormous power, which he repeated to his victims on more than one occasion, saying he was the law, he was the judge. In other words, he had what I refer to as a reign of judicial terror or tyranny over these individuals, utilizing his power as a Federal judge to misuse that power in such a way to put these women in a situation where they thought they had nowhere to turn. Just based on that, he ought to be removed from office.

I should say to our colleagues who are watching in their offices right now, a simple review of the report presented by this committee will show sufficient evidence to justify every single article. We will vote on every single article in this House, as we have always done, and it is important for us to do that so that when we go to the Senate, they have the opportunity to review each single article of impeachment.

This is extremely important, not just for Judge Kent, not just for his employees, who have suffered unnecessarily, but for the entire judicial system.

For us to tarry a single day is to do injustice. This judge is now receiving, as has been said, his salary as a sitting judge while he sits incarcerated in a Federal institution of confinement. What arrogance. And if we do not act, we are letting the word go out that we, the only branch of government that is enabled by the Constitution to act in these circumstances, do not take our constitutional obligation seriously.

We cannot resist acting here and we cannot resist asking the Senate to act as expeditiously as possible. This Federal judge has demeaned his office, has demeaned this country, has demeaned his oath of office and the Constitution itself, and we need now to act. We have sufficient evidence presented on this record for all Members to vote in favor of each and every article of impeachment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the task force and also the Chair of the Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, the chairman of the task force, the ranking member of the committee, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

This unquestionably has the facts that are obvious for this House to vote for impeachment. This judge has abused his office and justice by pleading guilty to obstruction of justice, committing obstruction of justice and lying to an official panel, and has taken an action upon his employees and his position, women, that is an affront to all women in this country. And these are actions that are high crimes and misdemeanors worthy of the vote of impeachment. That is unquestioned.

But what is particularly impressive to me is the procedure that this House has acted in and the speed to make sure that the public Treasury and the public trust are protected.

This man does not deserve his pay. He does not deserve his position. He does not deserve his pension. For he has shamed the country, the Judiciary, and been offensive toward people and good conduct, and for those reasons it is important that this House act, that the Senate have the opportunity to try this man, and to protect the public Treasury and the public good.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Impeachment Task Force and a former district judge from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the leadership and the very responsible conduct of the chairman of the task force, ADAM SCHIFF, for having done an exemplary job in moving this along and bringing it to a head as quickly as could have humanly been done, and to Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH. We have worked together on this because it is a very serious matter when our Federal courts are held in less than high esteem.

We have a Federal judge, as has already been mentioned, who pled guilty to obstruction of justice. He admitted to nonconsensual sexual acts. We have the transcript from the Federal court hearings in which there is actual specificity of misrepresentations. We also can take judicial notice of his orders and opinions that he wrote himself.

It is very clear that, as some of the witnesses testified, he was arrogant, he was a bully. That is not enough to impeach someone or remove them from office, but certainly obstruction of justice would be under the circumstances here.

What I found particularly offensive beyond the obstruction were the games that were played by this judge with this body. Here the day before we were having our hearing of the task force, we get a resignation letter dated June 2, 2009, addressed to the President, saying, ''I hereby resign from my position as United States district judge for the Southern District of Texas effective June 1, 2010,'' a year away, a resignation that could be withdrawn at any time before it became effective.

Now, we heard testimony from the witnesses that this judge was particularly manipulative, and that is how he was able to continue the nonconsensual sexual assaults over and over, because he was so manipulative. They were afraid of losing their jobs, and it was clear that he had said, I am the king, and it is good to be king.

It is good to be king, unless you are committing crimes and misusing the office to which you were entrusted.

But the resignation letter would just be a resignation, if it were sincere. But then we got another letter before our final hearing before the committee asking that it be taken into consideration that he had these problems and he needed his salary and his medical and he was trying to pay medical bills of his late wife. Ironically, he wasn't quite as concerned for his late wife when he was groping and manipulating and bullying people within his trust and care as a Federal judge.

We heard testimony that if someone had come before his court and used the same reasons that he gave as to why he ought to keep getting his salary, that he would not only have not been moved to sympathy, he would have been moved to anger and would have taken it out on the defendant.

So even at this late date, there is no evidence of contriteness. There is no evidence of remorse, other than being caught. There is more manipulation, which makes clear all the more that he should not have his request granted that he be paid as a Federal judge while he is sitting in prison for committing crimes while he was getting paid to be a Federal judge.

Let's bring this to an end and vote for the impeachment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the deputy ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and also a former district judge from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think a little history is in order here, because only Congress can remove a Federal judge. It is part of the checks and balances in our Constitution. It prevents the executive who doesn't like what a judge is doing from taking that person out of office. It prevents other judges in the United States in the judicial branch from removing a judge when they don't like that judge's opinion. That is our duty today, to resolve this issue.

Over my career, I have been somewhat critical of Federal judges, but the reason is because of a philosophical difference sometimes with interpretation of the Constitution and constitutional law.

□ 1430

For the most part, most of our judges, the hundreds that serve all over the United States in the third branch of government, have the utmost integrity and demeanor. In our judicial branch, I would hope we would always have the best legal minds on the bench, not the best legal minds that appear before the bench as attorneys. Unfortunately, that's not universally true, because our Federal judges are underpaid. The lawyers that appear before them, for the most part, make more than the Federal judges. But they serve, not because of money. They serve because of their pride and belief in our Constitution and public service.

Judge Kent is the exception to this rule. We are past the stage of allegations because he made admissions against his own interest in a court of law sufficient to convict him of a felony to the degree it is an abuse of office, abuse of duty, while serving on the bench in a courtroom. That basically is the end of the story. It is a felony. It is a high crime and misdemeanor. He's in prison, and his actions since his conviction show a haughty spirit and a total disregard for his conduct.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States, we don't pay Federal judges to go to the penitentiary. He should be impeached today by this body.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank all of those who volunteered on this task force for impeachment. And I especially want to thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH for pulling this together in their professional fashion and the people on our side of the aisle and Mr. SCHIFF from California who has taken to conduct himself, I think, with a solid degree of professionalism throughout these proceedings.

And I'm very well aware, Mr. Speaker, that this is a rare and extraordinary step that this Congress is taking, and that this is a serious moment. And when I read through this report that's been produced by the task force that pulled together the data in a compressed fashion, it is appalling to me that this could have gone on as long as it did.

But I will say, when the conviction came down and the sentence was made, the 33 months in the Federal penitentiary to Judge Kent, this Congress acted immediately and quickly and did so in a bipartisan fashion to do our constitutional duty, and brought this through the hearing and committee action to this floor and, with urgency, is ready to send it over to the United States Senate, whom I believe will act also immediately with dispatch.

And as I look at this, I see this as an abuse, as arbitrary power. The high

crime and misdemeanor that we're talking about is sexual abuse of subordinates, and the arbitrary power of using the official oppression of the power of his office and the threat of removing them from their jobs if they raised a voice, and also the threat that no one would believe them because he had manipulated the others around him and, to some degree, I believe that is true.

So it's essential that we take this extraordinary step, Mr. Speaker, and I am gratified that this Congress has acted immediately, pulled themselves together to take this action in a bipartisan fashion in a solidly constitutional fashion. We have, I think, added to today and will continue to add to the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors, and further put into the RECORD a solid foundation, and send a warning out to other judges that might think they could abuse this power.

So I urge adoption of this language that's here, and I commend my colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN, who is also a member of the Homeland Security Committee.

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. This judge should be, and I think will be, impeached with this resolution. And it's about time for this body to do its constitutional authority, to be a check on judges. Unfortunately, this Congress has not fulfilled its constitutional authority in many instances.

Article I, section 1, sentence 1 says, all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

We have had a perversion of the Constitution by both administrations of both parties in the Presidency, as well as by Congress. The Constitution has been perverted. We all swear to uphold the Constitution against enemies, both foreign and domestic. We've got a lot of domestic enemies of the constitution, and I think enough is enough.

Under the Constitution, in the writings of our Founding Fathers in the Federalist Papers, including the first U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice, they very clearly delineated what they meant for the Constitution to mean. And it's time that we, as Congress, took our rightful places, being the strongest power of the Federal Government, to stop this spending, to stop the destruction of our children's and grandchildren's future.

I rise in support of the resolution.

This afternoon . . . the House of Representatives will exercise one of the great checks and balances built into the United States Constitution . . . the power to impeach.

Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution gives the House of Representatives the sole power of impeachment.

Article 2, Section 4 of the Constitution lays out the criteria for who can be impeached and for what offenses . . . It specifies that—"the President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for . . . and conviction of . . . treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

These "civil officers" include federal judges and cabinet members.

The serious nature of impeachment is evident as the House of Representatives has only moved to impeach 18 officials in more than two centuries . . . This includes two presidents . . . one cabinet member . . . one senator . . . and 13 judges—not including today's proceedings.

Judge Samuel B. Kent . . . of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas . . . has pled guilty to unwanted, non-consensual sexual contact with two employees . . . testifying falsely before a special investigative committee of the federal judiciary . . . and making false statements to the Department of Justice.

His crimes certainly fit the high standard for impeachment that our Founding Fathers intended . . . I applaud the members of the Judiciary Committee on both sides of the aisle for exercising their Constitutional duty and moving this to the full House for a vote.

When thinking about today's historic action . . . I also think about how far Congress and the Federal Government have strayed from what our Founding Fathers intended.

One only needs to read the historic Federalists Papers . . . written by three of the most prominent authors of our U.S. Constitution including the very first U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice . . . to understand that our Founding Fathers intended Congress to be the strongest and most powerful of the three branches of government.

Yet, too often in this modern era . . . we the Congress . . . have abdicated our power to legislate . . . allowing the Judicial and Executive branches to greatly expand their roles far beyond what the framers of our Constitution ever intended . . . all while taking liberty away from the American people.

Today, the Executive and Judicial Branches are sadly doing the job of the Legislative Branch . . . regardless of which party sits in the White House or in the Speaker's chair.

President George W. Bush went forward with the auto bailout despite Congress's clear opposition . . . President Barack Obama has created numerous unconstitutional "Czars" with massive power once reserved for Senate-confirmed officials.

Executive Orders were once rarely used . . . but today they have become the norm for Presidents to bypass Congress and judicial review.

And today, our federal benches are filled with judicial activists who are hell-bent on legislating from the bench.

When is this madness going to end?

When is this body . . . the United States Congress . . . going to reclaim the power the Constitution has given this institution . . . intended to protect the liberties of the American people?

Today we are exercising our Constitutional authority to remove a judge who clearly is not fit to serve. But this should also serve as a wake-up call to this legislative body that our work should not stop with just this one vote.

We must continue to bring accountability to those who violate their constitutionally-permitted responsibilities. . . . Those who legislate from the bench . . . without regard to the will of the people . . . Those who by-pass the Congress to institute policy.

As our Nation's first President once said: "Government is not reason, nor eloquence . . . It is force . . . And like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearsome master."

Today, we may use force to impeach . . . But we should constantly remind ourselves that this Nation sits on the precipice . . . looking to us for direction.

I urge my colleagues to not only support this resolution to impeach Judge Kent . . . I also urge them to take this opportunity to reflect on where we are headed as a legislative body . . . to stand up and take back the authority granted by the U.S. Constitution on behalf of the American people we represent.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, never before has a Federal judge pled guilty to a felony, gone to jail, and refused to resign immediately from the bench.

In a clear attempt to get every penny possible from American taxpayers, Judge Kent, who pled guilty to obstruction of justice and is currently in prison serving a 33-month sentence, submitted a letter to the President resigning effective June 1, 2010.

The law does not require Judge Kent to step aside from the bench, even though he is a convicted felon. Every day he remains in office he receives his taxpayer-funded salary.

Congress has taken up this impeachment inquiry and moved quickly to ensure that Judge Kent is removed from the bench. His continued attempts to game the judicial system are just another example of how Judge Kent has abused his position of authority.

Earlier this month, the House Impeachment Task Force heard testimony from Judge Kent's two victims. His victims described the living nightmare they experienced while working for him. They were subjected to physical and verbal sexual abuse for years, ranging from lewd comments to forced physical sexual conduct. Neither woman felt that she could file a complaint without losing her job. Judge Kent warned all of his staff that disloyalty was grounds for removal. It was his ability to intimidate his staff into silence that perpetuated his abuse of authority.

Today's vote is necessary to ensure that justice prevails. When a judge is given a lifetime appointment, it is a tremendous honor and responsibility. But when a judge takes advantage of his authority, he must be held accountable for any violation of those principles of justice.

Congress must put an end to Judge Kent's abuse of authority and exploitation of American taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the four articles of impeachment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we would like to close on this side by calling a senior member of the Judiciary

Committee, JERRY NADLER of New York, who, in addition, is the serving member of the Chair of the Constitution Subcommittee, the remaining time on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad day when the House has to impeach a Federal judge. Yet, today that is our constitutional duty.

Impeachment is a power that Congress rarely uses; both because it is rare that a Federal judge will so abuse his position that impeachment is required, and because it could affect the independence of the Judiciary. The Constitution reserves this extraordinary remedy for extreme cases. This, regrettably, is one of those cases.

The task force that was established by this House to inquire into whether Judge Kent should be impeached has recommended the articles of impeachment that we are considering today.

We want to commend the members of the Task Force and the Chairman, Mr. SCHIFF, for their independent, diligent and thorough investigation. The evidence they've assembled is copious and sobering. They've made a strong case that impeachment is both appropriate and necessary.

First, Judge Kent has pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice and has been sentenced on his conviction to 33 months in prison.

As part of the plea proceedings, Judge Kent signed a statement in which he admitted and described the conduct that constituted the obstructive conduct. He adopted this signed statement under oath before the court at the time of the plea.

In this signed statement, Judge Kent admitted making false statements to a Special Investigatory Committee of the Fifth Circuit about allegations of sexually assaulting court employee. In that same document, he also admitted having ''nonconsensual sexual contact'' with two subordinate court employees.

Two of the articles of impeachment allege that Judge Kent sexually assaulted these two women. His admissions that he had nonconsensual sexual contacts with the women is, indeed, a powerful one. Any unwanted sexual touching can be considered a sexual assault, so Judge Kent, by his own words, has come close to admitting that he assaulted the women, the only remaining question being the extent of the assault, and that question has been addressed by the sworn testimony of the women before the Task Force detailing Judge Kent's repeated abuse of his authority by coercing nonconsensual sex at the price of retaining their jobs.

In short, the executive branch may prosecute a Federal judge for violation of the criminal laws, and the judicial branch may punish that Federal judge upon his conviction, but only the Congress can remove a Federal judge if it determines that his behavior renders him unfit to hold his office.

In circumstances such as these, where Judge Kent misused the power of his office to undermine, rather than to uphold, the law, and where he abused his power as a Federal judge by sexually assaulting subordinates and lying to the Fifth Circuit Investigatory Committee about that, our duty to impeach is clear.

For these reasons, I intend to vote in favor of each of the articles of impeachment now before the House. I urge all the Members of this House to do likewise.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 520, to impeach Judge Samuel B. Kent of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas. Judge Kent has disgraced the bench, the Bar, and the entire American public. Throughout his legal proceedings he behaved with hubris and gross disregard for justice. Even after his conviction for obstruction of justice, he has continued to exert a manipulative demeanor and arrogance, thinking himself to be above the law. There appears to be no end to his impudent demands, as even now, he continues to draw his judicial salary while imprisoned. This is unconscionable, and it was incumbent upon the House Judiciary Committee and the entire House of Representatives to take decisive action. Therefore, I applaud and commend Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH for their bipartisan efforts to bring this measure before the floor so quickly.

The stability of any form of government rests on the rule of law. Accordingly, our system, though imperfect, rests on the American public's fundamental trust in our legal institutions and the rights the Constitution bestows upon all U.S. citizens. Most important to any justice system is broad legitimacy and acceptance of those who act within the legal framework. People must believe they have access to a fair trial, an impartial jury, and a neutral judge. Judges have the duty to render well-reasoned and sound legal opinions, without bias and personal prejudice. We expect individuals who hold a lifetime appointment as a federal judge to act honestly out of respect for the law.

Judge Kent's sexual assault of two female employees and his subsequent efforts to lie about his actions to other federal judges were reprehensible acts. This conduct is totally inconsistent with the dignity and respect we expect from all federal judges.

Even though Judge Kent pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice, he continues to receive a salary for a job he is no longer suitable to perform. And he will continue to collect federal wages unless we act today and pass these articles of impeachment.

Every day Kent continues to draw his judicial salary is an affront to our legal system and to the American taxpayers. This resolution signals to Kent and others that no one is above the law—not even a federal judge. That is a testament to the rule of law and goes to the very essence of our justice system. The law must be blind, and everyone must be subject to its consequences and punishments as well as to its benefits and protections.

Mr. Speaker, I am so disappointed that Judge Kent has refused to resign from office and that we are forced to take this action to remove him from office. However, impeachment is provided for in the Constitution for circumstances such as this. Therefore, I add my voice of support for H. Res. 520 to impeach the disgraced Judge Samuel Kent, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the resolution. I also hope our colleagues in the other body will act with all deliberate speed to remove this disgraced judge from the federal bench.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives Member for Galveston, Texas, I have followed the case of Judge Samuel Kent with great interest. My study of the facts of this case has convinced me that the House Committee on the Judiciary made the correct decision in recommending that Judge Kent be impeached. Unfortunately, because of a commitment in my congressional district, I was only able to be on the House floor for the vote on the first count. Had I been on the House floor for the vote, I would have voted for all four counts of impeachment. I hope the Senate expeditiously acts on this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the Chair will divide the question for voting among the four articles of impeachment.

The question is on resolving the first article of impeachment.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on resolving the first article of impeachment will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on resolving each of the three succeeding articles.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie	Bright	Conyers
Aderholt	Broun (GA)	Cooper
Adler (NJ)	Brown (SC)	Courtney
Akin	Brown, Corrine	Crowley
Alexander	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Cuellar
Altmire	Buchanan	Culberson
Andrews	Burgess	Cummings
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Dahlkemper
Austria	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Baca	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Bachus	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Baird	Camp	Davis (TN)
Baldwin	Campbell	DeGette
Barrow	Cantor	Delahunt
Bartlett	Cao	DeLauro
Barton (TX)	Capito	Dent
Bean	Capps	Diaz-Balart, L.
Becerra	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berkley	Carnahan	Dicks
Berman	Carney	Dingell
Berry	Carson (IN)	Doggett
Biggert	Carter	Donnelly (IN)
Bilbray	Cassidy	Dreier
Bilirakis	Castle	Driehaus
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Duncan
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Edwards (MD)
Blumenauer	Chandler	Edwards (TX)
Boccieri	Childers	Ehlers
Bonner	Clarke	Ellison
Bono Mack	Clay	Ellsworth
Boozman	Cleaver	Emerson
Boren	Clyburn	Engel
Boswell	Coble	Etheridge
Boucher	Coffman (CO)	Fallin
Boustany	Cohen	Filner
Boyd	Cole	Flake
Brady (PA)	Conaway	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Connolly (VA)	Forbes
Braley (IA)		Fortenberry

Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
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
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—44

Ackerman
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehner
Capuano
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doyle
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gonzalez
Harman
Higgins
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kline (MN)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
McGovern
Melancon
Neal (MA)
Posey
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Slaughter
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Tiahrt
Tierney
Velázquez
Welch
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1503

So the first article of impeachment was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on resolving the second article of impeachment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 385, noes 0, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—385

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
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
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—48

Ackerman
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehner
Capuano
Cassidy
Costello
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doyle
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gonzalez
Harman
Higgins
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kline (MN)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
McGovern
Melancon
Murphy, Tim
Neal (MA)
Paul
Posey
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Slaughter
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Tiahrt
Tierney
Velázquez
Welch
Westmoreland
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1510

So the second article of impeachment was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on resolving the third article of impeachment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 381, noes 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—381

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
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
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—52

Ackerman
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehner
Capuano
Cassidy
Costello
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doyle
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Harman
Heller
Higgins
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kline (MN)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
McGovern
Melancon
Murphy, Tim
Neal (MA)
Paul
Peterson
Posey
Rodriguez
Rooney
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Slaughter
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Tiahrt
Tierney
Velázquez
Welch
Westmoreland
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1516

So the third article of impeachment was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 417, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on resolving the fourth article of impeachment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 372, noes 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—372

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Fallin
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
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
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Watt

NOT VOTING—60

Ackerman
Baca
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehner
Camp
Capuano
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Costello
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doyle
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Harman
Heller
Higgins
Hinchey
Jones
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kline (MN)
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
McGovern
Melancon
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Neal (MA)
Paul
Posey
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Slaughter
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Velázquez
Welch
Westmoreland
Woolsey
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1521

So the fourth article of impeachment was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on Articles I, II, III, and IV.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker. I was not present during the rollcall vote Nos. 415 to 418 on June 19, 2009. Had I been present, I would have voted:

on rollcall vote No. 415 I would have voted "yea;"

on rollcall vote No. 416 I would have voted "aye;"

on rollcall vote No. 417 I would have voted "aye;"

on rollcall vote No. 418 I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 417 and 418 on H. Res. 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 417 and 418 on H. Res. 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 417 and 418 on H. Res. 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote Nos. 415, 416, 417, and 418, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all 4 articles of impeachment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 415, 416, 417 and 418, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all 4 articles of impeachment.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 416, 417, and 418, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

APPOINTING AND AUTHORIZING MANAGERS FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF SAMUEL B. KENT, A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 565

Resolved, That Mr. Schiff, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Goodlatte, and Mr. Sensenbrenner are appointed managers on the part of the House to conduct the trial of the impeachment of Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers on the part of the House may exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary in connection with preparation for, and conduct of, the trial, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on the Judiciary under House Resolution 279, One Hundred Eleventh Congress, agreed to March 31, 2009, or any other applicable expense resolution on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any subsequent pleadings which they consider necessary.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 2892, the 2010 Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and the 2010 Interior and Environment Appropriations Act. We will also consider the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

And I would just like to ask: he noticed two appropriations bills for next week, the Homeland Security and the

Interior. I was just wondering if the gentleman could tell us what he believes next week's process will be in terms of amendments.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The two appropriations bills are two of the 12 appropriation bills that it is my intention to see us send to the Senate by the end of next month. Obviously, as the gentleman knows, the fiscal year ends on September 30; therefore, in order for us to get these bills completed and do them individually rather than bundled in an omnibus, which I think is a far preferable process, it's necessary for us to move these bills in a timely fashion. The rules, therefore, will try to accommodate both the Members and the time frame and the time constraints that we confront.

I would say to the gentleman that we tried to reach, over the last 2½ months, some agreement on time constraints. Indeed, I offered to have a choice of amendments by your side after we reached a time agreement. We were, as the gentleman knows, unable to reach such agreement. In fact, I was told by your leadership that no such agreement was possible.

In 2004, on the bill that we did yesterday, when the majority was then your side of the aisle there were 16 amendments in total offered to the bill we did yesterday, 10 by Republicans—of course it was your bill and you were in charge—and six amendments offered by Democrats. We asked for preprinting of amendments so we would have some idea of what amendments would be pending, and your side filed 102 amendments. That is more amendments total than were filed by either party in 2004, 2005 and 2006, so it was clear that if we had had a rule that provided for the 5-minute rule, with 434 Members having the right to 5 minutes on each amendment, that it would have been impossible to finish that bill, much less 12 bills, by the end of July, very frankly, so that ultimately we had to do a structured rule to accommodate doing the people's business in a timely fashion.

I'm sorry that we couldn't reach agreement. There have been no further discussions, although I did talk to Mr. CANTOR, who is not here today—or at least not here this afternoon—I did talk to him on a number of occasions about this as recently as the night that we went to the Rules Committee to get the structured rule. I have not heard from him or from Mr. BOEHNER with respect to any option available to us for time constraints.

In fact, Mr. OBEY, as you know, had a colloquy with Mr. LEWIS on the floor on the rule that was essentially an open rule. And the colloquy essentially asked by Mr. OBEY, Can we reach time agreements? And Mr. LEWIS responded, I'm afraid my conference might very well have a revolution on its hands and you might have a new ranking member, in which he indicated that time constraints were not possible. Therefore, I say to my friend from California that we are considering a rule which, as I said, will allow us to consider amendments on substance, but allow us to do so in a time frame that may well be shorter than has been the case in the past.

Let me say to you that when we last considered the Commerce-Justice-Science bill in 2006 when your side was in charge, you got a unanimous agreement from Mr. OBEY on time constraints. Those time constraints provided for consideration of approximately 17 hours on the bill.

In 2007, we got—not time constraints, but about the same amount of time. Now, unfortunately, after we thought in 2007 we were going to have agreement to do about the same time that we gave to you when you were in the majority, notwithstanding that, we went 50 hours over. Now, 50 hours, in terms of legislative time, is at least 2 weeks of time, unless of course you have a day like yesterday. But in terms of a normal day, that's 2 weeks. We simply cannot complete and do our business in that context.

So I tell my friend that we are considering a structured rule because we believe that if we are going to get our work done, that's necessary. We believe it has been amply shown—amply shown—in 2007, and because we were unable to reach, over 2½ months, an agreement on time constraints, that the only way you are going to allow us to get our work done is if we limit the time frame in which we can act.

□ 1530

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my friend for expressing the desire to get the work done in this House, and I will tell you from this side of the aisle, that is our desire as well.

Knowing when we talk about time, we believe we can get our work done on time as well. But having only been in this House 2½ years and seeing bills come to the floor and knowing, even when we brought the stimulus, the whole idea about time, that soon we found out, because somebody rushed the bill to the floor, that there were AIG bonuses in the bill at the time. I always think the American people believe it's okay to have some checks and balances; it's okay to have debate on the floor; it's okay to have some amendments asked upon the bill process.

And I ask my good friend who brought up the number of amendments, the thing that I would recall, though, this is in a world of preprinting, and when you deal with preprinting of amendments, that you have to submit them earlier, there are numerous ones you submit but they will not come to the floor. Much like when we started the debate this week, we did not enter the first Republican one until six of them had already been denied. So even though a quote will be named of a hundred and some amendments, that's not the number that we'll take up.

And when we talked about the ability of having an agreement on time, that came to pass after the bill had started. And I would think in the idea of making sure that the best products come out of this floor that a time idea would not be until you start the bill. Look to where the process is, and how would it be wrong to have a debate?

When I just watched the legislative branch today, we only had one amendment that we all agreed to. We had one chance of a motion to recommit, which we were able to save the taxpayers $100,000, where 374 people came together and said, yes, we could do better, that we don't have to settle for good; we could settle for great. But how much more money could we have saved had we had that opportunity to offer it?

And one thing I would say to the gentleman is if we did have an open rule, as it was before, and we talked about maybe taking away the preprinting, maybe we could be a little faster in the process. And I think looking at the history of what happened this week, we could have gotten it through faster in an open rule.

So I ask the gentleman, as he talks about having a closed structure in the process, is there any assurance that we know you're going to agree to that plan or maybe even have an open rule as we progress?

Mr. HOYER. I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. You had said earlier that you were looking to——

Mr. HOYER. I know what I talked about, but at the end you asked a question, and I'm not sure I got exactly what the question was.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, the assurance, will you stay with that, or is there any ability to open it up, to have an open rule?

Mr. HOYER. Let me respond to the gentleman's observation with respect to starting the bill without agreements on time. We did that in 2007. We went 50 hours over what we agreed to in time constraints the year before when you were in the majority. My belief is, and I tell my friend this very sincerely, and I think my friend knows my reputation about working across the aisle and working in an honest, open fashion, is that the agreement was that we would do exactly, not to the minute, but within the framework of the agreement that we gave to you to consider the bills that you brought to the floor in 2006. We expected the same consideration. Notwithstanding that, notwithstanding that, we went 50 hours over what I thought the agreement was.

Now, 50 hours, as I told the gentleman, is 2 weeks. And 2 weeks is a long time in terms of the weeks we have available to do our bills. In fact, at this current time, we have approximately 7 weeks left to complete the appropriations process, House, Senate,

and sending it to the President, if we do it in a timely fashion. Now, usually we do not do that, and I think that's unfortunate. Both sides don't do that. But I'm very hopeful that we will do it.

Let me make one additional comment. You mentioned the AIG bonuses. Clearly, the AIG bonuses weren't in that bill to which you referred. That bill, of course, came from the administration of your party and the Secretary of the Treasury from your party. And as you know, when they originally submitted the bill, it was a 3-page bill for $700 billion.

Now, the gentleman is correct that we didn't have appropriate constraints in there to preclude AIG's doing that, but they certainly weren't in the bill. And to represent that as the case, I'm sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that they were in the bill. They clearly were not.

So I say to my friend we've had experience on this. It's not as if you would like to believe or represent that we have a clean slate, that we're coming at this just brand new, clean, and everybody wants to be fair and balanced. The fact of the matter is that did not occur in the last year. Unfortunately, we didn't do the appropriations process very well last year. Both parties point the finger at each other for the blame. Irrespective of whom was to blame last year, we didn't do it. I don't like that. I want to see the regular process pursued, and I intend to provide for timeframes in which to do that. And as I say, for 2½ months I pursued an effort to see if we could reach time agreements, as we gave to you in 2006. We have been unable to do that. I think that's unfortunate. But having failed to do that, I, frankly, want to tell the gentleman that I will not advise Mr. OBEY nor the Rules Committee nor the Speaker to proceed for an hour or 2 hours or 5 hours or 10 hours before we get an agreement on time constraints, which was the practice, frankly, in 2007, and I don't intend to go down that road again.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Just to clarify to my good friend that on the other side of the aisle in the other house, they had passed an amendment to deny the right for those AIG bonuses. And if I recall when I was sitting on this floor, those lights were all green saying ''yes'' to the resolution, that they would have 48 hours, the American people, to see that bill. But in the short timeframe, within the next day, that was not to be true. That was not the agreement that transpired on this floor that, yes, it was handed out after midnight and, yes, we voted on it the next day.

Mr. HOYER. Would my friend yield on that point?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I will gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. For what purpose was the 48 hours asked for?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. It was the motion to instruct. And one thing I would say——

Mr. HOYER. For what purpose was the 48 hours asked for?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. If I may just finish, the one thing I was asking for was really for the American people to be able to see it, be able to read it and be able to understand it.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Gladly, to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Isn't that what preprinting of amendments attempts to do? I yield back.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

One thing I would say as we continue forward, if I could just finish with this discussion, if it is your intention to close down and continue to have a preprinting, is there a number in the gentleman's mind that he could tell this side of the aisle that the Republicans would be able to have a number of amendments just to have a check and balance for the American people when we talk about the billions of dollars that will be spent in these appropriation bills, even though we're being denied the amount of time that we can debate it?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding because that's a good question. That's exactly what I offered your leadership.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Do you have a number in mind?

Mr. HOYER. No. I offered it to your leadership. I didn't mention a particular number, but I offered that to your leadership for over 2½ months. Your leadership concluded that they could not make or would not make such an agreement. I tell my friend that it's difficult to put a number on the amendments because, as the gentleman says and as I told you, we asked for six amendments. We offered six amendments in 2004 to that bill that was considered yesterday, six. Now you may say you would have winnowed 102 down to a lesser number. I don't know what the lesser number would have been, whether it would have been 70 or whether it would have been 50 or whether it would have been 40. But as you know, without a structured rule, with 5 minutes for each Member of the House to speak, you can do the math. Five times 400, obviously, is 2,000 minutes. Divide that by 60, you have a lot of days to consider that bill.

I think the gentleman is probably correct, it would not have been 102 amendments, but I don't know what number there would have been, and it's impossible to put a number on it unless we know how many amendments are requested. If as was the case in 2004 and we only asked for six, giving us 10 would not have seemed to make much sense. On the other hand, if we asked for 20, maybe a higher number certainly would be in order.

So I say to my friend, we will have to see how many amendments are sought, but we are not going to go down the road we went down in 2007. And I say to the gentleman, in my opinion, the problem with his party is they're hoisted on the petard of their performance in 2007 in trying to argue that somehow we don't have reason to be concerned by filibuster by debate. Yesterday was filibuster by vote, and we wasted a lot of time yesterday, unfortunately. Many hearings were cancelled on health, on safety, on statutory PAYGO and other matters that we couldn't have hearings on because we were voting four times on an issue with essentially the same result each time.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I do appreciate the decades of service you have provided, and, again, I say I have only been here 2½ years. But as I always studied and watched Congress and understood the idea of a filibuster, never did I think a filibuster was 20 minutes. Never did I think when you came to the floor, on the very first amendment a Republican took up, that in 20 minutes somehow it got called a filibuster.

And from one perspective on this side of the aisle, please understand, you set the rules. Nowhere did we not abide by the rules. You asked for preprinting; we provided our amendments preprinted. You said to go along with the debate; we got into the debate. We were into 20 minutes. And I think the American people like the idea of debating on this floor.

But if I may move on, there is just one final question on this. The reason I asked you about the number of amendments on the Republican side, you've got to understand the questioning of why I would. We just took up a legislative branch, and you said you weren't sure about how many Republican amendments there could be in the future, but to my good friend, there were none. There wasn't one Republican amendment. So our ability within the rules as they're constructed, we have one motion to recommit, and you know what happened? 374 people in this Chamber joined hands together. That doesn't come around very often to save the taxpayers $100,000.

So think for one moment what the American people would save in a time of crisis, and you look in my district where it's 15.9 percent unemployment, if they see a few more dollars saved, it helps them a great deal.

But if I may move on, to my good friend from Maryland, I would like to ask him about cap-and-trade. The Speaker has announced and I have read a lot of what she has said about if you don't finish this bill in Agriculture and Ways and Means by a certain date, you lose the right of authority. And the Speaker had a goal of considering the cap-and-trade bill on the floor prior to the July 4th process. Does my friend believe that time will still be the case, that we will see the bill before July the 4th?

Mr. HOYER. The energy independence and climate bill to which the gentleman refers, as you know, was

marked up in committee and passed out of committee prior to the May break. Since that time, there have been a lot of discussions, and the Speaker did, in fact, say that committees with concurrent jurisdiction ought to act by the 19th, today, to try to bring this matter to conclusion. As the gentleman knows, I did not announce that bill for next week. I don't want to say it's not possible, but I have, for the last 3 months, been telling people, particularly the press that asked me the schedule, that I thought the energy independence and climate bill would be on the floor either the last week in June or the first week we get back in July. So that was the timeframe from my expectations. At this point in time, I have no reason to believe that it's going to be on the floor next week, but I want to make it clear to the Members that work is being done as we speak on this bill. The Agriculture Committee and Ways and Means in particular are working on this bill. We believe this is a very critical and important bill. This is one of the President's priorities. So I say to the gentleman that I have not announced it on the schedule. My present expectation is that it will not be on for next week, but if agreement was reached today or tomorrow and it was possible to move forward, it is possible. And if we have the time to do that, it is possible that we would consider it next week.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. If I just may follow up on that, should I believe what I read in the paper, that even though this bill has three different committees of jurisdiction with the Agriculture and the Ways and Means bill, if it was not taken up by a certain date, would they lose the jurisdiction right to take up the bill before it came to the floor, or will we expect it to come out of those committees before the floor?

□ 1545

Mr. HOYER. I think that, obviously, is going to be up to the Speaker and committee Chairs as they discuss this. But I think, again, we deal with time constraints, and we want to do things right. But we know that if you simply do not set targets to get things done, the legislative process, which I have been at for over 40 years, sometimes can delay, and you don't get things done. So you set target dates to get things done, and this is what she has done. I don't think it's so much a question of losing jurisdiction as it is a sense of trying to get something done by a date so that you can then move on to final passage on the floor of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

And if I may move on to another subject. During the debate of the war supplemental, one major issue was dropped from the bill. The bipartisan provision to prevent release of detainee photos was removed from the final version, knowing the release of these photos could create greater tension in the very region that our troops are now fighting. As the gentleman knows, the Senate unanimously passed the Lieberman bill yesterday, preventing the release of detainee photos. I am just wondering why the bill didn't come to the floor today to protect our troops.

Would you consider that to be brought up next week?

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's question. I think many of us share the view that the present action was well advised as it relates to the safety and security of our troops. On June 11, as the gentleman may know, just a few days ago, the President wrote to the Chairs of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and said as follows:

''I deeply appreciate all you have done to help in the efforts to secure funding for the troops. I assure you that I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure that DOD and detainee photographs are not released.''

In light of that—and of course, the court has put a stay on the release, as I'm sure the gentleman knows. So there is no present intention by the administration to release these photos. So while the Senate acted yesterday, obviously there's no need for us to act immediately on this. I am sure that the committee will consider it in due course.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman. And knowing that and with the Senators knowing that as well, they still passed it yesterday unanimously.

Do you believe we could take it up next week?

Mr. HOYER. I think we could do a lot of things next week.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I look forward to that. I appreciate that.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I didn't say that we would do that next week. You asked me, could we. We could.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I would never bet against you. I appreciate the opportunity to bring that up.

And to my good friend from Maryland, knowing that this is the last colloquy before the Fourth of July break, as we look forward to when we come back, there are a lot of big topics coming before this House. I will tell you from a personal level, it was a little disturbing on some of the items I'm reading about. Because in this House on this side of the aisle, I participated really for the first time coming back this year of inviting our President to our conference, inviting President Obama to the conference because we wanted to work in a bipartisan manner. We worked on the idea of the stimulus bill where we got together and we created ideas that he asked for, and we gave it to him. We could create twice as many jobs with half as much money, scored by his own administration. And when I look forward, one thing that we did early on was, this leadership on this side of the House signed a letter to the President, talking about, we want to work together on health care. We want to find common ground. We want to make sure that all Americans have access to health care. We want to make sure that we solve this problem. And in doing that, we even put together our own working group. We set out our principles, and we continue to put them forward. And one of the concerns I had when I tried to find information from the other side of the aisle—I would go to the President's Web page. First there were eight items; and as we got closer, it would get down to three items. They were actually taking things off the Web site. But then when I read in the newspaper Politico where people are being directed on your side of the aisle not to talk to Republicans on the health care issue—I don't know if you read that quote, but I can provide it to you. And then when I hear of other people that are outside of these Chambers working on it, being told not to talk to Republicans or they would not be put in the room, I'm just wondering if there's a chance that that behavior will change and that we will have the opportunity to work together, that we will have the opportunity for our ideas to be presented. That is something the American people would want, that we could work in a bipartisan—much like earlier when a Republican produced the motion to recommit, and 374 people came together to save the taxpayers $100,000.

I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm not sure what quote and who was instructed not to speak to Republicans because I have had a number of discussions with my good friend ROY BLUNT. So I didn't follow that direction, I haven't give that direction, and I want to make it clear that from the Speaker's perspective and mine, anybody on our side of the aisle who wants to sit down with anybody on your side of the aisle at any time to discuss health care issues, either in committee or in subcommittee, they are more than free to do so; and I would encourage them to do so. In fact, as I think the gentleman may know, all of the three committee Chairs of Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor and Ways and Means have been sitting down with their ranking members.

Now there was a change in ranking members, as you know, on the Education and Labor Committee. Frankly, I'm not sure that you've made the change on Education and Labor. Maybe you have.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Yes, we have.

Mr. HOYER. In any event, so I'm not exactly sure about Mr. MILLER. But I know that Mr. RANGEL has had discussions with Mr. CAMP; and I know that Mr. WAXMAN has sought and indicates to me—and I wasn't there—but he's had discussions with his ranking member as well, Mr. BARTON.

So let me assure the gentleman that we welcome bipartisan participation. I told that to Mr. BLUNT. Mr. BLUNT and I, I think as you know, have a history of working together successfully on behalf of legislation in this body, and I have great respect for him. He heads up your health task force. We have had discussions; and I've asked him to provide me with any suggestions that his task force has that he believes would be useful for us to discuss further; and I'm very hopeful that he will do so. As you know, we put a discussion draft on the table today for discussion. Our side has put some principles out as well. I'm hopeful. I know the President's hopeful that we can discuss those. We did have an unfortunate experience, as the gentleman recalls, when the President said he wanted to sit down and talk about the stimulus, and he was coming down to meet with your caucus, and a half-hour before he got there, your leadership instructed all of your Members to vote ''no'' on the bill before talking to the President. I thought that was unfortunate. But notwithstanding that, it's our intention to continue to try to seek bipartisan input and agreement where that can be possible.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I thank the gentleman. The only thing I would say, having been in that caucus, the President came to the caucus that we had invited him to prior to our retreat because we wanted to speak to this President before. And I will tell you, knowing that these are closed-door sessions, but this is probably one of the best caucuses I had been to. I thought it was very honest, open, talked about the issue, discussed the issue. There were times when the President disagreed with us. He said, I philosophically disagree. But other times he said, You know what, that's a good idea. Let's work on that. But as the President left that caucus, the other side introduced the bill, so in essence in part we felt crushed with the opportunity to even work in a bipartisan manner. But we continued along the trail where we put the working group together, and we didn't go out and score the bill our way. We took the President's scoring, which will tell you how many jobs and how much money it would cost; and our focus was on small business and job creation. It created twice as many jobs with half the amount of money. Our whip, Mr. ERIC CANTOR, personally handed it to the President; and the President said, This isn't crazy at all.

So we, on this side of the aisle, really look forward to working in a bipartisan manner and especially after seeing the scoring on the latest health care bill from the Democratic side, where it would only help 15 million of those uninsured but costs more than $1 trillion, knowing that that does not solve the problem, but continues to cost taxpayers tremendous amounts of money. I appreciate your assurance that maybe the attitude has changed, that the quote from Congressman JIM COOPER to the Politico where he was told not to work with Republicans, that that will change. I appreciate your work on that and the words you have said today.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Gladly.

Mr. HOYER. Because I know the gentleman doesn't want to mischaracterize my remarks.

I have never said we have changed our opinion. That has been our opinion expressed by our President, expressed by me and expressed by others, that we desire to work in a bipartisan mode. But the gentleman surely understands that there were, I can tell you, people on your side of the aisle who indicated to me that they wanted to vote for a number of the pieces of legislation that dealt with the stimulus; but the party pressure was so great to vote ''no'' that they didn't feel comfortable doing it. I may in private give you those names so you can check on the veracity of my representation.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I appreciate the gentleman because when I was sitting here on the floor, and I saw 17 of your Members join with everyone voting ''no,'' the bipartisan support, that there was a better way, that there was an opportunity. That kind of goes back to the whole debate about amendments. I always thought, coming to this floor, that maybe the power of the idea should win, and no one should be afraid of an idea or an amendment, that we would actually be better. But I think the opportunity to spend time with the gentleman—and I appreciate it if some Members on your side thought differently in the past, that we can get the message out. I appreciate the work that you have done.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

PROTESTS RESULTING FROM IRANIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It has now been 1 week since the Iranian people went to the polls to elect their new political leader. And in the last 7 days, the results of the election have been questioned, the media in Iran has been suppressed, thousands of demonstrators have protested, and some of these demonstrators have been injured and killed. Yet this very morning the supreme leader of Iran compared the election to a family disagreement. He offered no apologies for the deaths of the civilian protesters and, instead, simply blamed the Western media for being Zionist-controlled.

As a Member of Congress, I am appalled at this response and the apparent mockery of a fundamental democratic freedom, the freedom to protest and report on one's own government. We know the demonstrators were harassed rather than defended, and we know that Internet connections were cut and cell phone services disabled. Even foreign radio and television satellites were jammed.

So I ask, is this the behavior indicative of a country that recognizes liberties? I was proud earlier today to vote for H. Res. 560 and express my support for the Iranian citizens who recognize the need for their voices to be heard.

CONGRATULATING THE LADY GOLDEN TIDE SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lady Golden Tide softball team of Curwensville, Pennsylvania, for capturing the State softball championship in their division.

This is the team's second Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association Class A title in 3 years. They won on June 12 by a single run against a powerhouse team from Old Forge, the Lady Blue Devils, who had a record of 18 wins and 3 losses.

Tide Coach Allen Leigey said in an interview, ''This group of girls has been great, and we're really going to miss the seniors. They've done everything we've asked, and their winning attitude is just tremendous.''

Winning Lady Tide pitcher Holly Lansberry also hit the winning run for the team in a 1–0 game. The Lady Blue Devils were on a 17-game winning streak, but the momentum was with the Tide. After the Curwensville run scored, the Lady Blue Devils were shut out by a double play in the sixth inning.

All these women deserve praise for their competitive spirit and their team effort. Coach Leigey can be justifiably proud of these young women who worked hard to get to the finals and to come home champions.

Congratulations to the Lady Golden Tide.

MORE NUCLEAR ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, as the House and the Senate continue to look

for solutions to a problem of climate change and global warming, as the chairman of the Nuclear Energy Working Group here in the House, I just would remind everyone that we built our first 100 nuclear reactors in this country in less than 20 years; and we could build another 100 in the next 20 years if we really wanted to take a global leadership role on climate change, carbon reduction, pro-America, 5,000 jobs per plant. We can reprocess the spent fuel and turn it back into energy as they do in other countries, like Japan and France. All around the world they're looking back at us saying, Why does the United States not move towards nuclear power and nuclear energy? We need it from a competitiveness standpoint, from a jobs and economic standpoint, and to lead the world towards cleaner air. Nuclear is the way to go.

□ 1600

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENSURING A SOUND CREDIT SYSTEM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, last Sunday, Treasury Secretary Geithner and the President's economic adviser, Larry Summers, both Wall Street men, wrote an editorial laying out their case for financial regulatory reform, or at least that is what they called it. It fell far short of the mark.

They stated the basis of their proposal is the theory ''the financial system failed to perform its function as a reducer and redistributor of risk.'' Let me repeat that. Their fundamental principle is ''the financial system failed to perform its function as a reducer and redistributor of risk.'' They then advised the President to use that idea as the basis of what he proposes.

I beg to disagree. The purpose our financial system should be to assure sound credit. A financial system should be structured to promote responsible lending and responsible savings practices. We have seen the result of a financial system that lost its way and traveled down the road of high risk-taking with other people's money, a system with no boundaries, no accountability and inherently unstable.

Securitization and risk were at the heart of that failed system. Have we learned nothing? Securitization may spread out risk, but it does not spread out damage when it fails. We see that clearly enough today.

Who on Wall Street who led the charge on high risk-taking is suffering today? They are getting bonuses. I cannot say that for those Americans who are losing their jobs, their homes and their businesses.

Enshrining securitization and risk at the heart of their proposal is absolutely the wrong end of the road to be starting at. Securitization has nothing to do with sound credit. Securitization removes the connection between the lender and the borrower. It does nothing to assure sound credit, nor encourage savings and prudent lending. The lender sells the loan, and they are done. What does the lender care if the profit has been made? They don't.

We don't need more securitization, more credit default swaps, more derivatives and more obligations that are hedged so many times that no one can even find them.

The financial regulatory reforms the administration released this week do not restore prudent financial behavior. That is what is necessary to lead us out of this economic darkness. America needs a credit system that is safe and sound, not risky and not overleveraged.

Yesterday in The New York Times, and I will place this article in the RECORD, Joe Nocera said that if President Obama wants to create regulatory reform that will last for decades, he needs to do what Roosevelt did. ''He is going to have to make some bankers,'' and I would add security dealers, ''mad.''

But why are Mr. Geithner and Mr. Summers protecting Wall Street? To date, the executive branch has been barking about the too-big-to-fail institutions. But the best they have done is nip at the edges of real reform and fixing what is wrong. Did AIG teach us nothing? An institution that is too big to fail is too big to exist.

Wall Street's bailout taught banks exactly the wrong lesson. It taught them, be reckless. The U.S. Government will make sure you do not take a hit. Just keep your campaign contributions rolling our way.

Take a look at derivatives in their proposal. Why only regulate normal boring derivatives when the derivatives that got us here are the exotic ones that are being protected from regulation? Do we need yet another credit default swap debacle to teach us that every derivative needs to be regulated in a transparent way and over the counter? Didn't the President campaign on transparency? Isn't the best disinfectant sunshine? Let the sun shine too on the Federal Reserve.

Do you know that the Federal Reserve is responsible for regulating mortgage lending? But did the Federal Reserve act when the FBI warned in 2004 that the subprime mortgage fraud could become an epidemic? No. So if the FBI warned an epidemic was ahead on something that the Federal Reserve regulated and the Federal Reserve failed to act, what makes us think that they can actually regulate anything, and why should we give them more power, which the administration proposal does?

Many more questions need to be asked about financial regulatory reform. We should not rubber-stamp the administration's first idea. Our people want a sound credit system. We should ask for no less.

The first goal of our banking system, as opposed to a securities system, should be to create a safe and sound credit system, one that promotes responsible savings and lending practices. Prudent financial behavior by individuals and institutions should be its primary purpose. The administration's priorities tell me they plan a much larger role for higher-risk securities in whatever system they are envisioning, which to me threatens higher-risk behavior.

Banks traditionally have served as intermediaries between people who have money—depositors—and those who need money—borrowers. The banks' value-added was their ability to loan money sensibly and manage and collect the loans. Securitization broke down that system. The banks didn't much care about making sensible loans as long as they could sell them. The regulators didn't stay on top of it because they foolishly thought the banks had gotten the loans off their balance sheets and the chickens would not come home to roost.

[From The Washington Post, June 15, 2009]

A NEW FINANCIAL FOUNDATION

(By Timothy Geithner and Lawrence Summers)

Over the past two years, we have faced the most severe financial crisis since the Great Depression. The financial system failed to perform its function as a reducer and distributor of risk. Instead, it magnified risks, precipitating an economic contraction that has hurt families and businesses around the world.

We have taken extraordinary measures to help put America on a path to recovery. But it is not enough to simply repair the damage. The economic pain felt by ordinary Americans is a daily reminder that, even as we labor toward recovery, we must begin today to build the foundation for a stronger and safer system.

This current financial crisis had many causes. It had its roots in the global imbalance in saving and consumption, in the widespread use of poorly understood financial instruments, in shortsightedness and excessive leverage at financial institutions. But it was also the product of basic failures in financial supervision and regulation.

Our framework for financial regulation is riddled with gaps, weaknesses and jurisdictional overlaps, and suffers from an outdated conception of financial risk. In recent years, the pace of innovation in the financial sector has outstripped the pace of regulatory modernization, leaving entire markets and market participants largely unregulated.

That is why, this week—at the president's direction, and after months of consultation

with Congress, regulators, business and consumer groups, academics and experts—the administration will put forward a plan to modernize financial regulation and supervision. The goal is to create a more stable regulatory regime that is flexible and effective; that is able to secure the benefits of financial innovation while guarding the system against its own excess.

In developing its proposals, the administration has focused on five key problems in our existing regulatory regime—problems that, we believe, played a direct role in producing or magnifying the current crisis.

First, existing regulation focuses on the safety and soundness of individual institutions but not the stability of the system as a whole. As a result, institutions were not required to maintain sufficient capital or liquidity to keep them safe in times of system-wide stress. In a world in which the troubles of a few large firms can put the entire system at risk, that approach is insufficient.

The administration's proposal will address that problem by raising capital and liquidity requirements for all institutions, with more stringent requirements for the largest and most interconnected firms. In addition, all large, interconnected firms whose failure could threaten the stability of the system will be subject to consolidated supervision by the Federal Reserve, and we will establish a council of regulators with broader coordinating responsibility across the financial system.

Second, the structure of the financial system has shifted, with dramatic growth in financial activity outside the traditional banking system, such as in the market for asset-backed securities. In theory, securitization should serve to reduce credit risk by spreading it more widely. But by breaking the direct link between borrowers and lenders, securitization led to an erosion of lending standards, resulting in a market failure that fed the housing boom and deepened the housing bust.

The administration's plan will impose robust reporting requirements on the issuers of asset-backed securities; reduce investors' and regulators' reliance on credit-rating agencies; and, perhaps most significant, require the originator, sponsor or broker of a securitization to retain a financial interest in its performance.

The plan also calls for harmonizing the regulation of futures and securities, and for more robust safeguards of payment and settlement systems and strong oversight of ''over the counter'' derivatives. All derivatives contracts will be subject to regulation, all derivatives dealers subject to supervision, and regulators will be empowered to enforce rules against manipulation and abuse.

Third, our current regulatory regime does not offer adequate protections to consumers and investors. Weak consumer protections against subprime mortgage lending bear significant responsibility for the financial crisis. The crisis, in turn, revealed the inadequacy of consumer protections across a wide range of financial products—from credit cards to annuities.

Building on the recent measures taken to fight predatory lending and unfair practices in the credit card industry, the administration will offer a stronger framework for consumer and investor protection across the board.

Fourth, the federal government does not have the tools it needs to contain and manage financial crises. Relying on the Federal Reserve's lending authority to avert the disorderly failure of nonbank financial firms, while essential in this crisis, is not an appropriate or effective solution in the long term.

To address this problem, we will establish a resolution mechanism that allows for the orderly resolution of any financial holding company whose failure might threaten the stability of the financial system. This authority will be available only in extraordinary circumstances, but it will help ensure that the government is no longer forced to choose between bailouts and financial collapse.

Fifth, and finally, we live in a globalized world, and the actions we take here at home—no matter how smart and sound—will have little effect if we fail to raise international standards along with our own. We will lead the effort to improve regulation and supervision around the world.

The discussion here presents only a brief preview of the administration's forthcoming proposals. Some people will say that this is not the time to debate the future of financial regulation, that this debate should wait until the crisis is fully behind us. Such critics misunderstand the nature of the challenges we face. Like all financial crises, the current crisis is a crisis of confidence and trust. Reassuring the American people that our financial system will be better controlled is critical to our economic recovery.

By restoring the public's trust in our financial system, the administration's reforms will allow the financial system to play its most important function: transforming the earnings and savings of workers into the loans that help families buy homes and cars, help parents send kids to college, and help entrepreneurs build their businesses. Now is the time to act.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 2009]

TALKING BUSINESS—ONLY A HINT OF ROOSEVELT IN FINANCIAL OVERHAUL

(By Joe Nocera)

Three quarters of a century ago, President Franklin Roosevelt earned the undying enmity of Wall Street when he used his enormous popularity to push through a series of radical regulatory reforms that completely changed the norms of the financial industry.

Wall Street hated the reforms, of course, but Roosevelt didn't care. Wall Street and the financial industry had engaged in practices they shouldn't have, and had helped lead the country into the Great Depression. Those practices had to be stopped. To the president, that's all that mattered.

On Wednesday, President Obama unveiled what he described as ''a sweeping overhaul of the financial regulatory system, a transformation on a scale not seen since the reforms that followed the Great Depression.''

In terms of the sheer number of proposals, outlined in an 88-page document the administration released on Tuesday, that is undoubtedly true. But in terms of the scope and breadth of the Obama plan—and more important, in terms of its overall effect on Wall Street's modus operandi—it's not even close to what Roosevelt accomplished during the Great Depression.

Rather, the Obama plan is little more than an attempt to stick some new regulatory fingers into a very leaky financial rather than rebuild the dam itself. Without question, the latter would be more difficult, more contentious and probably more expensive. But it would also have more lasting value.

On the surface, there was no area of the financial industry the plan didn't touch. ''I was impressed by the real estate it covered,'' said Daniel Alpert, the managing partner of Westwood Capital. The president's proposal addresses derivatives, mortgages, capital, and even, in the wake of the American International Group fiasco, insurance companies. Among other things, it would give new regulatory powers to the Federal Reserve, create a new agency to help protect consumers of financial products, and make derivative-trading more transparent. It would give the government the power to take over large bank holding companies or troubled investment banks—powers it doesn't have now—and would force banks to hold onto some of the mortgage-backed securities they create and sell to investors.

But it's what the plan doesn't do that is most notable.

Take, for instance, the handful of banks that are ''too big to fail''—and which, in some cases, the government has had to spend tens of billions of dollars propping up. In a recent speech in China, the former Federal Reserve chairman—and current Obama adviser—Paul Volcker called on the government to limit the functions of any financial institution, like the big banks, that will always be reliant on the taxpayer should they get into trouble. Why, for instance, should they be allowed to trade for their own account—reaping huge profits and bonuses if they succeed—if the government has to bail them out if they make big mistakes, Mr. Volcker asked.

Many experts, even at the Federal Reserve, think that the country should not allow banks to become too big to fail. Some of them suggest specific economic disincentives to prevent growing too big and requirements that would break them up before reaching that point.

Yet the Obama plan accepts the notion of ''too big to fail''—in the plan those institutions are labeled ''Tier 1 Financial Holding Companies''—and proposes to regulate them more ''robustly.'' The idea of creating either market incentives or regulation that would effectively make banking safe and boring—and push risk-taking to institutions that are not too big to fail—isn't even broached.

Or take derivatives. The Obama plan calls for plain vanilla derivatives to be traded on an exchange. But standard, plain vanilla derivatives are not what caused so much trouble for the world's financial system. Rather it was the so-called bespoke derivatives—customized, one-of-a-kind products that generated enormous profits for institutions like A.I.G. that created them, and, in the end, generated enormous damage to the financial system. For these derivatives, the Treasury Department merely wants to set up a clearinghouse so that their price and trading activity can be more readily seen. But it doesn't attempt to diminish the use of these bespoke derivatives.

''Derivatives should have to trade on an exchange in order to have lower capital requirements,'' said Ari Bergmann, a managing principal with Penso Capital Markets. Mr. Bergmann also thought that another way to restrict the bespoke derivatives would be to strip them of their exemption from the antigambling statutes. In a recent article in The Financial Times, George Soros, the financier, wrote that ''regulators ought to insist that derivatives be homogeneous, standardized and transparent.'' Under the Obama plan, however, customized derivatives will remain an important part of the financial system.

Everywhere you look in the plan, you see the same thing: additional regulation on the margin, but nothing that amounts to a true overhaul. The new bank supervisor, for instance, is really nothing more than two smaller agencies combined into one. The plans calls for new regulations aimed at the ratings agencies, but offers nothing that would suggest radical revamping.

The plan places enormous trust in the judgment of the Federal Reserve—trust that critics say has not really been borne out by its actions during the Internet and housing bubbles. Firms will have to put up a little more capital, and deal with a little more oversight, but once the financial crisis is

over, it will, in all likelihood, be back to business as usual.

The regulatory structure erected by Roosevelt during the Great Depression—including the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the establishment of serious banking oversight, the guaranteeing of bank deposits and the passage of the Glass-Steagall Act, which separated banking from investment banking—lasted six decades before they started to crumble in the 1990s. In retrospect, it would be hard to envision even the best-constructed regulation lasting more than that. If Mr. Obama hopes to create a regulatory environment that stands for another six decades, he is going to have to do what Roosevelt did once upon a time. He is going to have make some bankers mad.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST JARRETT GRIEMEL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the State of Texas lost a warrior this month in the Forward Operating Base Gardez in Afghanistan, a remote and desolate place in the middle of the badlands in this war zone. Army Specialist Jarrett Griemel died on Wednesday, June 9, 2009, from injuries he suffered in Afghanistan. He was just 20 years of age.

This is a photograph right here, Madam Speaker, of Specialist Griemel. Specialist Griemel is the 28th warrior to have died in Iraq or Afghanistan with connections to my Second Congressional District in Texas.

Jarrett was a young man who personified the best qualities of the young people in America today. Born in San Angelo, Texas, and raised in La Porte, Texas, Jarrett was living the life he had always made plans to live, that being a life filled with the achievement and adventure that he desired.

Jarrett was a patriot. He joined the Army his junior year in high school, and he had already completed basic training before graduating with honors from La Porte High School.

He was a member of the swim team and the surf club, and he loved the outdoors and especially the beach and water sports. Jarrett spent his spare time parachuting and cliff diving. Jarrett lived his life to the fullest.

In February of last year, Jarrett married his high school sweetheart, Candice, at a small ceremony in front of a justice of the peace. She joined him in Alaska, where he was deployed by the Army, to begin their young married lives together. Jarrett had a lifetime goal of eventually becoming a surgeon.

Jarrett was an athletic young man with bright red hair and an infectious smile. His brother Chase says he and Jarrett were typical adventurous boys growing up. They spent time in the woods catching snakes and bugs. He wanted to travel, see the world and live a life of excitement and adventure. And Jarrett did just that.

Jarrett was a petroleum supply specialist assigned to the 425th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division Battalion at Fort Richardson Alaska, home of the Arctic Warriors. The 3,500-soldier brigade is still in the midst of deploying in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, our American warriors live under the most grueling of conditions in Afghanistan. Jarrett's experience in the outdoors growing up would come in handy in the rugged and cursed terrain.

Having been to Afghanistan myself, I have witnessed how the hot desert sun is unrelenting as our soldiers patrol the dusty, rocky mountains and deserts. The only real relief from the heat is the freezing cold night in the desert, one harsh extreme to another.

Even in the ''desert of the sun and the valley of the gun,'' our troops are not deterred. The elements do not stop the best-trained, best-prepared, most-lethal military in the history of the world. The United States Army is on patrol in the mountains and cursed land of Afghanistan.

Our brave men and women in uniform are unequaled anywhere in the world. They are an all-volunteer force. They are educated, motivated, but they are tenacious. They bleed red, white, and blue. They meet and exceed any task our country sends them to accomplish with great skill and with great pride. They are America's backbone. Our heroes. The best of our Nation. Our amazing examples of the youth of this country.

Jarrett was a proud and accomplished soldier, and at just 20 years of age he was only 1 day from becoming a sergeant when he died in Afghanistan.

Texas is proud to have called him a soldier, a son, and a hero. He will always be remembered by his family, his friends, and a grateful Nation for his service. His love of country, excellence in achievement, and love of his family will be forever engraved on the hearts of every life he touched.

Jarrett's wife, Candice; his mother, Trena Dorsett, and her husband, Donnie, of La Porte, Texas; his father, Michael Griemel; his brothers, Chase, Jason, and Brandon; and his sister, Brianna, are all a living testimony to the memory of this one brave soldier's love of life, love of his country, and love of fellow citizens.

Madam Speaker, it has been said without the brave efforts of all the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines and their families, this Nation would not stand so boldly, shine so brightly, or live so freely.

Madam Speaker, Jarrett Griemel was one of those soldiers. He was an American soldier, the rare breed who take care of the rest of us, and we will forever be indebted to him, his life, and his service to our Nation.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

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

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DEMOCRAT AND REPUBLICAN ENERGY PLANS

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the differences between the Democrat and Republican energy plans.

As we move into summer, energy prices are creeping up, as they do each year, placing higher costs on those in our country who can least afford them. We need an energy plan that ensures a reliable, safe and affordable energy supply.

Democratic leaders in Washington have proposed a plan that would replace our present energy supply with unreliable and costly energy alternatives. The cornerstone of this plan would reduce carbon emissions through an aggressive cap-and-trade program. This program would set nationwide limits on greenhouse gas emissions and create a market-based trading program for companies to meet the cap. The goal of this plan is to force reductions in carbon emissions through government rationing of carbon credits for energy producers.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office analysis of this plan concluded that the potential job loss in my home State of Texas alone by the year 2020 could go as high as 311,600. Let me say that again. Over 300,000 jobs lost in my State by 2020, resulting in a staggering loss in personal income of up to $22.8 billion. That cost is simply too high. It is not cap-and-trade; it is cap-and-tax.

My Republican colleagues and I believe we can still achieve an energy plan that keeps costs affordable, lowers emissions and grows energy jobs right here in America.

□ 1615

I'm opposed to a plan that dramatically little increases the cost of energy

for American consumers. That is why my Republican colleagues and I have crafted a comprehensive energy bill that not only increases energy production here in America, but ensures that all forms of energy have the ability to compete to provide clean, reliable, and affordable energy for all Americans.

The American Energy Act is a blueprint of solutions for American energy problems. We must create an environment where all producers have the opportunity to compete to provide safe, reliable energy, instead of the current stranglehold of bureaucratic red tape and regulatory obstacles producers face.

We have an important opportunity to reduce carbon emissions sought by Democrats through increased use of nuclear energy. The American Energy Act would allow nuclear energy to compete with other energy sources based on its merits, such as being affordable, domestic, and, most importantly, emissions-free.

The U.S. Department of Energy is now in the process of awarding financing for four American power companies to build new nuclear power reactors to allow more nuclear power to come online between 2015 and 2020. And we can bring more energy onto the grid if we streamline the application process, as the American Energy Act does.

The goal of this plan is not to promote one form of energy over the other, but to allow the market system to determine which producers can achieve the goal of providing a safe and reliable energy supply to meet our Nation's needs.

Americans need safe, reliable and affordable energy, not government-mandated emission programs that increase consumer costs and kill American jobs. We need a plan that promotes all forms of energy to meet that goal.

Madam Speaker, the Republican energy plan is a commonsense approach to increasing domestic energy sources, creating American energy jobs, and promoting a clean environment without dipping in the pockets of American families.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE

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, probably the most needless, useless agency in the entire Federal Government is the Air Marshal Service.

In the Homeland Security Appropriations bill we will take up next week, we will appropriate $860 million for this needless, useless agency. This money is a total waste: $860 million for people to sit on airplanes and simply fly back and forth, back and forth. What a cushy, easy job.

And listen to this paragraph from a front-page story in the USA Today last November: ''Since 9/11, more than three dozen Federal air marshals have been charged with crimes, and hundreds more have been accused of misconduct. Cases range from drunken driving and domestic violence to aiding a human-trafficking ring and trying to smuggle explosives from Afghanistan.''

Actually, there have been many more arrests of Federal air marshals than that story reported, quite a few for felony offenses. In fact, more air marshals have been arrested than the number of people arrested by air marshals.

We now have approximately 4,000 in the Federal Air Marshals Service, yet they have made an average of just 4.2 arrests a year since 2001. This comes out to an average of about one arrest a year per 1,000 employees.

Now, let me make that clear. Their thousands of employees are not making one arrest per year each. They are averaging slightly over four arrests each year by the entire agency. In other words, we are spending approximately $200 million per arrest. Let me repeat that: we are spending approximately $200 million per arrest.

Professor Ian Lustick of the University of Pennsylvania wrote last year about the money feeding frenzy of the war on terror. And he wrote this: ''Nearly 7 years after September 11, 2001,'' he wrote this last year, ''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 to 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 sound bites 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 maelstrom of waste.'' And there is no agency for which those words are more applicable than the Federal Air Marshal Service.

In case anyone is wondering, the Air Marshal Service has done nothing to me, and I know none of its employees. But I do know with absolute certainty that this $860 million we are about to give them could be better spent on thousands of other things.

As far as I'm concerned, it is just money going down a drain for the little good it will do. When we are so many trillions of dollars in debt, a national debt of over $13 trillion, we simply cannot afford to waste money in this way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 814. An act to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of land held by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, to facilitate the construction of a new educational facility that includes a secure parking area for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and objectives of the Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets.

EVENTS OF THE WEEK

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 as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you this evening on the floor of the House of Representatives, and at the conclusion of what some considered to be a long week here in Congress. And I'd like to go back and reflect upon some of the events that took place this week and perhaps look into the future.

And always our deliberation here on the floor of the world's greatest deliberative body should be about perfecting legislation and moving America forward in the right direction.

Looking back upon some of the things that have taken place this week that are unprecedented, some would say that yesterday, and it was unprecedented, more votes on the floor of the House of Representatives than ever in the history of the United States of America. After all of these years, from 1789 until 2009, we had more votes on the floor, almost a third more votes on the floor than ever before. The previous record was 40 votes. I think yesterday, 54.

One would ask, why is that? And the answer to that is, because the majority

decided they were going to shut down the deliberation and the debate here in the House.

And I take all of us back to think about the continuum of events, the Constitution that underpins us, the directive in the Constitution that all spending has to start in the House of Representatives, not in the Senate, Madam Speaker, but in the House of Representatives.

In fact, if we shut this operation down here, no new spending could be initiated in the United States Government, at least constitutionally, because it all has to start in the House. That is our duty. It's one of our most important duties, not our only duty by any means.

And we've had a tradition of going through a number of appropriations bills, 13 in number, as I recall, and it gets changed a little bit from year to year as the configuration of the Appropriations Committee gets changed. But we've run through those appropriation bills in the years that I've been here under Republican leadership, starting, by my recollection, at least, every one out with an open rule that allowed every Member of Congress to introduce an unlimited number of amendments, and offer and debate those amendments on the floor of the House, ask for a recorded vote if they chose to do so, ask for a re-vote if they chose to do so. In fact, there could be a movement for reconsideration if we chose to do so.

If every Member offered amendments, of course this place would slow down dramatically and it would come actually to a halt. But for all of these years of the United States Congress, we got our work done under open rules because we found ways to come together and come to a conclusion so this government's business could be done in a legitimate fashion, with debate on both sides, with amendments that are offered that seek to perfect the legislation that's there, with fiscal responsibility on our part of the aisle, at least, and sometimes on the part of the Blue Dogs who used to come up and try to slow the growth of the government of their own party.

But that has not been the case this week, Madam Speaker, and that is the reason for the unprecedented number of votes that took place here on the floor. And that's because the majority party decided to shut down the process and disallow amendments and disallow debate in order to shield their spending, in order to protect them from, let me say, an alternative view. Some would call it criticism.

But addressing you tonight, Speaker pro tem, Speaker PELOSI received the gavel that you hold this evening in January of 2007. The first woman Speaker in the history of the United States. I've been here to witness the swearing in of that historic event, as well as the swearing in of the first African American President of the United States. Historical moments. And both of those moments were coupled with a degree of optimism that flowed on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, although I will stipulate that there had to have been more euphoria on the Democrat side of the aisle than there was on the Republican side of the aisle. But just the same, a level of euphoria on each side, a sense of optimism, a sense of we have reached some historical milestones.

But, Madam Speaker, when we reach that moment, that is no time to rest on our laurels. That's no time to come to a conclusion that the people who have been honored so in such a historically unprecedented fashion should be exempt from criticism or exempt from dissent, nor should they be handed all the power of the government of the United States, whether they're the President or the Speaker of the House. But it seems as though that's the attitude of significant numbers of Members here in the House of Representatives.

And so if I take you back to the 12 years that Republicans were in the majority here in the House, from 1994 until 2006, those were elections, sworn in '95 and until January of 2007 were actually the times that our span served, we offered appropriations bills under an open rule that allowed amendments, an unlimited number of amendments, to be filed. They didn't have to be filed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Nobody had to come here with their play book and open it up and say, here's the play I'm going to run, do you think you can play defense on that. We just said, offer your amendments into the RECORD, and we'll deal with them when they come up. And as long as we haven't passed that title of the bill in our deliberations, the amendment will be in order. And if you have amendments that you'd like to offer at the end of the bill, we're going to allow for an unlimited number of amendments to be filed at the end of the bill as well.

And so Democrats and Republicans were able to record their dissent from each of the appropriations bills by filing amendments, seek to perfect the legislation that was there, and either expand the spending or reduce the spending as their conscience and their constituents dictated. That went on through the 12 years of Republican leadership.

And I will also make a point that there were times when we had too many amendments and there were times when leadership came together and negotiated a unanimous consent agreement. And there were times when some people didn't all agree, but didn't really have much opportunity to object. And I have been one of those people that saw unanimous consent agreement reached and didn't have an opportunity to object.

But at least the leadership was talking about how to perfect legislation, how to bring the most important amendments to the floor for debate and for vote so we could bring the will of the American people and the wisdom of the American people together and move this country forward.

That's how it was here in this Congress from 1995 until the beginning of 2007, when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, named a whole group of new committee Chairs, a new appropriations Chair, a new Ways and Means Chair, a new Financial Services Chair, the list goes on. And as the appropriations bills were brought to the floor, Republicans and Democrats offered amendments to those bills, and there were—and that debate, although it was extended more than it was this year, was shut down by unanimous consent agreement.

□ 1630

Okay. I can accept that. I don't like it, but I can accept it. That was the last time we had a legitimate process, Madam Speaker, because the 2007 appropriations cycle didn't even have an appropriations bill come to the floor, not 1 of 10, not 1 of 13—zero—because Democrats didn't want to take a vote on bills to spend money, and they didn't want to take a vote on the amendments that would be seeking to slow this massive growth in government, so they stacked it all up and put it into one continuing resolution that kicked the can down the road until after the last election when they brought up an omnibus spending bill that put everything into one bill. Then that bill appeared on the Internet. It was after 11 o'clock at night. The following morning, there were 3,600 pages, as I recall, and around $450 billion in spending all wrapped up and stacked into one bill. Actually, it may not have been 3,600, but it was a lot of pages of legislation. We had overnight to read it, and we are held accountable for everything that we vote for or against in this Congress. We have to have an opportunity to read the legislation no matter how good our staff is. We can't even delegate that we break the bill up into pieces and tell each one of our staff to read 100 pages. It's impossible.

Furthermore, there was no opportunity to tell what was in the bill. Even more difficult was to figure out what wasn't in the bill, and that all has to be evaluated if we are going to be operating and running the finest country that has ever had the privilege of being sovereign on the face of this Earth.

Yet our process is broken. Our process has been usurped. Because of the sense that power can dictate, then it has dictated. So, for 2 years, we haven't had a legitimate appropriations process here in the United States Congress, not until this week, not until the Justice Appropriations bill was offered. Even then, it wasn't a legitimate process. It was offered under a rule that I had never seen before, and I believe it was historically unprecedented, which was: print all of your amendments into the RECORD and then we'll make them all in order. Now, they can announce this in advance. They can

tell us what the Rules Committee is going to decide in advance. We filed all of our amendments into the RECORD, 127 of them or some number near that, and that allowed the majority to read our entire playbook. It allowed the majority to evaluate the political implications and the economic implications of every amendment, and it allowed the majority to plan their strategy. What was their strategy?

The strategy was: well, we dare not let them debate this because they're going to bring up things that are embarrassing. We dare not allow votes because the Members will be held accountable. Who will hold them accountable? The voters. So, in order to protect the vulnerable Members of the United States Congress, the constitutional duty and the deep traditions of this Congress have been suspended by the majority party, and they were suspended with the structured rule that allowed for these 127 amendments, of which I had some; but even that, Madam Speaker, wasn't good enough. Twenty-some minutes into the debate on the first amendment, the majority party moved to recess to the call of the gavel, and they decided to go up to the Rules Committee and change the rules again.

Now, it is a very bad deal when you change the rules from the Constitution and from the tradition of this body, from these 200-and-some years of this constitutional Republic that we are. That is a very serious thing, but those changed rules are the ones we started out with. Once we got 20 minutes into the debate on the first Republican amendment, they then decided to change the rules again, Madam Speaker, and went up to the Rules Committee, which, by the way, is the heart of the power of this Congress. The people who decide what debate will take place here on the floor are up there on the third floor—that way. It's a tiny, little room, and it doesn't have television cameras in it, and you can't tune into it on C–SPAN, and there is no live feed that goes out of there.

I brought an amendment up a couple of years ago to present it when the Chair of the Rules Committee said, Well, we're going to make sure that we report every vote out and that we put it into the RECORD. I simply brought an amendment up there that would require the Rules Committee to print every vote into the RECORD. The Chair became—let me just say to understate it—unreasonable and emotional in that I would seek to codify a promise that she had made. Didn't I trust her?

Well, the answer to that, I think, is obvious, because the rules got changed twice in the middle of the game. The second time, they decided they would only allow amendments to come to the floor of the House that they thought were good for them politically. So these 127 amendments got chopped down to 23 amendments. Of the 23 amendments, 20 of them were about spending.

You know, it surprises me, but the Democrats didn't mind voting for more spending and voting against reducing spending with the exception of this $100,000 on capital bicycles today. Trillions of dollars have been spent, but they did get mobilized, some of them, about the spending on the capital bicycles.

So the rules were changed from tradition. Then they were changed in the middle of the game. This Justice Appropriations bill came to the floor, and it was set up so that there wouldn't be embarrassing votes.

For example, the Speaker of the House has declared the CIA to be willfully lying to the Congress of the United States of America and to her, and this issue is unanswered and unspoken to, and the security of the United States of America is hinged upon our ability to have a working and trusting relationship to fund the CIA and the 14 other members of the intelligence community and our Department of Defense, I might add, and our domestic law enforcement, I might add. Well, now there is no relationship between the Speaker of the House and the intelligence community other than one of being directly at odds against each other, with the Speaker's declaring the CIA up here in the secure room in the Capitol to be lying to the person who is third in line for the Presidency—the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Yes, they lied to me. They did it all the time. They misled the Congress of the United States of America.

That's the statement—not retracted, not clarified, no evidence given. Just an allegation.

Now, when someone accuses someone else of lying outside of these doors and on the street, in the family, at the workplace or in private society, they had better have the evidence before they accuse somebody of being a liar. That is the standard in America. If you think somebody is not telling you the truth, you don't call him a liar unless you have the facts. We have worse than that here in the Congress because there is a statute that has been passed that directly prohibits anyone from lying to Congress, especially about domestic or international terrorism, and that's what these briefings were about. They were about enhanced interrogations that most of America, Madam Speaker, thinks took place down at Gitmo, waterboarding among them. The truth is that no waterboarding took place at Gitmo. None of it took place in this hemisphere, and I can't verify that there were any enhanced interrogation techniques that took place even in this hemisphere, let alone at Gitmo by United States forces.

So that's a long subject, and I won't go into that, Madam Speaker, except to say, to the extent when that declaration was made by the Speaker of the House, that declaration of the CIA's lying, it was an allegation of willfully committing repeated felonies against the Congress of the United States.

This is an untenable position. We cannot have a situation where the most powerful Member of the House of Representatives, the person third in line for the Presidency, can declare our intelligence community to be willful liars, to be lying to us here in this Congress and to be in violation of Federal statute. We cannot just simply decide, because the Speaker doesn't want to talk about it anymore, we aren't going to talk about it either.

I am bringing this up because this is the only arena that exists. This is the only forum that exists right now. We could not force a vote on it. We could not shut off funds. We could not direct the Speaker. We could not bring any language, because it was shut down in the Rules Committee. I will submit that the security clearance for the Speaker of the House of Representatives must be suspended until this matter is cleared up. It is her responsibility to clear it up, not mine. It is not the part of some outside working group or of some factfinding force. It is for the person who made the allegation.

Madam Speaker, I would ask you to reflect. When Jesus stood in front of the high priest, Caiaphas, Caiaphas asked him, Jesus, did you really say these things? Did you really preach in this fashion?

Christ said to Caiaphas, It's you who say I did. Ask them. They heard me. I was open.

The guard struck Jesus, and Jesus said again to Caiaphas, If I have spoken wrongly, then you must prove the wrong, but if I have spoken rightly, why do you strike me?

That's the standard. When someone speaks rightly, you can't attack him. You can't strike him. You can't challenge him. You can't beat him. You can't call him a liar; but if he speaks wrongly, the one who makes the allegation of speaking wrongly must prove the wrong. That's the standard in the Book of John. That's the standard in this American culture. That needs to be the standard here in the United States Congress. We need to hold the Speaker accountable for this for the very sake of the integrity of this institution and for the very sake of the security of the United States of America, which, surely, is put at risk when you think about the majority party, the majority party that is all trying to work together, to get along and to follow the direction of the Speaker, all of the staffs of all of the committees—the committee Chairs, the subcommittee Chairs, the rank-and-file members, the Armed Services people, the Select Committee on Intelligence, which just had their markup in secret. That won't hit the press. You won't know what went on in there in the Select Committee on Intelligence. You won't know what kind of debates took place, because that's in secret. You won't understand how partisan the Select Committee on Intelligence is today because

the committee has been stacked with people who will support the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the American people don't have any insight into what goes on within the intelligence zones here in this Congress nor do they have an opportunity to view it, because a lot of it is classified. I can tell you, when you have a partisan committee, partisan votes, partisan debates in secret in the Committee on Intelligence, and when you have all of the intelligence agencies that are now colored with the allegation from the Speaker of the House that they willfully lied to the Congress of the United States, let me ask:

Does that produce more funding for on-the-ground intel? for more devices? for more technology? Is America safer because of this tension, this conflict? Are we less safe? Are there more of our resources put to bear to gather this intelligence that we need so that we can direct our military to protect us from attacks from terrorists, both foreign and domestic, or is it less resources?

When you send a brother and a sister out to the kitchen to clean up the table after dinner at night and they're fighting, does the job get done better or worse? Does it get done quicker or sooner? When people are at odds with each other, that lack of cooperation ultimately leads to less efficiency and to a poorer product.

One of the problems that we had that left us vulnerable for September 11 were the silos of intelligence when we didn't have our members of the intelligence community sharing intelligence. They weren't communicating as well as they should have. That is the foundation for the reason of establishing the Director of National Intelligence and for putting it under at least one command. I have concerns about the results of that as well, but that was the reason, and now we have a silo of politics here under the Speaker of the House, who declares Intelligence to be lying to Congress. She continues to go up to the fourth floor to receive intelligence briefings from an intelligence community that is probably walking on egg shells.

The CIA, itself, directed by Leon Panetta, has laid out that they have the documents and that they have the proof, and their notes show that the Speaker was briefed in line with what had been taking place with the enhanced interrogation techniques of three individuals and that it had already taken place prior to the briefing that she received on September 4 of 2002.

This is an untenable position. It must be rectified, and it can't go on. This Congress has been shut down partly so we don't have a debate on this issue.

Another reason this Congress has been shut down—and I'm talking about the open amendment process to appropriations bills—is there is a partisan interest in protecting ACORN. It can't be anything else. Most everybody in America at this point has heard of ACORN, the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now. ACORN was in the news constantly throughout the election cycle last fall. I've been watching ACORN for 4 to 5 years. ACORN has been involved from the beginning, and here is a series of things, and I'll just lay them out and then talk about them to the depth that I can at this point, Madam Speaker.

□ 1645

ACORN's involvement early on way back in the Community Reinvestment Act. This Congress passed the Community Reinvestment Act in 1977 and then refreshed it under Bill Clinton in the 1990s. The Community Reinvestment Act recognized something that was wrong, and that was that we had lenders who looked at neighborhoods and concluded that the real estate value in those neighborhoods was declining because of violence, because of activities going on in those neighborhoods.

And so they drew what they called—they did what they call redlining. They drew a red line around those neighborhoods and concluded they weren't going to loan money for homes for real estate in those neighborhoods because the value of the real estate was going down.

If you looked at the racial makeup of the residents of those redlined areas, often it was African Americans in those inner-city parts. Some of them contributed to the decline in the value of the real estate. Some of them were victims of the decline in value of the real estate. The Community Reinvestment Act was passed to encourage lenders to—let me just say in simplistic terms—make bad loans in bad neighborhoods, to loan into the redline neighborhoods so they could improve the percentage of home ownership, get more people into their own homes, and the theory is they will take care of them: They'll have a nest egg to work with, and they will be more stable with everything they do. The families will be more stable, too.

I don't disagree with the philosophy of the Community Reinvestment Act. I disagree with the result of what came about. And what came about was ACORN seizing on the Community Reinvestment Act and learning that they could go in and, essentially, intimidate lenders. If lenders wanted to expand or open up a branch office, they had to meet the standards of the Community Reinvestment Act. Vaguely written. But those standards were easier to prove if you had the approval of ACORN. If you had the disapproval, it was hard to get them approved because ACORN established political connections, and supported political candidates, and became a get-out-the-vote machine for Democrats.

Now, think in terms of Chicago politics. I think Chicago is a city in America that best illustrates the foundation that is ACORN.

And so ACORN intimidated lenders. They got groups together—some would say gangs; I'm calling them groups. And they went into lenders' offices and sometimes shoved the banker's desk over to the wall and surrounded him and hollered at him and screamed at him, intimidated the lender into making bad loans in bad neighborhoods. They intimidated lenders and banking institutions to write nice big checks to ACORN, and ACORN used that money to operate, and if they wrote a big enough check, ACORN wouldn't be in there demonstrating or jamming the entryways to the banks and shutting down their commerce. These were intimidation shakedown tactics. ACORN is just one of the entities that did that. We know of a few others, and I think the name Jesse Jackson comes to mind for most people when I raise this subject matter. There were other entities out there that did the same thing.

But ACORN was in the center of this. And not only that, but ACORN found themselves in a situation where they could go out and identify and broker the people who would qualify for these low-interest loans, subprime loans—a lot of subprime loans were promoted by ACORN. The lending institutions made those loans because then ACORN would be off of their back and allow their doors to stay open, and they kept this relationship going.

ACORN also found themselves in a position to be brokering these subprime loans through into the secondary market of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. So I think already, Madam Speaker, you see the pattern here.

The Community Reinvestment Act was a foundation that allowed ACORN to go in and intimidate lenders and set themselves up where they became the broker for home mortgage loans that many times were subprime loans that were sold in the secondary market to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac And on up through the line to the investment banks, where these loans were sliced, diced, sorted, shuffled, cut, stacked, and tranched.

And all of that went on to the point where you couldn't trace where all of the loans had gone anymore, but the collateral still was attached to the mortgage loans. And this became part of the core of the financial meltdown that we've experienced in the last several months.

That's transgression number one for ACORN.

Transgression number two is ACORN's pledge to go out and register—I think their goal was 1.3 million new voters for the 2008 election cycle. So they put their minions out into the streets across the streets of America. Interesting. They've been active doing this before. There were investigations that came up in 2006. In the 2006 election in the State of Washington, ACORN turned in in one sample 1,800 voter registration forms, and the number of legitimate registration forms out of 1,800 was six. Only six were real. The rest were phony. I didn't do the

percentage on that, but I can tell you it's not very good.

And so they brought about a prosecution there and got some kind of settlement. But that was 2006. There were other incidents scattered across the country. The focus of these incidents seemed to show up in swing States, swing States like Ohio, States that they wanted to affect the result of the election. Of about five or six important swing States, ACORN was the most active in them.

Now, this is also an organization that has received, as a matter of fact, more than $53 million of our tax dollars to fund them. To do what? Well, in part, facilitate bad loans in bad neighborhoods sold up through Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—which have since been nationalized, by the way, because of the insolvency in part created by some of those transactions—and a get-out-the-vote Democrat drive that took place in many of the cities, Chicago for example, and registered hundreds of thousands of fraudulent voter registrations. And in fact by ACORN's own admission, over 400,000 fraudulent registrations were filed by ACORN in that cycle leading up to the 2008 election.

And I asked for investigations. I asked for congressional inquiries. I asked for the Justice Department to look into ACORN. And I had no sympathy on this side of the aisle. I temporarily had some sympathy from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, who for about 3 weeks was on record as believing there was evidence there that may warrant that we take it up and investigate ACORN. But 3 weeks after he expressed the sentiment, he concluded there wasn't enough evidence there.

There is a lawsuit against ACORN that has been won and a settlement that's been achieved. We have put hundreds of pages of data into the records here in this Congress, and still they conclude that there is not enough evidence there to bear looking into it. We've named hundreds of—I don't know if it's hundreds—we've named dozens of post offices this year. We debate these on the floor under suspension. We vote and name post offices. We've got time to name post offices, but we don't have time to look into ACORN, which is corrupting our election process and has undermined the financial integrity of the United States of America?

And furthermore, we have to suspect that there is a real lack of enthusiasm on the part of the administration, as well as the Democrats in the Congress and the House and in the Senate, because when we look back through the history of the President of the United States, we find a consistent association with ACORN on the part of Barack Obama. Barack Obama, who was a lawyer for ACORN and argued for them in a voter registration case, albeit pro bono, but still their employee, still representing ACORN in court.

And when someone does that pro bono, does that tell you they agree with them or disagree with the agenda of ACORN? I think we all can agree that if you're going to take a case for free and argue in court that surely you must agree with the principles and the people that you're working for. You're not going to see me go represent Planned Parenthood in court for free or for a check, for that matter, because I disagree with the agenda of Planned Parenthood.

Barack Obama clearly agreed with the agenda of ACORN. When he worked for them for free and represented them in court, that makes him their employee as their attorney.

Now, if that's not compelling enough, Madam Speaker, we'll take another component of this. Barack Obama headed up Project Vote. Project Vote is a subsidiary of ACORN. That's not disputed. They're the get-out-the-vote machine in Chicago. That's not disputed. The head of ACORN in Chicago hired President—well, at that time Barack Obama—to train the people that were going to work under Project Get-Out-the-Vote and also those that would go into the bankers' offices and encourage them to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods.

Part of this enterprise that has all of the trappings of a criminal enterprise headed up in Chicago by—I will check the name—- but I believe it's Margaret Talmage, who hired Barack Obama to head up Project Vote, and he got paid. The canceled checks exist. He worked for Project Vote as an employee, hired by the head of ACORN in Chicago to work for their subsidiary to get out the vote and to train people in community-organizing activities and postures himself as if community-organizing is a highly virtuous endeavor.

Well, hardly anybody knows what a community organizer does. And I suspect that it's different from community-to-community, county-to-county, State-to-State, and nation-to-nation.

But when it comes to community organizing in Chicago, clearly there are those who adhere to the mission of Saul Alinsky, the great community organizer, Rules for Radicals Saul Alinsky—whom also Hillary Clinton studied under, by the way directly, and whom Barack Obama seems to be a philosophical protégé.

But the ''Rules for Radicals'' clearly applied to ACORN. They were activists. They did intimidate. It was part of their M.O. ACORN, Project Vote, and dozens and dozens of other subsidiaries of ACORN scattered across this country. And ACORN central headquarters is down in New Orleans. It's been moved from downtown New Orleans out to the outskirts of New Orleans at 2609 Canal Street. A $2.5 million building, roughly relatively new and modern, that houses many of the subsidiary corporations that one can connect.

And I've filed a list that is incomplete but is a list of 174 of the more than 250 corporations that are affiliated with ACORN. I filed them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the amendments that were to go on the justice appropriation's bill that was managed by Mr. MOLLOHAN and concluded yesterday. But of course, those amendments were denied not quite in secret, but up here where you can't hardly get six reporters in the room if there are going to be a dozen Members of Congress, if they're pleading to be heard here on the floor.

So that's the record. That's the standard. 2609 Canal Street, ACORN's building. One should go on Google Earth and take a look at that and zero in on it and see what it looks like, Madam Speaker, and the corporations that are involved as subsidiaries, the inner-connecting spider web of corporations.

By the way, Louisiana is one of the easiest States in the union to incorporate in. I don't think it's a coincidence that ACORN is there with their central headquarters. But they have headquarters scattered across this country in 50 cities, at least that they announce—and I don't know how many States—and activities going on, and also they say over 100,000 members—that number actually is higher than that, around 175,000 families.

Annual dues for an individual, whether you're poverty stricken or aren't, I understand is around $120. So they raised some of that money from dues from people that may or may not be able to afford that. Fifty-three million dollars from our tax dollars, and now—actually, we don't know the whole picture because it takes a lot of work to unravel this spider web of corporations that exist that are affiliated and part and parcel of ACORN that have interconnecting boards of directors and sometimes copy-and-paste boards of directors where if the board of—let's just say Project Vote or one of the other subsidiaries happened to meet and then walk into another room and you would sit down with ACORN and that board met, you might look around and not find any faces that are different. They might all be the same. Some of these interconnecting corporations, subsidiaries of ACORN, have identical boards of directors and identical addresses and identical corporate filings with the exception of the name and the date that they're filed.

This is a copy-and-paste reproductive method that allows them to go out and take all kinds of money in from every avenue, pour that through, commingle those fungible funds and spend them however they like, including getting out the vote for Democrats, registering hundreds of thousands of fraudulent votes.

And when ACORN's asked about this, Madam Speaker—and that question came up in a little debate with the head of ACORN last night—they say, Well, ACORN's not under investigation or indictment. Not true. They clearly are. Absolutely in Nevada they are. But they are alleging that there were only investigations or indictments of their employees that were just a few,

not very well managed, maybe rogue employees that were out there registering.

Well, it turns out to be a fact that ACORN's policy in print was, in some of the States, to pay commissions for people to sign up voter registrations. Clearly against the law in a number of the States across the country and many of the States across the country, including Nevada. We will see more of these investigations and convictions unfold.

□ 1700

Now, why am I concerned about this, Madam Speaker? The answer is, first, it is essential that we maintain a legitimate, reliable and honorable election process in America. If first you corrupt the voter registration rolls, the next thing that happens is the votes themselves are corrupted. And ACORN's position is, well, maybe we gave you 400,000 or more fraudulent voter registration forms, but never fear, there were no fraudulent votes that came from that. In fact, the Attorney General of Nevada, who happens to be a Democrat and is involved in the prosecution of ACORN, and I applaud him for that, says that he's certain that there were no fraudulent votes that came from this. I don't know how anybody can be certain that there were no fraudulent votes that came from 400,000 or more fraudulent registrations. That defies my ability to imagine. 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations and no fraudulent votes? That is a leap of faith that I can't take.

It's logical to me that the more fraudulent registrations you have, the more fraudulent votes you have. It's not logical that every fraudulent registration would be a fraudulent vote, but it's clearly logical that with over 400,000 fraudulent registrations, you're going to get fraudulent votes. How many, is the question. Who were they? We don't know because a fraudulent vote is almost the perfect crime. If you can walk into a polling place and the poll worker says, Who are you, and you answer, my name is Joe Schmo and I live at—let's just use a previously used address, 2609 Canal Street, New Orleans, and if there's someone registered under that name, they hand you a ballot and you go vote, no ID required, no picture ID required. In fact, in New Mexico—and this is part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where the Secretary of State of New Mexico testified before the Judiciary Committee about 3 years ago—it comes down to this: if I am working as a poll worker in New Mexico registered to vote in New Mexico and someone walks into that polling place and says, I'm Steve King and I live at—names the address that I live at, even if they say they are me and I'm working the polls, by law in New Mexico I can't challenge that fraudulent voter. It's against the law to challenge voters in New Mexico and many other States because the liberals have so corrupted the process.

First, they passed Motor Voter, so that when people get a driver's license they ask them, Do you want to be registered to vote? Well, who says no? Also, there is a little spot on there that attests that you are a citizen of the United States. Well, who says no? What if you don't understand the language, are you really going to read that as a legal document and know that if you attest that you're a citizen of the United States, that you're guilty of perjury?

By the way, out of 306-or-so million Americans, does anybody know anybody that has been prosecuted for falsely attesting that they are a citizen on a voter registration form? No. That's an unprosecuted crime; a crime of perjury, which exists as a felony in every State that I know of, unprosecuted. So our voter registration rolls were corrupted by the low standard of Motor Voter.

And then we had the Florida fiasco in 2000. And there, if we looked across what was going on in Florida, there were allegations of voter fraud on both sides. I don't know that there wasn't some on both sides. But what I saw was indicators that there could have been significant votes shifted. And I think all the scrutiny that came into those counties in Florida helped. I think it was a good thing that a lot of people went down and watched the hanging chad count.

But I also have seen film of the director of the Miami-Dade County Election Board, Michael—last name starts with an L, and I actually can't remember it, it's been 9 years. In a previous election, there is videotape of the hanging chads that would come in. How did they deal with the hanging chads in Miami-Dade County? And I've seen this videotape; I don't think it could be reconstructed in any way. They had 70 volunteers from the League of Women Voters—now, they haven't been on my side very much, they really don't seem to be very bipartisan to me—long table, 70 volunteers from the League of Women Voters. They were set down at a table, and they would bring in these punch-card ballots and set them on one side of each of the ladies that were there working, issue them two or three nice sharp No. 2 lead pencils—like you take your Iowa basic skills with where I come from—and they would pick up these hanging chad ballots, these punch-card ballots, and clean them up. If any chad is hanging and it's still dangling there, they would punch the pencil through the hole, break it off, and stack these cleaned-up ballots over on this other side where, once they got done cleaning up the hanging chads, these 70 volunteers from the League of Women Voters, then the process ballots would go through the vote counting machine. Now, does that give you a lot of confidence if you put somebody there at a table to decide your vote for you by where they poke the pencil and which chad is hanging? Not me it doesn't. That process should have never happened.

The Collier brothers did investigative research on election fraud down in Florida. Neither one of these gentlemen are alive today—and I don't have any sign of foul play and I don't allege such a thing, I just haven't been able to track what brought about their demise.

But I read a fair amount of material. And they did a movie in investigative journalism where they went into the previous election board director of Miami-Dade County that took care of the voting machines, sitting in a warehouse out along the edge of the swamp. And they walked in and said, What do you do? Well, I fix these vote-counting machines and I keep them up in shape. Well, how do you make this all work? And they got to talking about how the elections got rigged. And he said, Here's how it is—and the video exists. He pulled some plastic gears out of a drawer and he showed, here it is, we grind one of these teeth off on this plastic gear, we put it in the vote-counting machine, and then where we put that gear makes a difference in which side gets an extra vote for every 10 that comes through. Openly in the videotape.

And they went up into the loft in the attic and filmed a bunch more of that before they got suspicious and they had to skedaddle out of there with their cameras. I saw those things while I was doing this research back then.

I bring this out, Madam Speaker, because, just because this wasn't a particularly close election in November of 2008 doesn't mean that we shouldn't be alarmed about the corruption of our election process; 537 votes made the difference in Florida, and Florida made the difference on who would be the next leader in the Free World, Madam Speaker.

And those 537 votes could easily be blended through the more than 400,000 fraudulent registration forms that ACORN has admitted to turning in that corrupted voter registration rolls and opened the door for the corruption of our election process.

Now, I have discussed the Community Reinvestment Act, and now I have discussed the voter registration fraud process. And these are the ''get out the vote'' people for Democrats, please don't forget. And if we do forget—I should put another fact out.

President Obama, as a candidate for President, then-Senator Obama, hired ACORN to get out the vote and wrote the check to one of their subsidiary corporations for over $800,000. There's three ways the President is tied—more than three ways the President is tied to ACORN. One is as their attorney, one is as an employee of Project Vote, heading up Project Vote in Chicago, receiving paychecks, ACORN through Project Vote into President Obama. The third one is hiring ACORN to get out the vote.

There are rumors that donor lists got circulated back and forth; I haven't been able to chase that down. The

fourth component is the White House has hired ACORN to participate in the census.

Now, over 400,000 fraudulent registrations turned in, admitted by ACORN—I suspect significantly more. I have never met someone who admitted to such wrongdoing and admitted to it in the full magnitude of their wrongdoing. They always try to minimize. So at least 400,000. And now the President, who has worked for ACORN in two capacities, hired ACORN in at least one capacity, now hires ACORN in another capacity as President of the United States to help with the census, to help count the people of the United States.

Now, if you want to direct what goes on in America, if you want the power of this country, there are two ways: through the ballot box and influence the elections so you get your people in these seats here and in the seats in the Senate and in the White House, where there is tremendous power. That's one component. Another component is through the United States Census.

What does it do? Well, the Constitution requires us to count the people every 10 years, count the people—not by formula, not by some magic formula, but actually count the people. It costs a lot of money, and it takes a lot of people out there to do it to actually count them.

But once the people are counted, it affects two big things: one is the redistricting process, where new lines get drawn on the maps of all the States of the Union. And those maps are drawn and approved by the State legislatures. And some of them it's very, very partisan, and they decide how they expand the number of Democrat or Republican seats, whoever happens to be in charge. In my State I am really fortunate because it's far less partisan than it is in any other State that I know of. But that determines, in a large way, who will be in the majorities in the State legislatures after the next elections. Some seats will be lost and some seats will be won because of the lines that are drawn that are the result of the census that is taking place in 2010.

Not only does it make a difference in who is in the majority in the State legislatures—and every State is bicameral, with the exception of Nebraska, which is unicameral—but also it makes a difference in the congressional districts, these 435 districts that are seated here in this Congress, Madam Speaker. And when those lines are changed, it makes a difference on sometimes who comes to this Congress. It makes a difference on whether a few more Republicans get elected or a few more Democrats get elected. And if you can stack the count in certain areas, you can expand the number of seats and make a difference on who holds the gavel here behind me, Madam Speaker.

If we just look at the count of illegals in America, there is a study done by a reputable organization, Dr. Steve Camerata, as I recall, that comes to a conclusion that there are between nine and 11 congressional seats in America. This is an election or two ago, so the analysis probably shifts down. But it was between nine and 11 seats in America that are shifted because we count illegals along with legals for purposes of apportionment. It takes, in my opinion, a constitutional amendment to fix that. But someone like MAXINE WATERS in California, it will require perhaps 50,000 votes to get reelected to Congress because I suspect she doesn't have as many legal Americans there and a lower percentage of citizens, and certainly a lower incidence of people voting. My particular seat, it will take about 120,000 votes to be elected or reelected to the Fifth District of Iowa because we have a high percentage of citizens and a low percentage of illegals.

The census makes a difference. And if the census is an accurate count, then we can draw better lines. If the census is an inaccurate count, then the lines will be drawn to favor the partisan interests of the people that produce the inaccurate count.

Now, if I were going to look across the entire United States of America and try to come up with entities that have the wherewithal to significantly provide the manpower for this census and who had the most ability to corrupt the process, number one on my list of alarm would be ACORN and all of their affiliates for all these reasons that I've said. Now, how can anyone expect to get a legitimate count on the census from the very people that have produced the illegitimate voter registration forms? And yet President Obama, his administration has contracted with ACORN to assist with the census.

Madam Speaker, the question came up—actually, it came up last night in national media—about do I have any proof of this because ACORN denies it. And Madam Speaker, I have in my hand the documents that do determine—these are documents that come from the U.S. Census Bureau, and they read that, let's see, they were looking for some entities that could help with the census. Their goal was to work with national organizations and corporations that could help us reach the hard-to-count populations. And as I look down through this information that includes an agreement with ACORN, it says, Our overall goal was to work with organizations that could reach the hard-to-count populations.

And here's what they did to identify who to partner with. They went to a list of national organizations, they added advisory committees, they have used a cluster segmentation approach. They looked at the economically disadvantaged, the unattached mobile singles—that's a term I had not seen before—in high-density areas with ethnic enclaves. Okay. These are legitimate places where we would have difficulty with the census, and I recognize and agree with that. But then they had criteria for not partnering with a group. One is if they didn't meet the criteria above that I mentioned. The second one is if they're hate groups. Now, I would like to see that list of hate groups that's filed under the United States Census Bureau.

□ 1715

It seems as though the Department of Homeland Security had identified conservatives as hate groups. It seems as though the FBI had the resources to send investigators out to mill through the crowds on TEA Bag Day, April 15, Tax Day. The FBI was looking at the people that came to the courthouse square to voice their objection to the oppressive taxes that have been imposed upon this country and the irresponsible spending, and they're identified as hate groups. Conservative groups, hate groups. I don't know of a liberal group that would be on that, but I hope that we are able to make that request and get a list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of who are the hate groups. I suspect I'm probably alleged to be on some of them.

Then other groups that were not considered were law enforcement groups, anti-immigrant groups. I don't know what an anti-immigrant group is. I know there are some anti-illegal immigrant groups. I don't know of a single anti-immigrant group, but that gives you a sense of the biased ideology that lays this out. Also, any groups that might make people fearful of participating in the census. I don't know who that might be, but it gives them a way out. Or maybe any groups that did not serve the hard-to-count population.

So it looks to me like they have written some regs here that will qualify ACORN. I have in my hand a document from the U.S. Census Bureau, National Partnership, and it is a document that says the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, ACORN, their tasks check-marked and dated January 13, 2009, 3:02 p.m.: ''Dear sir or madam, I am writing to inform you that on behalf of the 2010 census partnership program, we would like to invite you to become a national partner with the Census Bureau for the 2010 census.''

ACORN is already in. It's not a matter of conjecture. ACORN is involved in the census. And if we don't suspend that here in this Congress, the result will be, I fear, a corruption of the census process that is nearly as serious as the corruption of the election process.

Why would you go to the people that have exactly the wrong track record and put them in control? Why did the President ask to move the Census within the White House and out of the Department of Commerce? Why is Rahm Emanuel involved in directing this, the man from Chicago, the Chicago politics visits and arrives at the White House with the President?

And, by the way, if one goes back also and even begins to think that President Obama wasn't involved with ACORN and this is just a random hiring process that took place because it

made sense, I would point out also that President Obama chaired for a time and sat on the board for a longer time of the Woods Foundation in Chicago, which distributed funds to community organizing groups and directed funds to ACORN. As chairing the Woods Foundation, he sent money to ACORN. He also sat on the board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. This is a liberal education initiative, the brainchild of the unrepentant terrorist William Ayers. William Ayers recruited President Obama, at that time State Senator Obama, to sit on the board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, which what did they do? Raised money and distributed it to places including ACORN.

So I think I have given you enough threads, Madam Speaker, to understand that President Obama is tied in with ACORN, part and parcel. He's been their attorney. He's been an employee under the Project Vote. He's hired them and written them a check out of his campaign for over $800,000, sat on the board of the Woods Foundation and the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. Both of them sent other money to ACORN. William Ayers, the unrepentant terrorist, was the founder of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. And by these documents here, Madam Speaker, ACORN is working on the census and at a minimum providing temporary employees to work on the census to count the people. And we know what's happened to our election process. It's been corrupted. And, by the way, there are news reports of fraudulent votes and prosecutions on fraudulent votes and people that voted multiple times that were enabled by the registrations of ACORN. Some of that, Madam Speaker, is in the news today.

So I revere this election process, and I would rather lose elections than I would lose the integrity of the election process. And I'm happy enough to accept the results of a legitimate census no matter what it is. If it draws a district out of Iowa, I will lament that. I want to have the most representation possible from Iowa. But we have got to have a real count and we have got to deal with integrity. And when we have corrupt organizations that have all the trappings of a criminal enterprise, this Congress should shut off funding to that criminal enterprise.

But, instead, we don't get a vote and we don't get a debate because the rules are unprecedentedly changed and corrupted up there on the third floor in the Rules Committee where nobody goes, and if many did, they couldn't get in. We need cameras there. We need the press there, and we need open rules here on the floor. And we need people that are willing to engage in this debate and take come whatever may. If you believe in yourself, stand up and say so. I will be happy to yield to you. But I see it never happens. You sit on your hands, and you accept this power that you happen to have right now.

But the American people are going to take it back, and they are going to give it to the people that they trust.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 1 p.m.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after noon on account of official business in district.

Mr. WELCH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2 p.m. on account of son's graduation.

Mr. SHADEGG (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of prior family commitments.

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. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 25 and 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 25 and 26.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, June 25 and 26.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, June 23.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and objectives of the Praque Conference on Holocaust Era Assets; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 813. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the ''J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 837. An act to designate the Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building.''

H.R. 2344. An act to amend section 114 of title 17, United States Code, to provide for agreements for the reproduction and performance of sound recordings by webcasters.

H.R. 2346. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2675. An act to amend title II of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such title for a 1-year period ending June 22, 2010.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 16, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution.

H.R. 1256. To protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make certain modifications in the Thrift Savings Plan, the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Federal Employees' Retirement System, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 40. To honor the achievements and contributions of Native Americans to the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 23, 2009, at 10:30 a.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:

2336. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8071] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2337. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2338. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket

No. FEMA-B-1048] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2339. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1046] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2340. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8073] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2341. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2342. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8075] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2343. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Issue and Cancellation of Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock [Regulations D and I; Docket No.: R-1307] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2344. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Impact Aid Programs [Docket ID: ED-2008-OESE-0008] (RIN: 1810-AB00) received May 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2345. A letter from the Asst. General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions; Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program; Federal Pell Grant Program; Academic Competitiveness Grant Program and National Science and Mathematics Access To Retain Talent Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2009-OPE-0001] (RIN: 1840-AC96) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2346. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2347. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2008 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2348. A letter from the Acting, Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2007-013, Employment Eligibility Verification [FAC 2005-29, Amendment-4; FAR Case 2007-013; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 19] (RIN: 900-AK91) received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2349. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's fiscal year 2008 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2350. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Mentor-Protege Program (RIN: 2700-AD41) received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2351. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Time-in-Grade Eliminated, Delay of Effective Date (RIN: 3206-AL18) received May 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2352. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Determining Rate of Basic Pay; Collection by Offset From Indebted Government Employees (RIN: 3206-AL61) received May 29,2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2353. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a separate management report for the period October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2354. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered an Threatend Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Alabama Sturgeon (Scaphirhynchus suttkusi) [FWS-R4-ES-2008-0058; 92210-1117-0000-FY08-B4] (RIN: 1018-AV51) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2355. A letter from the Dep. Chief of Staff, National Security Division, DOJ, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Justice Department Regulations Regarding Countries Whose Agents Do Not Qualify for the Legal Commercial Transaction Exemption Provided in 18 U.S.C. 951(d)(4) [Docket No.: OAG 124; A.G. Order No. 3018-2008] received June 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2356. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure in Adjudicatory Proceedings; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: OTS-2008-0013] (RIN: 1550-AC27) received June 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2357. A letter from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disbursing Official Offset (RIN: 1510-AB22) received June 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. SKELTON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 477. A resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 111–167). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SKELTON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 478. A resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 111–168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to reimburse States for the costs incurred in establishing a program to track and confirm the receipt of voted absentee ballots in elections for Federal office and make information on the receipt of such ballots available by means of online access, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2728. A bill to provide financial support for the operation of the law library of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111–170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1016. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide advance appropriations authority for certain medical care accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 111–171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOWNS: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1345. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the ''Hatch Act'' (Rept. 111–172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 1752. A bill to provide that the usual day for paying salaries in or under the House of Representatives may be established by regulations of the Committee on House Administration; with amendments (Rept. 111–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committees on Financial Services, Science and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2454 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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. KIRK (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2960. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay an additional amount of assignment special pay to members of the Armed Forces who agree to serve in Afghanistan for up to six years or the duration of the United States mission in that country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 2961. A bill to create additional permanent and temporary judgeships for the eastern district of California, to provide for an additional place of holding court in the eastern district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude certain advanced diagnostic imaging services from the in-office ancillary services exception to the prohibition on physician self-referral; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER (for herself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BRIGHT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CHILDERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MASSA, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for improving small manufacturers' computer technology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. BEAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CAO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H.R. 2964. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. NYE, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mr. BRIGHT):

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. NADLER of New York:

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for direct-to-consumer advertisements of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona (for herself and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 2967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the alternative fuel and alternative fuel mixture credits for black liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the required reduction in the amount of the accelerated death benefit payable to certain terminally-ill persons insured under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance or Veterans' Group Life Insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish water system adaptation partnerships; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum age limit for an original appointment to a position as a Federal law enforcement officer in the case of any individual who has been discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces under honorable conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2971. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. CAO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 2972. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 West Edward Street in Erath, Louisiana, as the ''Conrad DeRouen, Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 2973. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to notify units of local government when a Native American group files a petition to become a federally recognized Indian tribe and before the decision on the petition is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals eligible for veterans health benefits to contribute to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 2975. A bill to improve the medical care by reducing the excessive burden imposed by the civil liability system on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 2977. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study of sustainable water and environmental management in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 2978. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum age to qualify for coverage as a ''child'' under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WATT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2979. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure funding for grants to promote responsible fatherhood and strengthen low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the period of time for which a veteran must be totally disabled before the veteran's survivors are eligible for the benefits provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for survivors of certain veterans rated totally disabled at time of death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2981. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Indian tribes to transfer the credit for electricity produced from renewable resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2983. A bill to require the videotaping or electronic recording of strategic intelligence interrogations of persons in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2984. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to assist in the defense of United States mariners and vessels against piracy, to ensure the traditional right of self-defense of those vessels against piracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 2985. A bill to establish a public diplomacy international exchange program to be known as the Ambassador's Fund for Strategic Exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 2986. A bill to amend the Act of May 29, 1930 (Chapter 354; 46 Stat. 482; commonly known as the Capper-Cramton Act), to authorize a grant program to preserve resources in the National Capital region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure sufficient resources and increase efforts for research at the National Institutes of Health relating to Alzheimer's disease, to authorize an education and outreach program to promote public awareness and risk reduction with respect to Alzheimer's disease (with particular emphasis on education and outreach in Hispanic populations), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 565. A resolution appointing and authorizing managers for the impeachment of Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Res. 566. A resolution congratulating the 2008-2009 National Basketball Association Champions, the Los Angeles Lakers, on an outstanding and historic season; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 567. A resolution congratulating the University of California, Irvine's men's volleyball team for winning the 2009 national championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 568. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of John Brown's raid in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 569. A resolution supporting the work of citizen diplomacy organizations and encouraging the convening of a Presidential Summit on Global Citizen Diplomacy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 570. A resolution directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the Department of Homeland Security relating to the immigration status of any detainees and foreign persons suspected of terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 571. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should relinquish its temporary ownership interests in the General Motors Corporation and Chrysler Group, LLC, as soon as possible and should not micromanage or unduly intercede in management decisions of such companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FILNER introduced A bill (H.R. 2988) for the relief of Fernando Javier Cervantes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 24: Mr. NYE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HIMES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 52: Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 118: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 147: Mrs. HALVORSON.

H.R. 179: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 299: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 406: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 468: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 528: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 571: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 610: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 621: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 649: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 669: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 690: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 704: Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 716: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 745: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 827: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H.R. 948: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 949: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 995: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MASSA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1016: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 1024: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1025: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1032: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1064: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 1066: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 1074: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1084: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1177: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1205: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 1222: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1245: Mr. PAUL and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1247: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1255: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1346: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1428: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1454: Mr. CAO and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1470: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1505: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1517: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1521: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1548: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1558: Mr. OLVER and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1585: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 1600: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1612: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1618: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1677: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1681: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 1702: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1704: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1740: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 1744: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1751: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1776: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1826: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1835: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 1841: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1844: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1880: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1891: Mr. PAUL and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1912: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1933: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 2006: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2035: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 2049: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 2055: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2067: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2095: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2097: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. HOLT and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2119: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2125: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2139: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2140: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. HELLER.
H.R. 2193: Mr. KIRK and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 2194: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2213: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2245: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2254: Mr. MASSA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2259: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2266: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2267: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2269: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2271: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2296: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2324: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2339: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2345: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DENT, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2404: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2414: Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2421: Mr. Adler of New Jersey, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CAO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2435: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2438: Mr. COLE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2452: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2478: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2499: Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 2502: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2523: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 2547: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 2561: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2579: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2583: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2648: Ms. WATERS and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2667: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2669: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2683: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2692: Mr. UPTON, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2708: Mr. HARE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2729: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 2736: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2743: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2746: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2770: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2786: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 2793: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2796: Mr. COBLE and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSS, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. SNYDER.
H. R. 2802: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. R. 2815: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H. R. 2817: Ms. WATERS.
H. R. 2819: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. R. 2825: Ms. WATSON.
H. R. 2844: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. WELCH.
H. R. 2846: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H. R. 2875: Ms. FOXX, Mr. MACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BONNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. R. 2882: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. NORTON.
H. R. 2900: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2904: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2906: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2920: Mr. HALL of New York and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2935: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 2936: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 2941: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2942: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. MICA.
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. NUNES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. POSEY.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Con. Res. 132: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 152: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts and Mr. NADLER of New York.
H. Res. 57: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Res. 81: Mr. MASSA.
H. Res. 209: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 266: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 293: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 314: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRIGHT, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H. Res. 363: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 395: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H. Res. 409: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H. Res. 433: Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 443: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Res. 482: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 491: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SPACE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 507: Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 512: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 538: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MASSA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H. Res. 543: Mr. PALLONE.

H. Res. 549: Mr. HERGER, Mr. MACK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 550: Ms. WATSON, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3, by Mr. LATOURETTE on House Resolution 359: Elton Gallegly, Steve Buyer, Gregg Harper, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Thomas E. Petri, Ron Paul, Roscoe G. Bartlett, John Linder, and C. W. Bill Young.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2892

OFFERED BY: MR. OLSON

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 24, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $36,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $36,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $36,000,000)''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2009 No. 93

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, a Senator from the State of Delaware.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, Lord of all, give us the things that will enable us to make life worthwhile. Give to the Members of this body a sense of proportion to seek the things that matter. Help them to appreciate the long view that they may refuse to sell what is precious for temporary short-term gain. Lord, remind them that laudable goals often require perseverance. Impart to our Senators a teachable spirit that is willing to learn and a humble spirit that accepts advice and will not resent rebuke. Give them also a diligence that whatever their hands find to do, they may do it with all their might. We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable EDWARD E. KAUFMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2009.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KAUFMAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. There will be no rollcall votes today.

Senators DORGAN and MARTINEZ, the managers of the travel bill that is before the Senate, have indicated they are ready to move forward on amendments being laid down. We will have a series of votes Monday night and move toward completing that legislation as quickly as possible. It is important legislation, and we look forward to the completion of it.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the debate escalates over the best way to ease the crushing burden of health care, it is easy to become sidetracked by misrepresentations, distracted by minor details or tempted to point fingers. When we do those things, we lose sight of what is at the heart of this effort, this debate, and this reform.

I wish to take a moment at the end of this week to remind all of us what this is all about—the health care debate. It is about hardworking Americans because they are too often the casualties of our broken health care system. They deserve better than to be also casualties of misleading politics.

To the millions of Americans without health care, this is a concrete and critical crisis that affects children, families, small businesses, and big businesses every single day. It is about the parent who can't take a child to the doctor because insurance is prohibitively expensive. It is about the family who lives one accident or one illness away from financial ruin. It is about a small business that had to lay off employees because it couldn't afford the skyrocketing cost of health care premiums or that small business that had to cancel health insurance for its employees because it couldn't afford it. It is about the three-in-five families who put off health care because it simply costs too much.

As Democrats in the Senate, we are committed to lowering the high price of health care, ensuring every American has access to that quality, affordable care and, finally, letting people choose their own doctors, hospitals, and health plans. We are committed to protecting the existing coverage when it is good, improving it when it is not, and guaranteeing health care for the millions—including 9 million children—who have none. We are committed to preventing disease, reducing health disparities, and encouraging early detection and effective treatments that save lives.

No matter what Republicans claim, the government has no intention of choosing for you any of these things or meddling in any of your medical relationships. If you like the coverage you have, you can choose to keep it.

Health care is not a luxury. It shouldn't be a luxury. We can't afford another year in which 46 million people have to choose between basic necessities and lining the pockets of big insurance companies just to stay healthy.

I hear every day from Nevadans—through e-mails, phone calls, letters, and other means of communication—that people are turned down for health

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

coverage by insurance providers who care more about profits than people. I hear about people who lost their health coverage when they lost their jobs and now have no means of getting it back. I hear of people from Nevada who play by the rules and rightly demand that our health care system be guided by common sense.

That is what this debate is all about—nothing more, nothing less. These people—and nothing else—should be the focus of the open and honest debate they deserve—the people of America.

Mr. President, has the Chair yet announced that we are in a period of morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 193 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.'')

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about health care. Obviously, according to most media reports, and my experience as a member of the HELP Committee, we are basically at gridlock. The Congressional Budget Office stated on Monday, in relation to the legislation being considered in the HELP Committee, that

> Once the proposal is fully implemented . . . the number of people who had coverage through an employer would decline by about 15 million.

The Lewin Group, a health care consulting firm, estimates this number to be much higher. They estimate that up to 70 percent of all Americans who have private insurance today—120 million Americans—will lose their health insurance and be forced onto the government rolls.

That stands in stark contrast to the President's repeated assertions that if you like your health care, you can keep it. Further analysis by HSI Network, a health care economics firm, found that to get all Americans covered under the Democrats' bill, it would cost a staggering $4 trillion and result in 79 million Americans who currently have private insurance having to obtain coverage from the government plan.

What I have described is what is known as the ''crowdout'' phenomenon. It is the substitution effect that occurs when a massive government insurance plan ''crowds out'' private insurance as the expansion of publicly subsidized programs encourage or force people from private arrangements to public ones. This is a real issue and one we must pay attention to.

On Monday the President said:

> I know that there are millions of Americans who are content with their health care coverage. . . . And that means that no matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what.

If the bill we are considering is enacted, I do not believe this is a promise the President will be able to keep. The President's hometown newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, stated in an editorial on Tuesday:

> [The President] promises that anyone who wants to keep their private coverage will be able to do so . . . But we do know a few things about government-run health plans . . . the Federal Government isn't competition. It is the health care equivalent of Bigfoot . . . It sets low prices, to be sure, lower than many insurers are able to match. But that just means those doctors and hospitals recoup the losses by shifting costs onto those with private insurance . . . [which] could easily crowd out private plans. A lot of Americans think the health care system isn't really all that broken. They get good care. They pay for it via insurance . . . But a government-run health plan? Experience says that the cure would be worse than the illness.

The Chicago Tribune has it exactly right. The fact is, a lot of Americans are pleased with their health care options. In fact, 70 percent of Americans with health insurance rated their coverage good or excellent, according to a Rasmussen Reports poll dated May 14, 2009. Those 70 percent might be the precise group of Americans who will lose their health insurance and be forced into government-run programs if the legislation is enacted.

It is a fact that premiums continue rising, eating into family budgets and preventing the uninsured from getting covered. This is the problem we need to be addressing. We need to bring down the cost of health care and thus the cost of health insurance coverage. This will lead to more coverage of the uninsured and ensure that those who like their health care coverage can keep their coverage and their doctor as the President promises. Yet the majority bill contains not a single reform that will save money. Instead, as I have pointed out, it will cost up to $4 trillion and displace up to 79 million Americans from their current coverage.

This is not reform. This is why we should start over. I continue to believe that the Democrats and the White House should scrap this incomplete bill and start over. Democrats and Republicans must come together and draft a bill that allows the President to uphold his promise that Americans will be able to keep their current doctor or health care plan.

We spent a lot of time in the HELP Committee going over an incomplete proposal. Supposedly by tonight the three major issues, including the so-called government option, will be revealed to us by the majority side. I hope it is soon. I hope we will be able to view it so we could have for the first time a meaningful discussion and negotiation in the HELP Committee. So far, three major components are still blank spaces.

I have been in this body for a long time. I have never seen a process such as we are going through right now. It is basically fundamentally a charade so the Democrats can come to the floor and say we consulted with the Republicans, we had hours and hours of debate and discussion and markup—when we were not presented with the key elements of the legislation we were supposed to be considering. If the key elements are there and we get to examine it over the weekend, then perhaps we will be able to sit down together and negotiate some kind of reasonable approach to this bill.

It is not an accident that the Finance Committee, the other committee that is supposed to be tracking the health reform bill along with the HELP Committee, has decided not to present their proposal until after the Fourth of July recess because they simply do not have a way to pay for it.

The CBO analysis and other outside analysis has revealed something very important, that the plan as proposed and propounded by the administration and by the Democrats is unsustainably expensive and one that they do not have a way of paying for. It will be very interesting to see how they tailor their plan to the expenses and how they address the issue of how to pay for it. Clearly, raising taxes is an option they are considering. I don't think raising anybody's taxes in the present day economy is something that would be beneficial to all Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one thing Republicans and Democrats can all agree on is the need for serious health care reform. On Monday, President Obama spoke to the American Medical Association to discuss the issue. I applaud the President for his commitment to health care reform and agree with him that we need to make health care more affordable and accessible to all Americans.

While the American people want reform, they want us to fix what is wrong with the system without taking away the freedom, choices, and quality of care they now enjoy. During a speech to the AMA, the President acknowledged these concerns and articulated some principles on health care reform that many Republicans share. But it seems to me that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle should have listened more closely to what the President said to the AMA.

One thing the President said that Republicans agree with is that Americans should not be forced to give up the insurance they currently have and like and be forced into a government plan. The President promised the American people that:

> If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. No one will take it away no matter what.

Republicans agree with the President. Yet Democrats in Congress are making last-minute edits to a bill in the HELP Committee that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says will cost 10 million people with employer-sponsored insurance to lose the coverage they currently have. And that is the number of people who would lose their current insurance under just one section of the bill. This legislation is still missing significant sections that could force tens of millions of additional Americans to lose their current coverage. Republicans share the President's belief that those who like their health insurance should be able to keep it, but the bill currently being considered by the HELP Committee would force Americans off of the health care plans they now enjoy.

Another issue the President and Republicans agree on is the need to invest more in preventative care and wellness programs, which is an important way to cut costs and improve care. President Obama mentioned the successful wellness and prevention program Safeway created, which has dramatically cut the company's health care costs and employees' health care premiums. He said he would be open to doing more to help businesses across the country adopt and expand programs like the one created by Safeway. Yet the bill the Democrats are now pushing through the Senate would actually ban this successful program from being copied and implemented by other companies.

Republicans also agree with the President on the need to reform our Nation's medical liability laws. Frivolous malpractice lawsuits are a major cause of our increasing health care costs. These lawsuits cause insurance premiums for doctors to skyrocket, and doctors then pass those higher costs on, of course, to patients.

Doctors also often order expensive and unnecessary tests just to protect themselves against these lawsuits, and some doctors just close their practices or stop offering services as a result of all these pressures.

And patients are the ones who lose out. According to a report by the Kentucky Institute of Medicine, Kentucky is nearly 2,300 doctors short of the national average—a shortage that could be reduced, in part, by reforming medical malpractice laws.

President Obama has not advocated the kind of medical liability reform most Republicans would like to see, but he has at least opened the door to fixing the system. But none of the bills introduced in the Congress even acknowledge the need for malpractice reform or propose any solutions to deal with the problem.

Finally, Republicans share the President's concerns about how much health care reform is going to cost and how we will pay for it. President Obama said that he set down a rule that ''health care reform must be, and will be, deficit-neutral in the next decade.''

But the preliminary estimates from the bill before the HELP Committee show that just one—just one—section of the bill spends $1.3 trillion. And even more outrageous is the fact that the bill doesn't even have any proposals to pay for its enormous pricetag—other than to borrow it from the taxpayers. Americans want reform. But they don't want a blind rush to spend trillions of dollars that they and their grandchildren will have to pay for through higher taxes and even more debt.

When it comes to making sure Americans can keep the coverage they have, strengthening wellness and prevention programs, reforming our medical malpractice laws, and paying for health care reform, Republicans share common ground with the President. I just wish that congressional Democrats did too.

AUNG SAN SUU KYI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Nobel Peace Prize laureate Aung San Suu Kyi turns 64 today. Unfortunately, she will spend her birthday not in the company of family and friends but in Burma's notorious Insein Prison where 31 political prisoners have died since 1988.

Despite her apparently poor health, Suu Kyi is being housed in Insein because she is standing trial for the dubious charge of permitting a misguided American to enter her home. Sadly, Suu Kyi has already spent 13 of her last 19 birthdays under house arrest, and if convicted of these trumped-up charges by the Burmese regime, she could spend the next 5 birthdays in this foul prison.

The best gift Suu Kyi can receive for her birthday is for the regime to display some uncommon good sense and free her and other Burmese prisoners of conscience. My colleagues and I are committed to standing with her and the people of Burma for as long as it takes for that to occur.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

E-VERIFY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share a few thoughts about the E-Verify system. That is the system businesses are voluntarily using today in large numbers provided by the U.S. Government that allows a company to check the Social Security number of an applicant for a job to make sure they are lawfully eligible for employment. This system is growing and working very well. We have had some problems, I think, with Congress, and I attempted to offer an amendment to fix some of those problems on the tourism bill that is before us but was not able to do that. So I wish to share a few thoughts about it. I have been trying to get this situation fixed for some time.

E-Verify is an online system that gives very rapid identification of an individual through the Social Security Administration and Homeland Security to determine whether they are eligible for a job. A business just checks those numbers, and if they come back as clear and they hire the individual, it provides them protection from a charge that they may have knowingly hired someone who was illegally in the country or otherwise not able to be employed.

So it is a good system. As I said, as of June 13, this month, 130,000 employers are enrolled in the program. They have, among them, 501,000 hiring sites. It is free and voluntary, and it is the best means available to determine the eligibility of those who apply.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, 96 percent of the employees are cleared automatically, and growth continues at over 1,000 new users and participants each week as more and more businesses are using it. An employer, as I said, gets protection if they use it.

In 2009, this year, 5.6 million inquiries were run. In 2008, through the whole

12 months, more than 6.6 million inquiries were run, and they continue to grow.

In Alabama alone, there are 1,000 employers who use the E-Verify system. It has been proven effective, and I think it should be made permanent and mandatory for everybody who does business with the U.S. Government. As a matter of fact, that was what the law was supposed to be in January, but it is not. So the program is to expire in September unless it is extended.

Now, I am told the Homeland Security legislation the House passed—or will pass—will extend the E-Verify Program for 2 years. I am told the Senate Homeland Security bill may well report language that will extend it for 3 years. Why we don't make it permanent is beyond me. It is a cornerstone of the enforcement system of business and employers to ensure that they are attempting to comply with the law, and if they are not, to be able to identify them.

I was extremely disappointed when the economic stimulus package was up earlier this year and passed, where we spent $800 billion to stimulate the economy and create jobs, it was passed without any requirement that E-Verify be a part of the stimulus package. So a contractor who gets a job with the U.S. Government, with money paid from the stimulus package, legislation that was designed to create jobs for American citizens, could actually go out and hire people illegally in the country. That is not what the American people have a right to expect. That is not good policy. It should not be done.

We have surging unemployment, unfortunately. All of us hoped it would come in less than it is now. I know the President's budget, offered earlier this year, projected that unemployment would top at 8.4 percent. It is now 9.4 percent, the highest in over 20 years. It is continuing to go up, from what it appears. So we have an obligation to try to use what resources we are expending in a way that helps the American worker find work. Some of these stimulus jobs are good jobs. So the House has supported the extension of E-Verify. It passed in the House last July, 407 to 2. Yet it still hasn't become law to extend it past September.

One of the main purposes of the stimulus bill was to see that people got work. I think if we don't extend E-Verify, people have a right to question how serious we are about using that money—that huge amount—wisely to create jobs for American citizens.

An amendment offered and accepted in the House on the stimulus bill was by Congressman Jack Kingston. It said that funds made available under the stimulus package could not be made available to any business that did not use E-Verify. They apparently accepted that without a single dissenting vote. It was in the House legislation. I offered it in the Senate stimulus bill and did everything I could to see that we could make that a part of the law and make it permanent. It was blocked in the Senate by the Democratic leadership.

I am worried that we talk a good game about doing something about this, but so far, we have been very ineffective in taking real action that will work.

Let me share one more thing about Executive order 12989. President Bush issued an Executive order, and that order called for the implementation of the E-Verify system for government contractors in January of this year. It mandates the use of E-Verify for all Federal contractors and subcontractors. It was supposed to take effect in January. I believed President Bush should have been stronger about that than he was, but they went into it carefully, and that is what they decided to do.

When President Obama came in, immediately he extended that and put it off and blocked its enforcement. So it is still not in the law. Now it is being delayed until September 8—that rule that a government contractor at least ought to check his employees to see if they are legally entitled to be employed. How simple is that? It takes a few minutes, and thousands of businesses are voluntarily doing it today. This decision, again, to delay it now until September 8 is the fourth delay this year by President Obama. I believe it signals the fact that this administration is not yet serious about their stated goal of making sure that employers comply with the law and not hire people illegally.

On January 28, it was pushed back to February 20. A few weeks later, the implementation was pushed back to May 21. Prior to that, it was pushed back to June 30, and now it is further delayed until September 8. This system is up and working. It has been up for years now. It is nothing unusual. I cannot imagine that if this Senate is allowed to vote up or down on whether to make this the law that we would not pass it. I am going to offer an amendment that will do just that. That is the right thing to do. It makes common sense.

What I am afraid may happen is that we will have, through maneuvering and chicanery, actions taken to block that vote. If the Democratic leadership in the Senate blocks a vote on this question, that can only be interpreted as their position is that we should not extend E-Verify and that we should not make it apply to government contractors.

It cannot be interpreted any other way because we have been talking about this for years. Everybody knows what the issue is.

I am concerned. I hope the President, who has had his staff on board now for 5 or 6 months—it is time for them to get their act together and let us know where they stand. Just delaying this is an indication to me they are not serious about it. It should not have taken 5 minutes to know that a government contractor should not be hiring people illegally in the workforce. How long does it take to do that? This is not a new issue. But they are studying it, they say. OK, let's study it. But sooner or later, it is time to act.

To me, there are no two ways about it. There is one logical answer to this question. If we want to make sure the government money that is going out—money taken from American taxpayers—provides jobs for American workers, we need to pass legislation to mandate that. I hope we will. I hope the President will be able to get this study complete, which they claim they are doing, and get on with doing the right thing. We have waited long enough.

I thank the Chair, yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE PITTSBURGH PENGUINS ON WINNING THE 2009 STANLEY CUP CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 194, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 194) congratulating the Pittsburgh Penguins on winning the 2009 Stanley Cup Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 194

Whereas, on June 12, 2009, the Pittsburgh Penguins defeated the Detroit Red Wings 2-to-1 in Game 7 of the National Hockey League Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas the victory marks the Penguins' third Stanley Cup Championship in franchise history and capped off a historic playoff series;

Whereas the Penguins are just the second team in league history to win the seventh game of a Stanley Cup Championship series on the road after the home team won the first 6 games of the series;

Whereas the Penguins beat the Washington Capitals in the Eastern Conference Semifinals and the Detroit Red Wings in the Stanley Cup Championship after losing the first 2 games in both series, making the Penguins the only team in league history to rally from 2-to-0 series deficits twice in the same year;

Whereas Mario Lemieux is to be honored for his commitment to keeping the Penguins in Pittsburgh and passing along his legacy to a new generation of players and fans;

Whereas, in February 2009, the Penguins hired Head Coach Dan Bylsma from the Penguins' minor league franchise in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, making Bylsma the first coach in the history of the National Hockey League to begin a season coaching in the American Hockey League and finish a Stanley Cup champion;

Whereas Sidney Crosby, the youngest team captain to ever win the Stanley Cup, was third in scoring during the regular season, had a league-leading 15 playoff goals, and demonstrated leadership by taking the Penguins to the Stanley Cup Finals in 2 consecutive seasons;

Whereas, over the course of the playoffs, Evgeni Malkin led all players in scoring with 36 points, including 14 goals and 22 assists, and won the Conn Smythe trophy for most valuable player in the playoffs;

Whereas Max Talbot is to be commended for scoring the only 2 Penguins goals in the Game 7 victory over the Detroit Red Wings;

Whereas thousands of Penguins fans supported the team throughout the postseason, donning white t-shirts to create a ''whiteout'' effect at home games or gathering to watch the game on a big screen television outside Mellon Arena;

Whereas the Red Wings are to be commended for a terrific season, committment to sportsmanship, and excellence on and off the ice; and

Whereas nearly 400,000 fans packed the streets of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on June 15, 2009, to honor the Penguins in a parade along Grant Street and the Boulevard of the Allies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates—

(A) the Pittsburgh Penguins for winning the 2009 Stanley Cup Championship;

(B) Mario Lemieux and the coaching staff of the Penguins and support staff and recognizes their commitment to keeping the team in Pittsburgh;

(C) all Penguins fans who supported the team throughout the season; and

(D) the Detroit Red Wings on an outstanding season; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) co-owners Mario Lemieux and Ron Burkle;

(B) vice president and general manager Ray Shero; and

(C) head coach Dan Bylsma.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to say, first, how much I appreciate the action on that resolution. I could spend a lot of time talking about our Penguins; we are so grateful they were successful in a very hard-fought series against the Detroit Red Wings, who have a strong organization and were difficult to defeat.

As a Pennsylvanian, I was especially proud that it now marks three champions in the last year: the Philadelphia Phillies in baseball, the Pittsburgh Steelers in football, and now the Pittsburgh Penguins in hockey.

We are very fortunate in our State to have three champions this year. We let the Lakers have basketball for this year. We will try to get that next year.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon, at the end of a week where—and the Presiding Officer knows this in his work representing the State of Oregon and in his work as a member of our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—we have spent a lot of time on health care, as we did the week before and several weeks leading up to this time. But now we are at the point where in our committee we are actually voting—voting on amendments.

We know this is a challenge that has faced America for decades: the challenge of covering people in our country who do not have coverage and making sure those who do have coverage have quality health care coverage that is affordable. So all these challenges are presented to us now.

We have a situation in the country today—and Chairman DODD mentioned this this morning in a hearing—that about 14,000 people a day lose their health care coverage. It is hard to comprehend that every single day that number of Americans are losing their health care coverage. Candidly, if the number was half that, it would be unacceptable—or even less than that—but that is, in a very real way, the status quo, where we are now. Thousands and thousands of people losing coverage every day, 14,000 by one count; people who might have coverage but it is hard for them to afford it or to continue to afford it, and sometimes people have coverage and it is not of the kind of quality that would ensure the best health care for them and for their families.

We are at a point now where we are beginning to see a basic choice that the Congress has to make and the American people have to make. It is the status quo or change. It is the status quo—where we are now—which, in my judgment, is unacceptable—or reform. It is coming down to a basic, fundamental choice.

The status quo right now is the enemy of change. The status quo is the impediment in front of us, the tree across the road or whatever image you want to illustrate. So we have to get to work making sure that the status quo doesn't stay in place.

There are so many ways to tell this story. Every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House and, frankly, virtually every American could tell a story about someone they know or someone they have read about and the challenges they face. In Pennsylvania, we have a lot of examples about people who are living the reality of a lack of coverage or bad quality coverage or coverage they cannot afford. One letter I got stood out for me, among many. It was written back in February of this year by Trisha Urban from Berks County, PA, the eastern side of Pennsylvania. I will read portions of her letter which I think tell the story about as well as anyone could; unfortunately, in this case, in a tragic circumstance. She wrote, talking about her husband Andrew, that he had to leave his job for 1 year to complete an internship requirement that he had to get his doctorate in psychology. The internship was unpaid and they could not afford COBRA coverage—extended health care coverage. Now I am quoting from the middle of the letter. Trisha Urban says:

> Because of the preexisting conditions, neither my husband's health issues——

He had some heart trouble——

> neither my husband's health issues nor my pregnancy would be covered under private insurance.

Now I am quoting again:

> I worked 4 part-time jobs and was not eligible for any health care benefits. We ended up with a second rate health insurance plan through my husband's university. When medical bills started to add up, the insurance company decided to drop our coverage, stating that the internship did not qualify us for the benefits. We were left with close to $100,000 worth of medical bills. Concerned with the upcoming financial responsibility of the birth of our daughter and the burden of current medical expenses, my husband missed his last doctor's appointment less than one month ago.

Trisha Urban's letter goes on. She talks about what happened at one particular moment after summarizing their health care situation. She says, describing her pregnancy:

> My water had broke the night before. We were anxiously awaiting the birth of our first child. A half-hour later, two ambulances were in my driveway. As the paramedics were assessing the health of my baby and me, the paramedic from the other ambulance told me that my husband could not be revived.

She concludes her letter this way. Again, I am quoting Trisha Urban from Berks County, PA:

> I am a working class American and do not have the money or the insight to legally fight the health insurance company. We had no life insurance. I will probably lose my home and my car. Everything we worked so hard to accumulate in our life will be gone in an instant. If my story is heard, if legislation can be changed to help other uninsured Americans in a similar situation, I am willing to pay the price of losing everything.

Trisha Urban is telling us through that poignant but tragic story about her own circumstances and the circumstances surrounding the birth of her daughter and the death of her husband, all we need to know about this debate.

Then, posing that question—or that challenge, I should say—to all of us, especially those of us who have a vote in the Senate:

> I am willing to pay the price of losing everything if my story can be told and legislation can be enacted to deal with health care.

That is the basic challenge that Trisha Urban has put before the Senate and the Congress and the administration. It is the challenge we must respond to. We cannot pretend it is not

there. We cannot pretend that the status quo I talked about a moment ago—14,000 people losing their health insurance every day; so many other people worried about the coverage they have—we cannot pretend that is not there. We cannot say to Trisha Urban that we are sorry about the circumstances of your story, but Congress can't get it done this year.

We have to get it done. We have to pass a bill in our committee. We have to get a bill through the Finance Committee, and we have to make sure the Senate votes on this legislation this year—frankly, this summer; not late in the fall, not in the winter, not in 2010. Right now is the time for action.

President Obama has led us in this effort. He has attached the same sense of urgency to this issue that I know the American people feel.

What is it about? Well, it is about an act that a lot of Americans are just hearing about, which goes by a very simple name: the Affordable Health Choices Act. That is the act that is presently before our committee. It does a couple of things. It focuses on some fundamentals to get at that change that should come to the status quo. First, it reduces costs by way of prevention. It is very important. We know that can reduce costs substantially. It also reduces costs by better quality and information technology. It is still hard to believe that when other industries such as banking and insurance and other parts of our economy have moved into the new era of technology that our health care system isn't anywhere near where it has to be to reduce medical errors and to provide better quality. So by focusing on information technology, we can reduce costs. That is in the bill.

Also, the bill contemplates rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse—another area of cost reduction. We know that the big questions on costs will be dealt with in the other committee—the Finance Committee—but there are elements in this bill that, in fact, reduce costs.

Secondly, the bill preserves choice, that if you like what you have in your insurance plan and the coverage you have, you can keep it. There is no reason why that should change, and it won't change under this bill. But if you don't like the coverage you have, we want to give you options and we also want to give you an option in coverage if you obviously don't have any health insurance at all. So it does reduce costs, it does preserve choice, and, thirdly, it will ensure quality and affordable care for the American people.

I believe, and I think most people in the Senate believe, that one ought to have the option of not just any health care but quality care that is affordable, that you can actually make work in your own budget. So we are going to build on the system we have. We are not going to throw the old system out; we are going to build on the system we have and make it better.

We are also going to make sure that in this legislation, we protect the patient-doctor relationship. There is no reason why anyone should get in between those two, and this bill will not do that.

Finally—this is a quick summary, I know—we are going to make sure that at long last, a preexisting condition does not prevent you from getting the kind of quality health care you have a right to expect in America today.

As we move forward on this legislation, I want to make sure we highlight the fundamental obligation we have, not just in the bill—but especially in the bill—but even beyond this legislation, and that is the obligation we have to get this right for the American people, and to get it right especially for our children. The Presiding Officer knows of the great progress we made this year on children's health insurance. Thank goodness we got that done. Instead of having 6 million kids in America covered by the children's health insurance program, by way of the legislation we passed this year we are going to extend that to almost 11 million kids. That was wonderful. That is a big success and we should all be proud, but it is not enough. We should make sure that the other 5 million children out there who don't have coverage today will get it but especially a child who happens to be in a poor family, a low-income family, or a child with special needs.

Here is what the rule ought to be. This is what should happen throughout this process while enacting health care reform, but certainly at the end of the road, so to speak, ideally this fall when we will have a bill the President can sign: The rule ought to be no child worse off, and especially no child who is poor or who has special needs or is disabled. The great line from the Scriptures that talks about a faithful friend—we have heard this over many years in the context of friendship, in the context of sometimes a reading at weddings, but I would like for us today to think about it in the context of our children. This is what the Scripture said: ''A faithful friend is a sturdy shelter''—a great image about what friendship means. There are a lot of us day in and day out, year in and year out, who talk about how important children are to us, that we are advocates for children—and we should be—that we have solidarity with our children, we are going to do everything we can to protect them. In essence, we are saying we are their friend, that those of us who are elected to public office have an obligation to be a friend of and an advocate for our children. Going back to that line from the Scriptures, if we are going to be a faithful friend to children, we better make sure that we provide a sturdy shelter; not just in the context of the obvious in health care. What is more fundamental than that, other than making sure that a child has enough to eat and making sure that child has an opportunity to learn? Other than those two, health care is essential in the life of a child, especially a vulnerable child, whether they are poor or have special needs or both. So if we are faithful friends in the Senate to our children, we better provide that sturdy shelter. We better make sure that at the end of the day, these children are not worse off because of our legislation.

I wish to conclude with a thought from an expert—not someone who is just interested in children but someone who has an area of expertise which is probably unmatched. I am speaking of someone who testified last week—a week ago today, it was—in front of our committee. Her name is Dr. Judith Palfrey. She is a pediatrician, a child advocate, and happens to be president-elect of the American Academy of Pediatrics. She provided compelling testimony. I won't go through all of her testimony, but here is something she said which I think has relevance and resonance for the debate we are having on health care. She says—and I quote Dr. Palfrey's testimony:

> Sometimes we as childhood advocates find it hard to understand why children's needs are such an afterthought; and why, because children are little. Because children are little, policymakers and insurers think that it should take less effort and resources to provide them health care.

Because children are little, we think that somehow less effort is required or less resources, less in the way of hard work. Well, none of us believes that, do we? We don't believe that. The health care we provide to our children, the protection, the shelter we provide them should be every bit as significant, every bit as fully resourced as the protection we give to adults. We might disagree about a lot of the details in the health care bill, but I think we all in this Chamber believe that children may be little but in God's eyes they are 7 feet tall and we must treat them accordingly, especially on legislation so significant as legislation on health care reform.

So the rule ought to be no child worse off. It is that simple. I believe we can get it right. I believe we can enact health care reform that preserves choice, reduces costs, and enhances quality and affordable coverage for the American people, and that we can make sure every child is no worse off.

This is a great challenge. We understand the difficulty of it. This is a great challenge, but it is a challenge worthy of a great nation. It is a challenge that will help us in our continuing struggle, our journey to make this a more perfect Union.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will make a couple of comments on Senator CASEY's comments. We sit next to each other in the HELP Committee, and Senator CASEY reminds us almost every day, as we work on this health care bill, that ''no child should be

worse off.'' That is something that, frankly, we all need to hear and every Member of this body and in the House of Representatives needs to hear. I appreciate Senator CASEY's work. It is really our mission to do this right and to see that no child is left worse off.

We spend more than $2 trillion a year on health care in this country, which is more than double any other industrial nation. Americans account for more than 35 million hospital visits and more than 900 million office visits every year. More than 64 million surgical procedures are performed and more than 3.5 billion prescriptions are written. Health care is, in dollar terms, one-sixth of our national economy, and it is growing. Think about that—one-sixth of our economy and hundreds of billions of dollars. Yet millions of Americans are one illness away from bankruptcy.

What we cannot forget as we debate health care reform are the millions of Americans who are depending on us to do the right thing. We cannot forget their stories. Chairman DODD, in the HELP Committee today, reminded us that 14,000 Americans lose their health insurance every single day. So as our committee meets—and some people seem to be slowing this down a little, and they certainly have the right to offer amendments, but they get carried away and talk some of these amendments to death. Every day that we don't pass this health care bill, 14,000 Americans are losing their insurance. I will tell you some of the stories I hear.

Christopher, from Cincinnati, tells us that he and his wife are retired but are not yet 65, not yet Medicare-eligible. Without health care reform, they cannot afford health care insurance because of preexisting health conditions. Their 401(k)—their retirement—is bleeding. Their small pensions don't keep up with rising premiums. Chris puts off going to the doctor to save money. The annual premium increases will raise their out-of-pocket expenses by 45 percent.

Our Nation spends in excess of $2 trillion annually in health care. Yet too many people are only a hospital visit away from financial disaster. We cannot afford to squander this opportunity for reform, nor settle for marginal improvements. Instead, we must fight for substantial reforms that will significantly improve our health care system.

First of all, whatever plan you are in, if you are happy with it, you can keep your insurance. We want to fix what is broken and protect what works. That is why I am making a case for giving Americans a public health insurance option, not controlled by the health insurance industry.

So many of us have had fights—even the President, when he was talking about his mother as she was dying of cancer during the campaign last year, about how while she was sick she had to fight insurance companies to be reimbursed and get payment for her illness. The public health insurance option is important, in part, because it is not controlled by the health insurance industry. It is a competitor. It can compete with private insurance plans. We must preserve access, but that is clearly not enough for what we do in health care. Giving Americans a choice to go with a private or public health insurance plan is good policy and good common sense.

A public insurance option will make health care available and affordable for Americans like Michelle of Willoughby, OH, east of Cleveland. When she was first diagnosed with breast cancer, she had excellent coverage through her husband's insurance. But when her husband lost his job, she lost her insurance. Not yet eligible for Medicare, she started a consulting business and found an insurance plan—exorbitant as it was. With the economic downturn, Michelle writes that the ''sum of her work is to pay for insurance.''

At a time when too many Americans struggle to pay health care costs, the public health insurance option will make health insurance more affordable.

A public health insurance option would make insurance affordable for Americans like Gary from Toledo. Gary was laid off last year and couldn't afford the more than $800 a month COBRA costs. After obtaining health insurance from a company that promised equivalent payments of Medicare for surgeries, Gary's wife underwent surgery. After a week of recovery, they received a hospital bill of $210,000, with a hospital letter saying they lacked insurance. Gary talked to his provider, who agreed to pay only $400 out of $210,000. Fortunately for his family, the hospital absorbed the remaining costs. But that should not happen, either, because of what that means to the local hospital. With Gary and his wife still 3 years away from age 65, they deserve health reform that works for them now.

A public health insurance option will also expand access to affordable health care in rural areas that are often ignored by a private insurance market that tends to target big cities with a more dense population and more consumers.

Too often, as Randall of West Liberty, OH—a small town in our State—can explain, rural communities have a difficult time attracting even basic care. Randall oversees Ohio's only rural training track in family medicine. While his program has received awards for training excellence, he struggles to attract enough doctors for their rural residents. He wrote to me explaining the disincentives and misperceptions he has to overcome to attract the care needed to serve rural Ohio.

A public health insurance option will not neglect rural areas. Insurance companies bail out in rural areas or the insurance companies that stay are so small in number that there is no real competition and they can charge rates that are too high. Instead, the public option would be consistently available in all markets, including rural eastern Oregon and rural western and southeastern Ohio.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues to design a public insurance option as part of overall health care reform. The stories of millions of Americans behind spiraling costs of health care will no longer go unheard. The stories of Chris, Gary, Michelle, and Randall will guide this administration, this Congress, and this Nation to protect and provide health care for all Americans.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we are now embarked in the Senate on one of the most important challenges that our country faces—we will begin to reform our tragically flawed and broken health care system to bring down its skyrocketing costs, to cover its tens of millions of Americans left uninsured, and to improve its way-below-average results so that high-quality health care comes within reach for every American family. The stakes are high.

This week, in a speech before the American Medical Association, President Obama said:

> The cost of our health care is a threat to our economy. It is an escalating burden on our families and businesses. It is a ticking time bomb for the Federal budget. And it is unsustainable for the United States of America.

The President said:

> Health care reform is the single most important thing we can do for America's long-term fiscal health.

Savings in waste, confusion, unnecessary or defective care, and illness prevention could eventually well exceed $700 billion a year. It is not going to happen instantly, but it is a goal we can shoot for.

I applaud President Obama's commitment and leadership, and I commend my Senate colleagues for their tireless efforts in the pursuit of meaningful, comprehensive reform. The new energy and focus we have seen in this debate isn't limited to us here in Washington. In recent months, doctors and hospitals, patients and insurance companies, labor unions and drug companies have all come together in support of the need for a restructure of our system.

Amidst all this, it has been my great honor to join the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oregon, on the HELP Committee, where he serves with such distinction and where much of the legislation to repair our broken health care system is being debated, written,

and refined. In that capacity, I was recently invited to the White House to meet with President Obama, his health care team, and all of our colleagues on the HELP and Finance Committees. We discussed our priorities for reform, and we reported on the progress each committee has made in the past several weeks.

In the coming weeks, we will hear a lot about the details of health care reform legislation, and those details are very important. But even more important are the hundreds of millions of American families in each of our States all over the country who have experienced real anguish—coverage lost or denied, hospital stays extended due to complications or errors, prescription drug bills rising and rising, with no end in sight, even losing everything because a loved one fell ill.

A few months ago, I launched a page on my Web site for Rhode Islanders to share their personal experiences with our broken health care system, and hundreds of people have written in from all over the State.

Anita is a social worker and mental health professional in Providence. She shared what she describes as the ''sad and rude awakening'' she experienced after opening her own practice last year. As a provider, like all providers, she takes great pride in the quality of care and attention she gives to her patients. Yet she often found herself burdened with an endless trail of paperwork and the time-consuming task of battling insurance companies and tracking down claims. Like so many of her colleagues, Anita is frustrated that she must spend so much time fighting administrative hurdles and navigating bureaucratic red tape. After years of training to become a health professional, Anita wishes she had more time to do just that—provide care to her patients. She writes:

> I would much rather spend the time seeing clients than negotiating automated telephone systems and waiting to speak to a person several hours per week. It is a total waste of human time and talent.

I heard from Melissa, a self-employed writer from Newport, whose unpredictable income leaves her unable to afford health insurance. Without coverage, Melissa knows that she risks being one serious illness away from what she calls the ''brink of disaster.'' Through the stress and fear of not having insurance—through that brink of disaster that she lives on—Melissa waits and hopes that she doesn't get sick because that is the only option she has in this, our great country.

Rhonda is a mother in Coventry. She told me about her struggle to get health care coverage for her family. As if raising her two sons wasn't enough work, this single mother works two jobs to make ends meet. Although her employer offered health coverage at an affordable price, Rhonda's limited income could not be stretched to cover the additional cost of coverage for her children. So her sons went without insurance for 3 years. Rhonda, like so many hard-working Americans, was caught between a rock and a hard place—making slightly more than the eligible income to qualify for health coverage through State assistance plans, but not making enough money to afford health care coverage on her own. She prayed every day her children would be spared from sickness or injury.

I also received a story from Richard, in Providence, who told me about his father—a hard-working man who left work for 6 months to concentrate on fighting a battle against cancer. Sadly, just when Richard's father needed the support the most, his company dropped him from their health plan. Without coverage and unable to pay the costs out of pocket, his father was forced off his chemotherapy treatment. Richard's father was very lucky. The doctors cleared him of cancer. However, the medical bills were so high that Richard's parents lost their home. Remarkably, after all his family has been through, Richard feels fortunate that at least his father was covered for part of his treatment, but he urged us to fix ''this old and broken system.''

For these Rhode Islanders and for millions of more Americans silently suffering through their own personal catastrophes all over the country, we now have to be a voice. We must improve the quality of our health care, we must develop our Nation's health information infrastructure, and we must invest in preventing disease.

We must protect existing coverage where it is good and improve it when it is not. As the President said, if you like your health plan, you get to keep it. We must dial down the paperwork wars, and dial up better information for American health care consumers. We must speak for the 46 million Americans, 9 million of whom are children, who right now as I stand here on the Senate floor have no health insurance at all.

As Families USA reports, 47 million actually understates the problem because during the course of this year nearly 90 million Americans will, at one point or another, go without health insurance.

We look around at dark and tumultuous economic times. Yet looking beyond the immediate economic perils we face, a $35 trillion unfunded liability for Medicare—not a penny set against it—is bearing down on us. As the President told the AMA earlier this week:

> . . . if we fail to act, Federal spending on Medicaid and Medicare will grow, over the coming decades, by an amount almost equal to the amount our government currently spends on our Nation's defense. In fact, it will eventually grow larger than what our government spends on anything else today. It's a scenario that will swamp our Federal and State budgets and impose a vicious choice of either unprecedented tax hikes, overwhelming deficits, or drastic cuts in our Federal and State budgets.

We can only avoid that vicious choice by reforming the health care system. We are committed to making sure every American has health insurance coverage, but meaningful reform will take more than that. Think of it this way. If you had a boat out in the ocean and people overboard around it in danger of drowning, surely you would try to bring them all into the boat. But if the boat itself was sinking, if the boat itself was on fire, you would have to do more than just bring them on board. You have to repair the boat. You have to get it floating and moving forward.

That is what we have to do with our health care system. It is not enough just to provide coverage for all Americans, we also have to right this ship. This means improving the quality of health care and investing in prevention, especially in those areas where improved quality of care and investment in prevention means lower cost so that, for instance, 100,000 Americans will no longer die each and every year because of entirely avoidable medical errors. This also means reforming how we pay for health care so what we pay for is what we want from health care.

Government must act. At last, government must act. The problems of health care in America are rooted in market failures. We cannot wait for the market to cure a problem rooted in market failure. It is nonsense. We have to change the rules of the game.

We also can't pay for one thing and expect another. We have to change the incentives. We do not expect Americans to go out and build our highway infrastructure for us. We do that through government. We can't sit around and wait for our health information infrastructure to build itself either. We cannot expect quality improvement and prevention of illness to flourish when we make it a money-losing proposition for the people who have to make it work. We have to change those incentives too.

Opponents of reform are arguing that this process is going too quickly, that we need to slow down, wait, pause. They are loading down this bill with hundreds of amendments—170 amendments alone on the section that deals with preventive care. But haven't we waited long enough? Slow is what we have done for years, even decades. When I hear from Rhode Islanders with the stories I reported here, such as Richard and Rhonda and Melissa and Anita, I think not that we are going too fast, I think we are irresponsibly, even frighteningly late in getting after this problem and taking up this charge.

If we wait much longer, we may be too late to avoid that tidal wave of costs that threatens to swamp our ship of state. To those who say slow down, I say keep up.

Opponents of reform want people to believe that a system that costs too much, that lets insurance company bureaucrats make decisions about our health care; that is riddled with error, duplication, and waste; that leaves nearly 50 million Americans without any health insurance, is acceptable.

Everyone says they want reform, but unless we get moving, all we will end up with is more of the same. As President Obama said this week: The status quo is unsustainable.

Some opponents want to slow this down because they know if they slow it down they can kill it. We cannot let that happen. The stakes are way too high.

The anguish out there, as you know in Oregon, as I see in Rhode Island, as all our colleagues see across the country, is real and it is everywhere. At last we can do something about it. Now is the time. This is the moment. Let us make this work. Let us, together, find a way to make this work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent I may proceed as if in morning business for approximately 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, and to all present in terms of staff, this is Friday, and here we are at 1:25. I apologize to the doorkeepers, I apologize to the elevator operators, I don't want to keep you here for a long time, so I will quit apologizing, but there have been some things happening with regard to health care.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island indicated the need to move forward on health care. Everybody agrees to that. The pace of it, what is going on, is a real concern, so I do have some remarks to make. I will try to make this as quickly and succinctly as possible so everybody can go about their business. I see smiles from the pages, in regards if I can just hurry up and get through my comments.

Yesterday, in the HELP Committee's markup of the Kennedy-Dodd health care reform bill, we had a very good discussion about the proper use and the objectives of something called government-conducted comparative effectiveness research.

I know that is getting into the weeds in regard to health care language and health care acronyms. It is called CER; remember that term, ''CER.'' It is going to be around for a long time because it has become quite controversial in regard to our health care discussion and what eventually passes. CER is research that compares the relative outcomes of two medical treatments for the same condition to determine which one is better. That is a good thing. It is a good thing to disseminate and to inform doctors and everybody in the health care delivery system—nurses, health care providers, pharmacists, et cetera—it is a good thing. But the first problem with CER is that not every patient is the same. What is better for one patient may not be better, or could actually be worse, for another. For this reason doctors and patients must be able to deviate from the results of something called CER, or a master plan or a master evaluation that could come out of Washington from an outfit called CMS, under the Department of Health and Human Services.

The situation is patients must be able to deviate from the results and make treatment decisions on a case-by-case individualized basis. That is what we all want in terms of our treatment with our doctors.

The other major problem, I submit, is that CER has been used by other governments, such as the United Kingdom, to base treatment decisions not just on relative effectiveness but on relative cost. There is the rub. If CER is going to inform doctors and everybody in the medical community that this kind of treatment or this kind of best practice is the arena in which you should operate or pasture you should operate in, that is OK. But if it is used to control costs as opposed to care, then we have a problem.

By giving priority to the relative costs of the treatments being compared, the government can deny access to health care based on what I would call pseudoscience, under the guise of CER. That brings me back to yesterday's discussion on CER on the health care markup. The Kennedy-Dodd bill includes a section that establishes a new Center for Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation. This outfit is to conduct and support comparative effectiveness research.

Section 219(h)(1)—if that isn't getting into the weeds, I don't know what is—includes the following language relating to the practical effect of CER, or comparative effectiveness research. That would, again, be conducted by the center.

> Center reports and recommendations shall not be construed as mandates for payment, coverage and treatment.

That language was in there to get at this problem for those of us who worry that CER will be used by CMS—that is another acronym. That is the outfit that runs Medicaid and Medicare, in terms of services. These are the people who count the beans, these are the people who want to turn the red beans into black beans. These are the people into cost containment. These are the people who many times drive board members in small hospitals crazy.

At any rate, to take away the worry, that language was put in there: Senate reports and recommendations shall not be construed as mandates for payments, coverage and treatment. They thought that was enough to protect us in regard to CER dictating medical care and stepping in between you and your doctor.

Let's go back to those words ''shall not be construed as mandates.'' What does that mean? ''Mandate'' means to force, compel, bind. This language says the CER shall not be interpreted as forcing CMS, Veterans' Administration or the Department of Defense to restrict payments to doctors based on its results.

Senator MIKULSKI and I and Dr. COBURN as well had a very lively discussion about the intent of this language. Senator MIKULSKI said the intent of the language was to keep the right to make treatment decisions with the doctor and the patient, not with the government. I certainly agree with that.

Senator MIKULSKI has worked long and hard on this bill, and I respect her for that. She is a good colleague and a good friend. I agree with this intent.

But as I pointed out to the Senator, the language in the Kennedy-Dodd bill does not accomplish our common intent of saying the government is not mandated or forced to use the results of this comparative effectiveness research to make payment decisions. Whether you are paid or not in regard to Medicare or, for that matter, Medicaid is not the same thing as prohibiting or preventing CMS from doing so.

In order to vigorously protect the rights of patients and doctors to make treatment decisions against the danger that the government will interfere in that process, I believe the bill must prohibit the government from using the results of CER in making payment, coverage, or treatment decisions. Sorry, you cannot have that, you have got to have this treatment, because it is a best medicine practice, regardless of the fact that maybe you and your doctor have had that treatment before and the doctor thinks that treatment is the best treatment for you.

I offered new language, and the new language would have placed a clear, bright-line firewall between the conduct of CER—which, by the way, I think is essential to advancing medical science; it is a good thing—and the use of its results to restrict your doctor from using his or her best judgment when treating you.

My language, which I further modified at the suggestion of Senator MIKULSKI, read: ''Center reports and recommendations are prohibited from being used by any government entity for payment, coverage, or treatment decisions.''

Senator MIKULSKI agreed to consider my suggestion over last night, along with Senator DODD. I appreciate that. But today when the HELP Committee reconvened in our markup, Senator MIKULSKI and the majority refused to accept my language and offered counter-language that would basically put us back to square one and, in my view, would do nothing to protect patients and doctors from CMS or any other government agency interfering in their treatment decisions.

When I asked why my language was unacceptable, which I thought was acceptable for everybody when we left yesterday, I was told that the decision

to say my language was not acceptable was based on concerns by ''Washington policy experts.''

I said: Who is that? Which Washington policy expert said my language was not acceptable?

When pressed on which policy experts, we learned that the directive came straight down from the White House. Why would the White House be so concerned about prohibiting the Federal Government from using CER to restrict payments to doctors or to direct doctors to follow specific treatment orders? Why would the White House do this on this in-the-weeds proposal, which is not an in-the-weeds proposal at all, it is about what the government is going to do or tell doctors and patients what they can expect.

It is clear from statements made by this administration that they see CER as the golden ring for cost containment. The President said when asked, how on Earth are you going to pay for the health care bill, We are going to cut Medicare payments.

How are you going to do that?

Well, if you have a CER golden ring that comes down from CMS or the National Institutes of Health for cost containment, you can see: This research says that you should follow these practices, not those practices and those practices, or, these practices would certainly cost less.

I do not think that is a good thing. From OMB Director Peter Orszag, to the NIH Director, going on to the National Economic Council Director, Larry Summers, and indications from our new Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, a good friend, former Governor of Kansas, all have pointed to the huge potential of CER to be used to contain costs, not to recommend procedures best for patients and the doctors as determined by the patient and the doctor, but by CER to control costs.

That is why the White House does not want to prohibit CMS or any government agency from using the results of CER to deny you and your doctor the right to choose the treatment that is best for you.

After all of that was said and done, and a lot was said and not much done, I got quite a lecture this morning in regard to my use of the word ''rationing'' to describe what this could lead to. This lecture was referred to as a scare tactic. They indicated that I was using the word ''rationing'' out there as a scare tactic to scare people to say we do not want health care reform.

I find that rather condescending. I find that demeaning. And it is certainly not accurate. You tell me, when Medicare refuses to pay your doctor if he or she decides you need a particular course of treatment that deviates from the government standard, what would you call it? I would call it rationing.

That is the danger. It is not a scare tactic. Health care rationing is happening right now in this country. We may not have explicit rationing such as in the United Kingdom where the government refuses to give elderly people drugs to treat their macular degeneration until they have already gone blind in one eye—not making that up—or refuses kidney cancer drugs for terminal patients because it is not worth the money to extend their life by 6 months. That is rationing.

But we do have de facto rationing, because Medicare and Medicaid refuse to pay doctors anything close to what their costs are. By the way, it's the same thing for pharmacists, the same thing for home health care, and for all of the providers who provide our health care treatment. This means those doctors cannot afford to take Medicare and Medicaid patients—they make the decision then—and it means that those individuals do not have access to care. That is rationing I am talking about.

I am talking about a doctor who makes a decision: I am only getting paid about 70 cents in terms of the dollar in regard to my cost in regard to Medicare patients. I have to hire extra people to keep up with paperwork and regulations. Those people do not exist in the rural health care system. We have to try to find them. So it is a lot easier if I drop the Medicare Program.

That comes as a sudden jolt and a sudden decision that is not fair in regard to the patients who were being treated by that doctor in terms of Medicare. That is what we call rationing right now in regard to the United States of America.

We know the administration wants to use CER to contain costs. We know CMS has a history of denying full payment based on cost. I am not going to take the time on the Senate floor right now to go into all of the problems that CMS has posed for the health care delivery system. Again, these are folks who have a difficult task. They are trying to change the red beans into black beans so that health care does not cost so much. But in terms of their decisions here in Washington in regard to what care is going to be paid for and what is not, they are an absolute nightmare to every hospital administrator, every hospital board member in the 350 or so hospitals I have in Kansas, and the 83 critical access hospitals I have in Kansas.

We do not have a very good relationship with CMS. What we have is a meaningful dialog, most of the time, when yet another regulation comes down the pike to contain cost, most of which the doctors have never heard of, not to mention everybody else in the health care delivery system. I can go into quite a rant, as you can expect from my comments in regard to CMS and what they do and what they do not do.

Why is the majority, why are the Democrats, resisting any language to protect patients and their doctors, you and your doctor, and your right to make the right treatment decision for you? Why are they trying to muzzle my warnings that this could lead to the rationing of health care? It boils down to the fact that they do not want the American people to know what their true plans could actually be. That is why they are shoving this massive health care reform bill through Congress at warp speed, having markups before we even have complete language or cost estimates.

We heard from the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island about the need for health care reform, and the fact that he was complaining about over 100 amendments in the HELP Committee. My goodness. Almost every major bill I have been associated with, you have literally hundreds of amendments. Many fall by the wayside, many are withdrawn. We have dealt with 17, 18 of them as of today.

Senator MIKULSKI and Senator DODD did a very good job in that respect, along with our ranking member, Senator ENZI from Wyoming. But it would be helpful, if we are going to move forward with the health care reform, if we had the bill. We do not have the bill in the HELP Committee. We have one section of the bill, and then we have a Congressional Budget Office score on one-sixth of the bill that is $1 trillion. And, boy, did that shock everybody. Say $1 trillion for one-sixth of the bill. What is the whole bill going to cost? That estimate is somewhere in the neighborhood of $4 trillion. How on Earth are you going to pay, in the Finance Committee, the pay-for committee, $4 trillion for health care reform, and take it out of the health care delivery system?

I do not think you can do it. But we do not know, because we have not seen the legislation. We are being asked to go on a deadline schedule to produce amendments on things such as CER that worry people in regard to possible rationing by a date certain or a time certain, and we have not even seen the bill we are amending.

I have never been through a situation like that. Not to mention the specific cost estimates by CBO. This is not right. That is why Chairman BAUCUS in the Finance Committee had at least the good sense to postpone the markup of his bill until we could work this out. That is why slowing down does not necessarily mean that everybody is opposed to health care reform. It means we ought to get it right.

We at least ought to have a bill to read, to know what we are dealing with. I think it is because they know that if Americans knew what they were doing, they would never stand for it. I think we need to get this out to the public, and the public will hopefully fully understand it. I am not going to allow this. Personally, I am going to continue to shout it from the rooftops and beware of what lurks under the banner of ''reform'' to tell every doctor, every hospital administrator, every hospital board member, anybody who has anything to do with the health care delivery system, watch out in regard to CER.

It could be the golden ring of cost containment, and it could put you out of business. It could put you out of business. We have examples of CMS doing exactly that. So do not wake up one day and realize that the government has taken over your health care the same way they have taken over the banks and the auto industry. Do not let them ration your health care. Rationing is not what we need. It can be terribly counterproductive, and I hope we can do a better job in the future.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Oregon, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and at 2:30 p.m. the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:34 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MERKLEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Oregon, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have worked several days this week trying to move forward on the tourism bill. It is an extremely important piece of legislation. It is important to every State in the Union. That is why it is so heavily bipartisan.

We have almost 50 cosponsors of this legislation. Lots of Republicans cosponsored this legislation—BOND, BROWNBACK, ENZI, GRAHAM, MARTINEZ, THUNE, WICKER, ALEXANDER, COCHRAN, ENSIGN, VITTER—and I am sure there are others. It is a bipartisan bill.

We have already wasted so much time. We had to file cloture on a motion to proceed to this heavily bipartisan bill. Once we were on the bill, I spoke to the Republican leader. We thought we had a pathway to having civility here, so the Republicans would try to help us. But, of course, we learned yesterday the GOP is still saying no; Democrats need to know when they bring bills up, we are going to extend debate as long as we can, even if we cannot win.

We said: OK. You offer—you, the Republicans—four amendments. And they did. They picked all the amendments they wanted to offer—not germane to this bill.

I said: OK. They were all involving TARP or the money that we all know about by now. So I said, and I told the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS: If the Republicans want to offer nongermane amendments, I will be happy to have you offer your amendment.

His is a fairly simple amendment. We see what is happening in the world today as it relates to oil. Again, we are seeing speculation. We know it was there before, we are seeing it again. We have a large inventory, with no reason for the price to spike. But we have those people, these commodity traders, who are rolling the dice as if they were coming to Las Vegas to roll the dice on the oil because they think the price is going to go up.

What Sanders wanted to do is basically nothing unique. He wanted to make sure the entity that is responsible for making sure there are no shenanigans being conducted by these traders, that we pass some legislation saying: You have to do better than what you have done, in effect. I am paraphrasing the picture of that legislation. It was fairly noncontroversial. But the Republicans said no. Whom are they trying to protect?

So we were generous in our offer. What was the other amendment they wanted to offer? They still had another amendment. I said: Fine, go ahead. The Senate should take hard votes. I am not concerned about my folks having to take difficult votes.

The Presiding officer knows, in the short time he has been here, that we have taken some hard votes. That is what we are elected to do. We are not elected to run from issues. To be clear, some of the amendments which my Republican colleagues wanted to include would have been votes that have nothing to do with this bill. I said: Let's do it anyway.

But the standard for a Democrat offering an amendment that is not germane, I guess, is different. You can have four. I said: We do not even need the same number of amendments. I guess what is good for us is not good for them.

I am disappointed this has not been worked out. I was going to propound an agreement which was agreed upon that would permit the process of legislating on this most important tourism bill, but I am not able to do so because we do not have a Republican here to object. I certainly am not going to take advantage of anyone because no one is here to object.

But I do want the RECORD to reflect that the majority is ready to move forward with amendments now or Monday. I hope that on Monday, when our managers are here, Senators DORGAN and MARTINEZ, we may still be able to reach an agreement to begin the process of working through this legislation. If we cannot, we are going to vote at 5:30 on Monday on cloture on this bill.

A decision is going to have to be made. I have not tried to jam anybody. We have not tried to jam anybody. We have been as reasonable as anybody can be. But we are going to have to make a decision on this legislation.

The State of Oregon, the home of the Presiding Officer, a couple years ago I took my family to Oregon. Every summer we take all 5 children and all 16 grandchildren and try to go someplace. We went to Oregon. We rented a home on the beautiful coast that was stark. For 8 days the Sun did not shine. But I loved it. Being from the desert, I loved that rain a little bit. It was wonderful.

I would love to go back. There were so many things to do around there. We drove 20 miles to see a waterfall. The water fell some 300 or 400 feet. It was not a lot of falling, but it dropped a long way.

The only point I am making is there is so much for people to see. Years ago, UNLV had a great basketball team. Yours was good, but theirs was great—the Tarkanian years. So I flew into Portland with my wife. We drove over to the coast, down the coast, and went to—I think it was called Salem, the University of Oregon, I think, or Oregon State, whatever university it was where they had this tournament.

I watched UNLV play. The reason I mention it, driving down that coast was so beautiful. But every State, every State I have ever been to—I have been to most of them. I think I have been to all of them—have beautiful things for people to come and see. That is what this legislation is all about.

The No. 1, 2 or 3 most important driver of the economy in every State is tourism, every State. It is the same in Oregon, where unemployment now is over 12 percent. We can get more people to come to Oregon or Nevada. It would be tremendous for those economies. That is what this legislation does. It sets up a public-private partnership in the model, frankly, of what the Las Vegas Convention Center did, which has been so successful. That is what this legislation is all about.

It is bipartisan legislation. Because we could not work anything on amendments, I hope we will get cloture on this bill. But whether we do or not, I am happy to work with my Republican colleagues to move forward on this.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we close morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Morning business is closed.

TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that bill is now going to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1023) to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority on the Commerce Committee has provided authority to the Chairman, Senator ROCKEFELLER, to withdraw the committee amendments and the chairman has now provided me with that authority.

Therefore, on the authority granted by Senator ROCKEFELLER of the Commerce Committee, I now withdraw the Committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments are withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1347

(Purpose: To provide a perfecting amendment)

Mr. REID. On behalf of Senators DORGAN and ROCKEFELLER, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. DORGAN and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, proposes an amendment numbered 1347.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that there is a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Dorgan amendment, No. 1347, to S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009.

Harry Reid, Byron L. Dorgan, Barbara Boxer, Ron Wyden, Michael Begich, Evan Bayh, Charles Schumer, Max Baucus, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Patrick Leahy, Barbara Mikulski, Robert Menendez, Jeff Bingaman, Joseph Lieberman.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1348 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1347

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1348 to amendment No. 1347.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

This section shall take effect 5 days after enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1349

Mr. REID. I now call up my amendment to the language proposed to be stricken and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1349 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1347.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

This section shall take effect 4 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1350 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1349

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1350 to amendment No. 1349.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''3''.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with this provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009.

Harry Reid, Byron L. Dorgan, Barbara Boxer, Ron Wyden, Michael Begich, Evan Bayh, Charles Schumer, Max Baucus, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Patrick Leahy, Barbara Mikulski, Robert Menendez, Jeff Bingaman, Joseph Lieberman.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1351

Mr. REID. I now have a motion to recommit with instructions. That motion is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with instructions to report back forthwith with the following amendment numbered 1351.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end insert the following: This section shall become effective 2 days after enactment of the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1352 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1351

Mr. REID. I have a first-degree amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1352 to amendment No. 1351.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''2'' and insert ''1''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1353 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1352

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1353 to amendment No. 1352.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''1'' and insert ''immediately''

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 187, 189, 190, 191, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216, 220, 221, 222 to and including 250, 253, 254 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc; that no further motions be in order, that any statements relating to any of these matters be printed in the

RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Rand Beers, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary, Department of homeland Security.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Catherine Radford Zoi, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy, Efficiency, and Renewable Energy).

William F. Brinkman, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Anne Castle, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Howard K. Koh, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Laurie I. Mikva, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Martha J. Kanter, of California, to be Under Secretary of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Jane Oates, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Herbert M. Allison, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. (New Position)

EXCUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jeffrey D. Zients, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Andrew J. Shapiro, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs).

Eric P. Schwartz, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Coordinator for Threat Reduction Programs.

Eric P. Goosby, of California, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Zachary J. Lemnios, of Massachusetts, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. James J. Carroll

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William T. Lord

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brigadier General James W. Kwiatkowski
Brigadier General Jeffrey S. Lawson
Brigadier General Deborah S. Rose
Brigadier General Edwin A. Vincent, Jr.

To be brigadier general

Colonel Stephen M. Atkinson
Colonel Paul L. Ayers
Colonel Daniel S.V. Bader
Colonel Daryl L. Bohac
Colonel Joseph J. Brandemuehl
Colonel Timothy T. Dearing
Colonel Sharon S. Dieffenderfer
Colonel Jonathan S. Flaugher
Colonel Robert M. Ginnetti
Colonel Johnathan H. Groff
Colonel James D. Hill
Colonel Zane R. Johnson
Colonel Joseph K. Kim
Colonel Keith I. Lang
Colonel Robert W. Lovell
Colonel John P. McGoff
Colonel Gunther H. Neumann
Colonel Paul A. Pocopanni, Jr.
Colonel Christopher A. Pope
Colonel Carolyn J. Protzmann
Colonel Carlos E. Rodriguez
Colonel Jose J. Salinas
Colonel Wayne M. Shanks
Colonel William H. Shawver, Jr.
Colonel James C. Witham
Colonel Sallie K. Worcester
Colonel Wanda A. Wright
Colonel Wayne A. Wright

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 8034:

To be general

Gen. Carrol H. Chandler

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Steven J. Arquiette
Colonel Robert J. Beletic
Colonel Scott A. Bethel
Colonel Charles Q. Brown, Jr.
Colonel Scott D. Chambers
Colonel Cary C. Chun
Colonel Richard M. Clark
Colonel Dwyer L. Dennis
Colonel Steven J. DePalmer
Colonel Ian R. Dickinson
Colonel Mark C. Dillon
Colonel Scott P. Goodwin
Colonel Morris E. Haase
Colonel James E. Haywood
Colonel Paul T. Johnson
Colonel Randy A. Kee
Colonel Jim H. Keffer
Colonel Jeffrey B. Kendall
Colonel Michael J. Kingsley
Colonel Steven L. Kwast
Colonel Lee K. Levy, II
Colonel Jerry P. Martinez
Colonel Jimmy E. McMillian
Colonel Andrew M. Mueller
Colonel Eden J. Murrie
Colonel Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy
Colonel David E. Petersen
Colonel Timothy M. Ray
Colonel John W. Raymond
Colonel John N. T. Shanahan
Colonel John D. Stauffer
Colonel Michael S. Stough
Colonel Marshall B. Webb
Colonel Robert E. Wheeler
Colonel Martin Whelan
Colonel Kenneth S. Wilsbach

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gilmary M. Hostage, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Glenn F. Spears

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Douglas J. Robb

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Dennis L. Via

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203:

To be major general

Brigadier General Harold G. Bunch
Brigadier General Stuart M. Dyer
Brigadier General Glenn J. Lesniak
Brigadier General Charles D. Luckey
Brigadier General Jeffrey W. Talley
Brigadier General Luis R. Visot

To be brigadier general

Colonel Mark C. Arnold
Colonel Lawrence W. Brock, III
Colonel Dwayne R. Edwards
Colonel Steven J. Feldmann
Colonel Fernando Fernandez
Colonel Jonathan G. Ives
Colonel Bud R. Jameson, Jr.
Colonel Bryan R. Kelly
Colonel Jon D. Lee
Colonel Mark T. McQueen
Colonel Therese M. O'Brien
Colonel Lucas N. Polakowski
Colonel Peter T. Quinn
Colonel Robert L. Walter, Jr.
Colonel James T. Williams

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. David M. Rodriguez

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert W. Cone

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Kathleen M. Dussault
Rear Adm. (lh) Mark F. Heinrich

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Janice M. Hamby

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Steven R. Eastburg

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas P. Meek

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Joseph F. Campbell
Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Orzalli

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Townsend G. Alexander
Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Buss
Rear Adm. (lh) Kendall L. Card
Rear Adm. (lh) Nevin P. Carr, Jr.
Rear Adm. (lh) John N. Christenson
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael J. Connor
Rear Adm. (lh) Kenneth E. Floyd
Rear Adm. (lh) William D. French
Rear Adm. (lh) Philip H. Greene
Rear Adm. (lh) Bruce E. Grooms
Rear Adm. (lh) Edward S. Hebner
Rear Adm. (lh) Michelle J. Howard
Rear Adm. (lh) William E. Shannon, III
Rear Adm. (lh) Charles E. Smith
Rear Adm. (lh) Scott H. Swift
Rear Adm. (lh) David M. Thomas
Rear Adm. (lh) Kurt W. Tidd
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael P. Tillotson
Rear Adm. (lh) Mark A. Vance
Rear Adm. (lh) Edward G. Winters, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Michael W. Broadway

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Sean F. Crean

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Patrick E. McGrath
Rear Adm. (1h) John G. Messerschmidt
Rear Adm. (1h) Michael M. Shatynski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ron J. MacLaren

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robin L. Graf

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David G. Russell

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kurt L. Kunkel
Capt. Jonathan A. Yuen

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Katherine L. Gregory
Capt. Kevin R. Slates

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Ann E. Rondeau

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Joseph D. Kernan

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Richard C. Zilmer

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Inez Moore Tenenbaum, of South Carolina, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Inez Moore Tenenbaum, of South Carolina, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2006.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN432 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning STEPHEN R. DASUTA, and ending BETH M. DITTMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN470 AIR FORCE nomination of Thomas J. Sobieski, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN471 AIR FORCE nominations (10) beginning JOHN E. BLAIR, and ending PETER T. TRAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN495 AIR FORCE nomination of Joshua D. Rosen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2009.

PN511 AIR FORCE nominations (114) beginning MARK W. ANDERSON, and ending STEVEN W. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN565 AIR FORCE nomination of Jeffrey A. Lewis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

IN THE ARMY

PN105 ARMY nominations (19) beginning CHRISTOPHER L. ARNHEITER, and ending JAMES W. TURONIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 23, 2009.

PN106 ARMY nominations (82) beginning BRET T. ACKERMANN, and ending D060652, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 23, 2009.

PN472 ARMY nominations (2) beginning KINDALL L. JONES, and ending WILLIAM J. NOVAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN473 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SHARON E. BLONDEAU, and ending KAREN D. CHAMBERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN474 ARMY nominations (3) beginning REBECCA D. LANGE, and ending ROBERT SANTIAGO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN475 ARMY nominations (18) beginning WALTER A. BEHNERT, and ending ZACHARIAH P. WHEELER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN476 ARMY nominations (46) beginning ARTHUR R. BAKER, and ending ANITA M. YEARLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN477 ARMY nominations (9) beginning DENNIS C. AYER, and ending JEFFREY O. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN478 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MICHAEL C. OGUINN, and ending TRACY L. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN479 ARMY nominations (7) beginning LARRY D. BARTHOLOMEW, and ending KENNETH A. WADE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN480 ARMY nominations (3) beginning DAWN B. BARROWMAN, and ending REBA J. MUELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN481 ARMY nominations (38) beginning LAUREN J. ALUKONIS, and ending LUCY D. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN482 ARMY nominations (5) beginning PETER H. GUEVARA, and ending MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN483 ARMY nominations (10) beginning RICHARD CANER, and ending CHARLES W. WHITE JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN484 ARMY nominations (12) beginning MICHAEL J. BEAULIEU, and ending JAMES A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN496 ARMY nomination of Stuart W. Smythe Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2009.

PN512 ARMY nomination of Edward P. Naessens, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN513 ARMY nomination of Donald R. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN514 ARMY nomination of Sandra M. Keavey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN515 ARMY nomination of Thamius J. Morgan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN516 ARMY nominations (2) beginning CONSTANCE ROSSER, and ending AVERY E. DAVIS, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN517 ARMY nominations (3) beginning NORMA G. SANDOW, and ending PAUL J. SINQUEFIELD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN518 ARMY nominations (4) beginning CHARLES W. HIPP, and ending ANITA M. KIMBROUGHJACOB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN519 ARMY nominations (12) beginning DANIEL E. BANKS, and ending RICK A. SHACKET, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN520 ARMY nominations (4) beginning CARLTON L. DAY, and ending MARK W. WEISS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PN464 COAST GUARD nominations (37) beginning Scott W. Crawley, and ending James T. Zawrotny, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN465 COAST GUARD nomination of Michael J. Capelli, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN466 COAST GUARD nomination of Michael J. Hauschen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2009.

PN605 COAST GUARD nomination of Christopher G. Buckley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2009.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN282–1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (340) beginning Marvin F. Burgos, and ending Stephen Alan Cristina, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2009.

IN THE NAVY

PN433 NAVY nominations (6) beginning PAUL V. ACQUAVELLA, and ending DAVID M. TULLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN434 NAVY nominations (9) beginning CLEMIA ANDERSON JR., and ending RICHARD C. VALENTINE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN435 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JOSEPH R. BRENNER JR., and ending GREG A. ULSES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN436 NAVY nominations (7) beginning JOHN G. BISCHERI, and ending TODD J. SQUIRE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN437 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JEFFREY A. BENDER, and ending DAVID H. WATERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN438 NAVY nominations (14) beginning ROBERT J. ALLEN, and ending EDWARD B. ZELLEM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN439 NAVY nominations (9) beginning MICKEY S. BATSON, and ending FRANK A. SHAUL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN440 NAVY nominations (13) beginning ANGELA D. ALBERGOTTIE, and ending MICHAEL L. THRALL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN441 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL E. BEAULIEU, and ending GREGORY A. MUNNING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN442 NAVY nominations (15) beginning SCOTT F. ADLEY, and ending PATRICK W. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN443 NAVY nominations (19) beginning MICHAEL A. BALLOU, and ending STEPHEN F. WILLIAMSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN444 NAVY nominations (11) beginning ANN M. BURKHARDT, and ending JACKLYN D. WEBB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN445 NAVY nominations (218) beginning HEIDI C. AGLE, and ending THOMAS A. ZWOLFER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN446 NAVY nomination of JAMES F. ELIZARES, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN447 NAVY nomination of STACY R. STEWART, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN448 NAVY nominations (2) beginning STEPHEN E. MARONICK, and ending TAMARA A.L. SHELTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN449 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DANIEL T. BATES, and ending GARY P. KIRCHNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN450 NAVY nominations (14) beginning GARY R. BARRON, and ending MICHAEL M. NORMILE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN451 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JOSEPH R. DAVILA, and ending JOHN M. TARPEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN452 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MARCIA R. FLATAU, and ending LINNEA J. SOMMERWEDDINGTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN453 NAVY nominations (3) beginning STEVEN W. HARRIS, and ending GEORGE L. SNIDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN454 NAVY nominations (2) beginning PAUL C. BURNETTE, and ending STEPHEN S. JOYCE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN455 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW B. AARON, and ending DAVID M. SILLDORFF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN456 NAVY nominations (6) beginning DALE E. CHRISTENSON, and ending FRANK VACCARINO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN457 NAVY nominations (4) beginning THERESE D. CRADDOCK, and ending LEITH S. WIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN458 NAVY nominations (21) beginning ROBERT A. BENNETT, and ending KENNETH S. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN459 NAVY nominations (108) beginning DONALD T. ALLERTON, and ending TODD A. ZVORAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2009.

PN497 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SCOTT K. RINEER, and ending MARY P. COLVIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2009.

PN521 NAVY nominations (9) beginning JUDI C. HERRING, and ending LUIS M. TUMIALAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2009.

PN541 NAVY nominations (12) beginning VINCENT G. AUTH, and ending MARTHA P. VILLALOBOS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN542 NAVY nominations (12) beginning SALVADOR AGUILERA, and ending DENNIS W. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN543 NAVY nominations (16) beginning MICHAEL M. BATES, and ending DAVID G. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN544 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JOHN J. ADAMETZ, and ending RICHARD L. WHIPPLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN545 NAVY nominations (29) beginning KRISTEN ATTERBURY, and ending CONSTANCE L. WORLINE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN546 NAVY nominations (29) beginning DANIEL L. ALLEN, and ending DONALD J. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN547 NAVY nominations (35) beginning LUIS A. BENEVIDES, and ending TIMOTHY H. WEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN548 NAVY nominations (64) beginning BRIAN A. ALEXANDER, and ending PETER G. WOODSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2009.

PN566 NAVY nominations (2) beginning VINCENT P. CLIFTON, and ending PATRICK J. COOK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN567 NAVY nominations (2) beginning DAVID J. BUTLER, and ending JON E. CUTLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN568 NAVY nominations (4) beginning BARRY C. DUNCAN, and ending JAMES E. PARKHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN569 NAVY nominations (16) beginning DAVID A. BIANCHI, and ending SARAH WALTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN570 NAVY nominations (10) beginning LISA M. BAUER, and ending JOSEPH E. STRICKLAND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN571 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DWAIN ALEXANDER II, and ending THOMAS E. WALLACE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN572 NAVY nominations (19) beginning JAMES F. ARMSTRONG, and ending JULIE A. ZAPPONE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN573 NAVY nominations (10) beginning WILLIAM E. BUTLER, and ending JONATHAN D. WALLNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

PN574 NAVY nominations (12) beginning ROBERT J. CAREY, and ending BRIAN S. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wanted to go into a bit more detail about the cash for clunkers provision the Senate passed yesterday as part of the $105 billion war supplemental. I continue to believe that the American people would be appalled to learn the specifics of this lemon legislation. Here is a quick summary:

Any person who trades in a car he or she has owned and insured for at least 1 year that has a combined fuel economy value of 18 miles or less per gallon is eligible for: $3,500 toward the purchase of a new car if it has a fuel economy value at least 4 miles per gallon higher than the trade-in, or a new truck if it has a fuel economy value at least 2 miles per gallon higher than the trade-in; or $4,500 toward the purchase of a new car if it has a fuel economy value at least 10 miles per gallon higher than the trade-in, or a new truck if it has a fuel economy value at least 5 miles per gallon higher than the trade-in.

The auto dealer that sells the new car, must accept the trade-in and crush it, then submit paperwork to the Department of Transportation, DOT, and the money is directly wired to the auto dealer. This is ripe for fraud and abuse and the bill provides a penalty of a mere $15,000 fine for each abuse.

Only cars costing less than $45,000 and purchased between July 1, 2009, and November 1, 2009, are eligible.

Lastly, I want to talk about how this clunker was salvaged by the Democrats placing it in a war supplemental bill. On January 14, 2009, several Senators introduced a cash for clunkers bill that would provide between $2,500 and $4,500 toward the purchase of a new or used car as long as the trade-in had a fuel economy rating of less than 18 miles a gallon and the new or used car had a fuel economy rating exceeding target for that class of vehicles by at least 25 percent, as determined by DOT.

Then on May 21, 2009, a new cash for clunkers bill was introduced by a different group of Senators who limited the benefit to only the purchase of a new car, and removed the requirement that the new car must have a fuel economy rating exceeding the target by at least 25 percent and replaced it with a more lax requirement that a new car merely had to be 2 miles per gallon more fuel efficient.

Senators COLLINS and FEINSTEIN wrote an op-ed in The Wall Street Journal on June 11, 2009, stating:

> It's amazing how quickly a good idea can go bad in Washington . . . Our ''Cash for Clunkers'' proposal was a win-win for the environment and the economy. Then Detroit auto industry lobbyists got involved. Soon a rival bill emerged . . . tailored perfectly to the auto industry's specifications. They claim their bill would have resulted in 32 percent more oil savings and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. And then Detroit's bill was placed into the war supplemental and will likely be signed into law without ever having been reviewed by the committee that has jurisdiction over such legislation or being available for amendment by the full Senate.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, tomorrow is World Refugee Day, a day to pause and recognize the millions of people who have been forced from their homes by natural disaster, conflict, or in some cases persecution. They often only carry with them the clothes on their backs and the new burdens and trauma that accompany the title of ''refugee.'' Yet as we acknowledge the tragedy of their loss, we can also celebrate their enduring resilience. Even after years of suffering and hopelessness, many refugees never give up hope that they will return to their homes to be allowed to live peaceful and full lives. They continue to struggle to ensure that their basic rights are protected and basic needs met.

Today, the overall number of refugees and internally displaced people is estimated at 42 million. The refugee experience cuts across borders and countries, but the circumstances that give rise to displacement are often unique. There are so many crises to talk about—in Colombia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Zimbabwe, for example—but I want to briefly highlight three in particular.

First, in Pakistan's North West Frontier Province, a humanitarian crisis continues to unfold as more than 2 million Pakistanis have been displaced from their homes due to fighting between militants and the Pakistani Government. The Pakistani people have borne additional hardship as friends, families, and strangers—already strained by the global economic crisis—have opened their homes and lives to many of the displaced. We must do more to encourage this generosity through creative means as well as providing traditional aid to the hundreds of thousands in camps.

I also wish to highlight the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. Hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced by the fighting between the Congolese military and armed groups in eastern Congo, forcing people into squalid camps where children are subject to forced recruitment and women suffer unspeakable levels of sexual violence. In eastern Congo and so many other conflict zones, rape and other forms of gender-based violence have become not just outgrowths of war and its brutality—they are used as weapons of war. We must do more to stop this horrifying practice, to provide protection to these vulnerable refugee populations, and to address the underlying causes of eastern Congo's conflicts.

Third, there continue to be more than 250,000 refugees from the Darfur region of Sudan in eastern Chad in addition to some 190,000 internally displaced people—Chadians—in the area. Moreover, millions of people remain internally displaced in Darfur. These people do not have access to many basic humanitarian needs such as water, health care, and education, and they continue to be subject to attacks by government forces and armed rebel groups. We need to address their needs and enhance civilian protection, while working to stand up a viable peace process for Darfur and the wider region.

Finally, World Refugee Day is also an occasion to celebrate the work of donor governments including our own, private individuals, nongovernmental organizations, and agencies like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees that are working to meet the needs of the displaced. To those who have given generously, to those who have lived among the displaced, and to those who report their stories and refuse to allow them to be forgotten, I say, thank you.

Nonetheless, we must do more to bring attention to the plight of the tens of millions of refugees around the world and to ensure their fundamental right to be safe. The theme of this year's World Refugee Day is ''Real People, Real Needs''—a reminder of the human face of refugee crises around the world. Today, let us see that face and commit ourselves to meeting the real needs of refugees and IDPs around the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING THE ORLANDO MAGIC

• Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the Orlando Magic on a tremendous 2008–09 season; which ended on Sunday as the Los Angeles Lakers won a hard fought victory to win the NBA Finals. Although the Magic didn't end up taking home the championship trophy,

they still turned in an inspiring performance throughout their improbable postseason run.

Four years ago, few would have imagined the Orlando Magic would be the 2008–2009 Eastern Conference Champions. During the 2003–2004 season, the Magic finished last in the league with a record of 21 wins and 61 losses. Since that time, the Magic organization has assembled a team that has made the Orlando community and now all of Florida proud.

I commend coach Stan Van Gundy for leading his team to their third consecutive postseason and the team's second NBA Finals appearance. Whether it was overcoming long odds to beat the defending champion Boston Celtics or defeating LeBron James and the Cleveland Cavaliers, the team proved that when ''Blue and White Ignite,'' it is tough to beat the Orlando Magic.

For their hard work and sportsmanship, I would like to recognize Dwight Howard, Hedo Türkoğlu, Rashard Lewis, rookie Courtney Lee and the rest of the team for setting a tremendous example.

Today, all Floridians are proud of the Orlando Magic for having such a memorable season. I congratulate the Magic organization and their fans on a great season and look forward to the next season as the team builds on this year's success.●

COMMENDING MAIKI AIU LAKE

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of the passing of a most beloved and remarkable hula master and instructor, Maiki Aiu Lake. Her skills in the art of hula and love of teaching have made her a legendary figure in the State of Hawaii.

Affectionately known as ''Aunty Maiki,'' Maiki Aiu Lake has played a pivotal role in the preservation and continuation of Native Hawaiian culture. Her unwavering dedication to her students and art has proved hula more than a dance; the elegance and beauty exhibited in hula enriches its audience, and instills a deeper understanding and appreciation for Hawaii's artistic heritage. Her Halau Hula is renowned among many for its attention to detail and profound respect for the traditions of the Native Hawaiian people. Through her passion as both an artist and teacher, Aunty Maiki has touched countless lives. She remains an enduring influence whose legacy continues through the work of her many students and devoted friends.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the great accomplishments of Maiki Aiu Lake.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:45 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 813. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the ''J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 837. An act to designate the Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building''.

H.R. 2344. An act to amend section 114 of title 17, United States Code, to provide for agreements for the reproduction and performance of sound recordings by webcasters.

H.R. 2346. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2675. An act to amend title II of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such title for a 1-year period ending June 22, 2010.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DODD for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Kathleen Martinez, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Kathy J. Greenlee, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary for Aging, Department of Health and Human Services.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1306. A bill to provide for payment to the survivor or surviving family members of compensation otherwise payable to a contractor employee of the Department of Energy who dies after application for compensation under the Energy Employees occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1307. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to Medicare special needs plans and the alignment of Medicare and Medicaid for dually eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 1308. A bill to reauthorize the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. BURRIS):

S. 1309. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure funding for grants to promote responsible fatherhood and strengthen low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 1310. A bill to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1311. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand and strengthen cooperative efforts to monitor, restore, and protect the resource productivity, water quality, and marine ecosystems of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. 1312. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KYL, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 193. A resolution expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. Res. 194. A resolution congratulating the Pittsburgh Penguins on winning the 2009 Stanley Cup Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. Res. 195. A resolution recognizing Bishop Museum, the Nation's premier showcase for Hawaiian culture and history, on the occasions of its 120th anniversary and the restoration and renovation of its Historic Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAUFMAN (for himself, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BUNNING):

S. Res. 196. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BURRIS,

Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Res. 197. A resolution congratulating the men and women of the National Archives and Records Administration on occasion of its 75th anniversary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURRIS (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 198. A resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 535

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. BURRIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State and local requirements respecting devices.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the payment of the manufacturers' excise tax on recreational equipment be paid quarterly.

S. 883

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. KAUFMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 883, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the establishment of the Medal of Honor in 1861, America's highest award for valor in action against an enemy force which can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the Armed Services of the United States, to honor the American military men and women who have been recipients of the Medal of Honor, and to promote awareness of what the Medal of Honor represents and how ordinary Americans, through courage, sacrifice, selfless service and patriotism, can challenge fate and change the course of history.

S. 908

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran.

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, supra.

S. 973

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 973, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 1066

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 1106

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the provision of medical and dental readiness services to certain members of the Selected Reserve and Individual Ready Reserve based on medical need, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools, including early learning facilities at the elementary schools.

S. 1284

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1284, a bill to require the implementation of certain recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board, to require the establishment of national standards with respect to flight requirements for pilots, to require the development of fatigue management plans, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 11

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 11, a concurrent resolution condemning all forms of anti-Semitism and reaffirming the support of Congress for the mandate of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1253

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1253 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1256, to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make certain modifications in the Thrift Savings Plan, the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Federal Employees' Retirement System, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1320

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1320 intended to be proposed to S. 1023, a bill to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1306. A bill to provide for payment to the survivor or surviving family members of compensation otherwise payable to a contractor employee of the Department of Energy who dies after application for compensation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1306

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Improvement Act of 2009''.

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO SURVIVORS OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3672 of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s–1) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 3672. COMPENSATION TO BE PROVIDED.

''Subject to the other provisions of this subtitle:

''(1) CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered DOE contractor employee shall receive contractor employee compensation under this subtitle in accordance with section 3673.

''(B) COMPENSATION AFTER DEATH OF CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided paragraph (2)(B), if the death of a contractor employee occurs after the employee applies for compensation under this subtitle but before such compensation is paid, the amount of compensation described in clause (ii) shall be paid to a survivor (as that term is used in section 3674) of the employee or, if the employee has no such survivors, to the surviving family members of the employee in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 3628(e)(1).

''(ii) AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.—The amount of compensation described in this clause is the amount of compensation the contractor employee would have received pursuant to section 3673(a), except that if the Secretary cannot determine the minimum impairment rating of the employee under paragraph (1) of such section as a result of the death of the employee, such compensation shall not include compensation pursuant to such paragraph.

''(2) SURVIVORS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) or paragraph (1)(B), a survivor of a covered DOE contractor employee shall receive contractor employee compensation under this subtitle in accordance with section 3674.

''(B) ELECTION OF CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION OR SURVIVOR COMPENSATION.—A survivor who is otherwise eligible to receive compensation pursuant to both subparagraph (A) and paragraph (1)(B) shall not receive compensation pursuant to both subparagraph (A) and paragraph (1)(B), but shall receive compensation pursuant to subparagraph (A) or paragraph (1)(B), as elected by the survivor.

''(C) COMPENSATION AFTER DEATH OF SURVIVOR.—If the death of a survivor occurs after the survivor applies for compensation under this subtitle but before such compensation is paid and, in the case of compensation pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), there are no other survivors (as that term is used in section 3674) of the employee, the amount of compensation the survivor would have received under this section shall be paid to the surviving family members of the employee in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 3628(e)(1).''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of section 3672 of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s–1), as amended by subsection (a), shall apply to applications for compensation under subtitle E of such Act filed before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 1310. A bill to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation requested by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, as a courtesy to the Secretary and the Department of Veterans Affairs. Except in unusual circumstances, it is my practice to introduce legislation requested by the administration so that such measures will be available for review and consideration.

This ''by-request'' bill consists of several provisions addressing major facility construction projects and major facility leases for fiscal year 2010. It would authorize five major medical facility construction projects and fifteen major facility leases. The bill would authorize $1,196,230,000 for the major facility construction projects and $196,227,000 for the major facility leases.

I am introducing this bill for the review and consideration of my colleagues at the request of the administration. As Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have not taken a position on this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1310

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

SEC. 1. AUTHORIZATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2010 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects in fiscal year 2010, with each project to be carried out in the amount specified for each project:

(1) Construction (including acquisition of land) for the realignment of services and closure projects at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center In Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed $55,430,000.

(2) Construction of a Multi-Specialty Care Facility in Walla Walla, Washington, in an amount not to exceed $71,400,000.

(3) Construction (including acquisition of land) for a new medical facility at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Louisville, Kentucky, in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects in fiscal year 2010:

(1) Replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000.

(2) Construction of Outpatient and Inpatient Improvements in Bay Pines, Florida, in an amount not to exceed $194,400,000.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2010 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following fiscal year 2010 major medical facility leases at the locations specified, in an amount not to exceed the amount shown for that location:

(1) Anderson, South Carolina, Outpatient Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $4,774,000.

(2) Atlanta, Georgia, Specialty Care Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $5,172,000.

(3) Bakersfield, California, Community Based Outpatient Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $3,464,000.

(4) Birmingham, Alabama, Annex Clinic and Parking Garage, in an amount not to exceed $6,279,000.

(5) Butler, Pennsylvania, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $16,482,000.

(6) Charlotte, North Carolina, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $30,457,000.

(7) Fayetteville, North Carolina, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $23,487,000.

(8) Huntsville, Alabama, Outpatient Clinic Expansion, in an amount not to exceed $4,374,000.

(9) Kansas City, Kansas, Community Based Outpatient Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $4,418,000.

(10) Loma Unda, California, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $31,154,000.

(11) McAllen, Texas, Outpatient Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $4,444,000.

(12) Monterey, California, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $11,628,000.

(13) Montgomery, Alabama, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $9,943,000.

(14) Tallahassee, Florida, Outpatient Clinic, in an amount not to exceed $13,165,000.

(15) Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Health Care Center, in an amount not to exceed $26,986,000.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects, Account—

(1) $201,830,000 for the projects authorized in section 1; and

(2) $994,400,000 for the projects authorized in section 2.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Medical Facilities account $196,227,000 for the leases authorized in section 3.

(c) LIMITATION.—The projects authorized in sections 1 and 2 may only be carried out using—

(1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2010 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) of this section;

(2) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2010 that remain available for obligation;

(3) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2010 that remain available for obligation;

(4) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2010 for a category of activity not specific to a project;

(5) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before 2010 for a category of activity not specific to a project; and

(6) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after 2010 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2009.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to submit the enclosed draft bill to authorize $1,196,230,000 for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) major facility construction projects for Fiscal Year 2010 and $196,227,000 for major facility leases for Fiscal Year 2010.

Title 38 U.S.C. section 8104(a) (2) requires statutory authorization for all VA major medical facility construction projects and all major medical facility leases prior to the appropriation of funds. In accordance with title 38, the draft bill authorizes five major medical facility construction projects and fifteen major facility leases. The five major medical facility construction projects are located in: Livermore, California; Walla Walla, Washington; Louisville, Kentucky; Denver, Colorado; and Bay Pines, Florida. Previously, Congress authorized funds for Denver and Bay Pines. This proposed bill would authorize additional funds necessary to continue with these projects.

The proposed project in Livermore is for construction, including the acquisition of

land, necessary for the realignment of services and closure projects. The proposed project in Walla Walla is for construction of a Multi-Specialty Care Facility. The proposed project in Louisville is for the construction, including the acquisition of land, for a new medical facility.

The proposed project in Denver will provide for the replacement of the existing medical center. Additional authorization is required to complete this project. The proposed project in Bay Pines is for construction of both outpatient and inpatient improvements. Additional authorization is required to complete this project.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ERIC K. SHINSEKI.

Enclosures.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to carry out three major medical facility projects. Authorization is requested for the construction, including acquisition of land, for realignment of services and closure projects in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed $55,430,000. Authorization is requested for the construction of a Multi-Specialty Care Facility in Walla Walla, Washington, in an amount not to exceed $71,400,000. Authorization is requested for the construction, including acquisition of land, for a new medical facility in Louisville, Kentucky, in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of VA to carry out two major medical facility projects. Previously, these campuses received authorization, but additional authorization is required to complete the construction projects on these campuses. In this regard, authorization is requested for replacement of the VAMC in Denver, Colorado, in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000. Authorization is also requested for the construction of outpatient and inpatient improvements in Bay Pines, Florida, in an amount not to exceed $194,400,000.

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of VA to carry out major medical facility leases for an Outpatient Clinic in Anderson, South Carolina, in an amount not to exceed $4,774,000; a Specialty Care Clinic in Atlanta, Georgia, in an amount not to exceed $5,172,000; a Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Bakersfield, California, in an amount not to exceed $3,464,000; an Annex Clinic and Parking Garage in Birmingham, Alabama, in an amount not to exceed $6,279,000; a Health Care Center in Butler, Pennsylvania, in an amount not to exceed $16,482,000; a Health Care Center in Charlotte, North Carolina, in an amount not to exceed $30,457,000; a Health Care Center in Fayetteville, North Carolina, in an amount not to exceed $23,487,000; an Outpatient Clinic Expansion in Huntsville, Alabama, in an amount not to exceed $4,374,000; a Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Kansas City, Kansas, in an amount not to exceed $4,418,000; a Health Care Center in Loma Linda, California, in an amount not to exceed $31,154,000; an Outpatient Clinic in McAllen, Texas, in an amount not to exceed $4,444,000; a Health Care Center in Monterey, California, in an amount not to exceed $11,628,000; a Health Care Center in Montgomery, Alabama, in an amount not to exceed $9,943,000; an Outpatient Clinic in Tallahassee, Florida, in an amount not to exceed $13,165,000; and, a Health Care Center in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, in an amount not to exceed $26,986,000.

Section 4 authorizes for appropriation for Fiscal Year 2010, $201,830,000 from the Major Construction Projects account for the projects authorized in Section 1 and $994,400,000 for the projects authorized in Section 2. Section 4 also authorizes for appropriation for Fiscal Year 2010, $196,227,000 from the Medical Facilities account for the leases authorized in Section 3. Section 4 allows the projects authorized in Sections 1 and 2 to be carried out by using only 1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2010 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection a; 2) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2010 that remain available for obligation; 3) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2010 that remain available for obligation; and 4) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2010 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1311. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand and strengthen cooperative efforts to monitor, restore, and protect the resource productivity, water quality, and marine ecosystems of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, today I introduce an important piece of legislation that will help protect and preserve the health and productivity of one of our Nation's most important bodies of water—the Gulf of Mexico.

The Gulf of Mexico Restoration and Protection Act will serve as a national and international model for the collaborative management of large marine ecosystems. Specific provisions of this Act will be administered by the Gulf of Mexico Program, formed in 1988 by the Environmental Protection Agency as a non-regulatory, inclusive partnership that collaborates with federal offices, state, and local governments and the private sector in each of 5 Gulf States—all committed to helping preserve and protect the Gulf.

Collectively, the fertile waters and seabed of the Gulf of Mexico represent the 6th largest economy in the world with a total economic trade value of almost $6 trillion. These waters are now threatened by excessive nutrient loads and invasive species as well as the significant deterioration of many coastal wetlands as a result of hurricane and tropical storm damage.

The future of the Gulf's environmental stability is vital to America's economy and security. This legislation authorizes much needed additional funds to the Gulf of Mexico Program and finally puts it on a path toward more equal footing with other national great water body programs. Members of the Gulf of Mexico program are working together to secure the Gulf's future. It is time for this critical region to be recognized for its strategic importance. This legislation is an important step toward ensuring the Gulf receives the kind of support it deserves.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR ALL IRANIAN CITIZENS WHO EMBRACE THE VALUES OF FREEDOM, HUMAN RIGHTS, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND RULE OF LAW, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KYL, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 193

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law;

(2) condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro-government militias, as well as the ongoing government suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cellphones; and

(3) affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

SENATE RESOLUTION 194—CONGRATULATING THE PITTSBURGH PENGUINS ON WINNING THE 2009 STANLEY CUP CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 194

Whereas, on June 12, 2009, the Pittsburgh Penguins defeated the Detroit Red Wings 2-to-1 in Game 7 of the National Hockey League Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas the victory marks the Penguins' third Stanley Cup Championship in franchise history and capped off a historic playoff series;

Whereas the Penguins are just the second team in league history to win the seventh game of a Stanley Cup Championship series on the road after the home team won the first 6 games of the series;

Whereas the Penguins beat the Washington Capitals in the Eastern Conference Semifinals and the Detroit Red Wings in the Stanley Cup Championship after losing the first 2 games in both series, making the Penguins the only team in league history to rally from 2-to-0 series deficits twice in the same year;

Whereas Mario Lemieux is to be honored for his commitment to keeping the Penguins in Pittsburgh and passing along his legacy to a new generation of players and fans;

Whereas, in February 2009, the Penguins hired Head Coach Dan Bylsma from the Penguins' minor league franchise in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, making Bylsma the first coach in the history of the National Hockey League to begin a season coaching in the American Hockey League and finish a Stanley Cup champion;

Whereas Sidney Crosby, the youngest team captain to ever win the Stanley Cup, was third in scoring during the regular season, had a league-leading 15 playoff goals, and demonstrated leadership by taking the Penguins to the Stanley Cup Finals in 2 consecutive seasons;

Whereas, over the course of the playoffs, Evgeni Malkin led all players in scoring with

36 points, including 14 goals and 22 assists, and won the Conn Smythe trophy for most valuable player in the playoffs;

Whereas Max Talbot is to be commended for scoring the only 2 Penguins goals in the Game 7 victory over the Detroit Red Wings;

Whereas thousands of Penguins fans supported the team throughout the postseason, donning white t-shirts to create a ''whiteout'' effect at home games or gathering to watch the game on a big screen television outside Mellon Arena;

Whereas the Red Wings are to be commended for a terrific season, committment to sportsmanship, and excellence on and off the ice; and

Whereas nearly 400,000 fans packed the streets of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on June 15, 2009, to honor the Penguins in a parade along Grant Street and the Boulevard of the Allies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates—

(A) the Pittsburgh Penguins for winning the 2009 Stanley Cup Championship;

(B) Mario Lemieux and the coaching staff of the Penguins and support staff and recognizes their commitment to keeping the team in Pittsburgh;

(C) all Penguins fans who supported the team throughout the season; and

(D) the Detroit Red Wings on an outstanding season; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) co-owners Mario Lemieux and Ron Burkle;

(B) vice president and general manager Ray Shero; and

(C) head coach Dan Bylsma.

SENATE RESOLUTION 195—RECOGNIZING BISHOP MUSEUM, THE NATION'S PREMIER SHOWCASE FOR HAWAIIAN CULTURE AND HISTORY, ON THE OCCASIONS OF ITS 120TH ANNIVERSARY AND THE RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF ITS HISTORIC HALL

Mr. INOUYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 195

Whereas Bishop Museum was founded in 1889 in Honolulu, Hawai'i by Charles Reed Bishop in memory of his beloved wife, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the great granddaughter of Kamehameha I, to house the personal legacies and bequests of the royal Kamehameha and Kalākaua families;

Whereas the mission of Bishop Museum since its inception has been to study, preserve, and tell the stories of the cultures and natural history of Hawai'i and the Pacific;

Whereas the collections of Bishop Museum include more than 24,000,000 objects, collectively the largest Hawai'i and Pacific area collection in the world, which includes more than 1,200,000 cultural objects representing Native Hawaiian, Pacific Island, and Hawai'i immigrant life, more than 125,000 historical publications (including many in the Hawaiian language), more than 1,000,000 historical photographs, films, works of art, audio recordings, and manuscripts, and more than 22,000,000 plant and animal specimens;

Whereas a primary goal of Bishop Museum is to serve and represent the interests of Native Hawaiians by advancing Native Hawaiian culture and education, protecting the collections and increasing access to them, and strengthening the museum's connections with the schools of Hawai'i;

Whereas the national significance of Bishop Museum's cultural collection lies in the Native Hawaiian collection, which collectively represents the largest public resource in the world documenting a way of life, and has been a source of knowledge and inspiration for numerous visitors, researchers, students, native craftsmen, teachers, and community and spiritual leaders over the years, especially since the cultural revival, which has been steadily growing and gaining in popularity;

Whereas more than 【300,000】 people visit Bishop Museum each year to learn about Hawaiian culture and experience Hawaiian Hall;

Whereas the desire to see Hawaiian Hall and to learn about Hawaiian culture is the primary reason 【400,000】 visitors each year give for visiting Bishop Museum;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall is the Nation's only showcase of its size, proportion, design, and historic context that is devoted to the magnificent legacy of Hawai'i's kings and queens, and the legacies of its Native Hawaiian people of all walks of life and ages;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall, constructed between 1889 and 1903 and 1 of 3 interconnected structures known as the Hawaiian Hall Complex, is considered a masterpiece of late Victorian museum design with its Kamehameha blue stone exterior quarried on site and extensive use of native koa wood, and is one of the few examples of Romanesque Richardsonian style museum buildings to have survived essentially unchanged;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall, designed by noted Hawai'i architects C.B. Ripley and C.W. Dickey in 1898, was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982, based on its unique combination of architectural, cultural, scientific, educational, and historical significance;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of Hawaiian Hall and its exhibits by noted Hawai'i architect Glenn Mason and noted national and international museum exhibit designer Ralph Appelbaum are integral to the museum's ability to fulfill its mission and achieve its primary goal of serving and representing the interests of Native Hawaiians;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of Hawaiian Hall, begun in 2005, included the building of a new gathering place in an enclosed, glass walled atrium, improved access to the hall through the installation of an elevator in the new atrium to all 3 floors of the hall and other buildings in the Hawaiian Hall Complex, improved collection preservation through the installation of new, state-of-the-art environmental controls, lighting, security, and fire suppression systems, and restored original woodwork and metalwork;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of the hall's exhibits bring multiple voices and a Native Hawaiian perspective to bear on Bishop Museum's treasures, by conveying the essential values, beliefs, complexity, and achievements of Hawaiian culture through exquisite and fragile artifacts in a setting that emphasizes their ''mana'' (power and essence) and the place in which they were created;

Whereas the new exhibit incorporates contemporary Native Hawaiian artwork illustrating traditional stories, legends, and practices, and contemporary Native Hawaiian voices interpreting the practices and traditions through multiple video presentations;

Whereas the new exhibit features more than 2,000 objects and images from the museum's collections on the open floor, mezzanines, and the center space, conceptually organized to represent 3 traditional realms or ''wao'' of the Hawaiian world—Kai Ākea, the expansive sea from which gods and people came, Wao Kānaka, the realm of people, and Wao Lani, the realm of gods and the ''ali'i'' (chiefs) who descended from them;

Whereas the new exhibit's ending display celebrates the strength, glory, and achievements of Native Hawaiians with a large 40-panel mural titled ''Ho'ohuli, To Cause An Overturning, A Change'', made by students of Native Hawaiian charter schools in collaboration with Native Hawaiian artists and other students, and interpreted by Native Hawaiian artists and teachers in a video presentation; and

Whereas the people of the United States wish to convey their sincerest appreciation to Bishop Museum for its service and devotion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the reopening of historic Hawaiian Hall on the 120th anniversary of the founding of Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawai'i; and

(2) on the occasions of the reopening and anniversary of the museum, honors and praises Bishop Museum for its work to ensure the preservation, study, education, and appreciation of Native Hawaiian culture and history.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution that recognizes the Bishop Museum on its 120th Anniversary and celebrates the reopening of its historic Hawaiian Hall.

The Bishop Museum was founded in 1889 by Charles Reed Bishop in honor of his late wife, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the last descendant of the royal Kamehameha family. The museum was established to house the extensive collection of Hawaiian artifacts and royal family heirlooms of the Princess, and has expanded to include millions of artifacts, documents and photographs about Hawaii and other Pacific island cultures.

Today, the Bishop Museum is the largest museum in the State of Hawaii and the premier natural and cultural history institution in the Pacific, recognized throughout the world for its cultural collections, research projects, consulting services and public educational programs. It also has one of the largest natural history specimen collections in the world. The museum provides a great service to the State of Hawaii and I commend them for their long time commitment of serving and representing the interests of native Hawaiians.

SENATE RESOLUTION 196—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, AND FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN IRAN

Mr. KAUFMAN (for himself, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BUNNING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 196

Whereas since the June 12 Iranian presidential elections, there have been increased restrictions on freedom of the press in Iran and limitations on the free flow of information among the Iranian people;

Whereas newspapers and news services have been restricted by the Government of Iran, preventing the publication of specific articles, blocking the transmission of some

news broadcasts, and cancelling of foreign press credentials;

Whereas websites and blogs have been blocked in Iran, including social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter;

Whereas numerous Iranian journalists have been arrested, detained, imprisoned, or assaulted since June 12;

Whereas foreign journalists have been prevented from covering street demonstrations, confined to their hotels, and told their visas would not be renewed;

Whereas non-Iranian government news services, including the Associated Press, have been told they may not distribute Farsi-language reports;

Whereas Iranian journalists were instructed by the Government of Iran to report solely from their offices;

Whereas on June 13, the leading mobile phone operator in Iran, the government-owned Telecommunication Company of Iran, was suspended for over 24 hours;

Whereas short message service (SMS) in Iran has been blocked, preventing text message communications and blocking internet sites that utilize such services;

Whereas on June 14, an Al–Arabiya correspondent was instructed by the Iranian Ministry of Information to change a story and its Tehran bureau was subsequently closed;

Whereas shortwave and medium wave transmissions of the Farsi-language Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's (RFE/RL) Radio Farda have been partially jammed since June 12; and

Whereas satellite broadcasts, including those of the Voice of America's Persian News Networkand the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), have been intermittently jammed since late May: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) respects the sovereignty, proud history, and rich culture of the Iranian people;

(2) respects the universal values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in Iran and throughout the world;

(3) supports the Iranian people as they take steps to peacefully express their voices, opinions, and aspirations;

(4) supports the Iranian people seeking access to news and other forms of information;

(5) condemns the detainment, imprisonment, and intimidation of all journalists, in Iran and elsewhere throughout the world;

(6) supports journalists who take great risk to report on political events in Iran, including those surrounding the presidential election;

(7) supports the efforts of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) to provide credible news and information within Iran through the Voice of America's (VOA) 24-hour television station Persian News Network, and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's (RFE/RL) Radio Farda 24-hour radio station; and

(8) condemns acts of censorship, intimidation, and other restrictions on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran and throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 197—CONGRATULATING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION ON OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 197

Whereas the National Archives was established by Congress in 1934 to centralize Federal recordkeeping;

Whereas the National Archives, now called the National Archives and Records Administration (in this resolution referred to as ''NARA''), serves democracy in the United States by ensuring that United States citizens can discover, use, and trust the records of the United States Government;

Whereas NARA has grown from one building along the National Mall to 38 facilities nationwide, from Atlanta to Anchorage;

Whereas NARA administers regional archives, Federal records centers, Presidential libraries, the Federal Register, and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission;

Whereas the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom serves as the permanent home of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights and makes these founding documents available to more than 1,000,000 visitors each year;

Whereas the first issue of the Federal Register was published on March 16, 1936, and the Federal Register has not missed a publication date since, providing orderly publication of the official actions of the Federal Government;

Whereas the Electronic Records Archives is laying the foundation for preserving and providing public access to historically valuable electronic records, ranging from vast, complex databases to documents that detail the making of foreign and domestic policies;

Whereas the Presidential libraries are great treasures of the United States, serving as repositories and preserving and making accessible the papers, records, and other historical materials of Presidents of the United States;

Whereas the National Personnel Records Center serves as the official repository for records of military personnel, responding to 2,000,000 requests a year by veterans and their families for documents to verify military service;

Whereas the Information Security and Oversight Office is responsible to the President for policy and oversight of the Government-wide security classification system and the National Industrial Security Program;

Whereas the National Historical Publications and Records Commission promotes the preservation and use of the documentary heritage of the United States, which is essential to understanding the democracy, history, and culture of the United States, by providing grants in support of the archives of the United States and for projects to edit and publish non-Federal historical records of national importance;

Whereas NARA holds records, in the National Archives Building and its regional facilities across the country, that allow naturalized citizens to claim their rights of citizenship;

Whereas NARA works with Federal agencies, researchers, genealogists, lawyers, scholars, and authors to respond to their evolving needs, requirements, and methods;

Whereas NARA provides records management training, enhances reference services, works with partners to digitize its holdings, and improves access to the records of the United States;

Whereas NARA provides, through its Internet site, easy and convenient public access to many of the most important and most requested historic documents and valuable databases of the United States; and

Whereas inscribed on the facade of the National Archives Building are Shakespeare's words, ''What is past is prologue'', which aptly describe the records of the past preserved by NARA as the groundwork for the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the men and women of the National Archives and Records Administration on the occasion of its 75th anniversary;

(2) understands the vital role that records play in a democracy;

(3) recognizes the service that NARA has given to the democracy of the United States by protecting and preserving the records of the United States Government; and

(4) commends the efforts by NARA to support democracy, promote civic education, and facilitate historical understanding of the national experience.

SENATE RESOLUTION 198—OBSERVING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURRIS (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 198

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the southwestern States, for more than 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day'', as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 140 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national, and even global, event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to understand better the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

(B) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1347. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

SA 1348. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1347 proposed by Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the bill S. 1023, supra.

SA 1349. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1023, supra.

SA 1350. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1349 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, supra.

SA 1351. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1023, supra.

SA 1352. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1351 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, supra.

SA 1353. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1352 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 1351 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1347. Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

Strike out all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Travel Promotion Act of 2009''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. The Corporation for Travel Promotion.
Sec. 3. Accountability measures.
Sec. 4. Matching public and private funding.
Sec. 5. Travel promotion fund fees.
Sec. 6. Assessment authority.
Sec. 7. Office of Travel Promotion.
Sec. 8. Research program.

SEC. 2. THE CORPORATION FOR TRAVEL PROMOTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Corporation for Travel Promotion is established as a nonprofit corporation. The Corporation shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, section 29–1001 et seq.), to the extent that such provisions are consistent with this section, and shall have the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by that Act to carry out its purposes and activities.

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall have a board of directors of 11 members with knowledge of international travel promotion and marketing, broadly representing various regions of the United States, who are United States citizens. Members of the board shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce (after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State), as follows:

(A) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the hotel accommodations sector;

(B) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the restaurant sector;

(C) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the small business or retail sector or in associations representing that sector;

(D) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the travel distribution services sector;

(E) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the attractions or recreations sector;

(F) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience as officials of a city convention and visitors' bureau;

(G) 2 shall have appropriate expertise and experience as officials of a State tourism office;

(H) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the passenger air sector;

(I) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in immigration law and policy, including visa requirements and United States entry procedures; and

(J) 1 shall have appropriate expertise in the intercity passenger railroad business.

(2) INCORPORATION.—The members of the initial board of directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, section 29–301.01 et seq.).

(3) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of each member of the board appointed by the Secretary shall be 3 years, except that, of the members first appointed—

(A) 3 shall be appointed for terms of 1 year;

(B) 4 shall be appointed for terms of 2 years; and

(C) 4 shall be appointed for terms of 3 years.

(4) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—The Secretary of Commerce may remove any member of the board for good cause.

(5) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner required by this section. Any member whose term has expired may serve until the member's successor has taken office, or until the end of the calendar year in which the member's term has expired, whichever is earlier. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which that member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of the predecessor's term. No member of the board shall be eligible to serve more than 2 consecutive full 3-year terms.

(6) ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—Members of the board shall annually elect one of the members to be Chairman and elect 1 or 2 of the members as Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

(7) STATUS AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no member of the board may be considered to be a Federal employee of the United States by virtue of his or her service as a member of the board.

(8) COMPENSATION; EXPENSES.—No member shall receive any compensation from the Federal government for serving on the Board. Each member of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his or her usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall have an executive director and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. The Corporation may hire and fix the compensation of such employees as may be necessary to carry out its purposes. No officer or employee of the Corporation may receive any salary or other compensation (except for compensation for services on boards of directors of other organizations that do not receive funds from the Corporation, on committees of such boards, and in similar activities for such organizations) from any sources other than the Corporation for services rendered during the period of his or her employment by the Corporation. Service by any officer on boards of directors of other organizations, on committees of such boards, and in similar activities for such organizations shall be subject to annual advance approval by the board and subject to the provisions of the Corporation's Statement of Ethical Conduct. All officers and employees shall serve at the pleasure of the board.

(2) NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF APPOINTMENT.—No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, or employees of the Corporation.

(d) NONPROFIT AND NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION.—

(1) STOCK.—The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

(2) PROFIT.—No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

(3) POLITICS.—The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—It is the sense of Congress that the Corporation should not engage in lobbying activities (as defined in section 3(7) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (5 U.S.C. 1602(7)).

(e) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall develop and execute a plan—

(A) to provide useful information to foreign tourists, business people, students, scholars, scientists, and others interested in traveling to the United States, including the distribution of material provided by the Federal government concerning entry requirements, required documentation, fees, processes, and information concerning declared public health emergencies, to prospective travelers, travel agents, tour operators, meeting planners, foreign governments, travel media and other international stakeholders;

(B) to identify, counter, and correct misperceptions regarding United States entry policies around the world;

(C) to maximize the economic and diplomatic benefits of travel to the United States by promoting the United States of America to world travelers through the use of, but not limited to, all forms of advertising, outreach to trade shows, and other appropriate promotional activities;

(D) to ensure that international travel benefits all States and the District of Columbia and to identify opportunities and strategies to promote tourism to rural and urban areas equally, including areas not traditionally visited by international travelers; and

(E) to give priority to the Corporation's efforts with respect to countries and populations most likely to travel to the United States.

(2) SPECIFIC POWERS.—In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Corporation may—

(A) obtain grants from and make contracts with individuals and private companies, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

(B) hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out its purposes; and

(C) take such other actions as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes set forth in this section.

(3) PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INFORMATION.—The Corporation shall develop and maintain a publicly accessible website.

(f) OPEN MEETINGS.—Meetings of the board of directors of the Corporation, including any committee of the board, shall be open to the public. The board may, by majority vote, close any such meeting only for the time necessary to preserve the confidentiality of commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential, to discuss personnel matters, or to discuss legal matters affecting the Corporation, including pending or potential litigation.

(g) MAJOR CAMPAIGNS.—The board may not authorize the Corporation to obligate or expend more than $25,000,000 on any advertising campaign, promotion, or related effort unless—

(1) the obligation or expenditure is approved by an affirmative vote of at least ⅔ of the members of the board present at the meeting;

(2) at least 6 members of the board are present at the meeting at which it is approved; and

(3) each member of the board has been given at least 3 days advance notice of the meeting at which the vote is to be taken and the matters to be voted upon at that meeting.

(h) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

(1) FISCAL YEAR.—The Corporation shall establish as its fiscal year the 12-month period beginning on October 1.

(2) BUDGET.—The Corporation shall adopt a budget for each fiscal year.

(3) ANNUAL AUDITS.—The Corporation shall engage an independent accounting firm to conduct an annual financial audit of the Corporation's operations and shall publish the results of the audit. The Comptroller General of the United States may review any audit of a financial statement conducted under this subsection by an independent accounting firm and may audit the Corporation's operations at the discretion of the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General and the Congress shall have full and complete access to the books and records of the Corporation.

(4) PROGRAM AUDITS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall conduct a review of the programmatic activities of the Corporation for Travel Promotion. This report shall be provided to appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 3. ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES.

(a) OBJECTIVES.—The Board shall establish annual objectives for the Corporation for each fiscal year subject to approval by the Secretary of Commerce (after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State). The Corporation shall establish a marketing plan for each fiscal year not less than 60 days before the beginning of that year and provide a copy of the plan, and any revisions thereof, to the Secretary.

(b) BUDGET.—The board shall transmit a copy of the Corporation's budget for the forthcoming fiscal year to the Secretary not less than 60 days before the beginning of each fiscal year, together with an explanation of any expenditure provided for by the budget in excess of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year. The Corporation shall make a copy of the budget and the explanation available to the public and shall provide public access to the budget and explanation on the Corporation's website.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the Secretary of Commerce for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 15th day of May of each year. The report shall include—

(1) a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this Act;

(2) a comprehensive and detailed inventory of amounts obligated or expended by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year;

(3) a detailed description of each in-kind contribution, its fair market value, the individual or organization responsible for contributing, its specific use, and a justification for its use within the context of the Corporation's mission;

(4) an objective and quantifiable measurement of its progress, on an objective-by-objective basis, in meeting the objectives established by the board;

(5) an explanation of the reason for any failure to achieve an objective established by the board and any revisions or alterations to the Corporation's objectives under subsection (a);

(6) a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations and activities to promote tourism in rural and urban areas; and

(7) such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund may not be used for any purpose inconsistent with carrying out the objectives, budget, and report described in this section.

SEC. 4. MATCHING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FUNDING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND.—There is hereby established in the Treasury a fund which shall be known as the Travel Promotion Fund.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) START-UP EXPENSES.—For fiscal year 2010, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Corporation such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, from amounts deposited in the general fund of the Treasury from fees under section 217(h)(3)(B)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)(i)(I)) to cover the Corporation's initial expenses and activities under this Act. Transfers shall be made at least quarterly, beginning on October 1, 2009, on the basis of estimates by the Secretary, and proper adjustments shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(2) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—For each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014, from amounts deposited in the general fund of the Treasury during the preceding fiscal year from fees under section 217(h)(3)(B)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(B)(i)(I)), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer not more than $100,000,000 to the Fund, which shall be made available to the Corporation, subject to subsection (c) of this section, to carry out its functions under this Act. Transfers shall be made at least quarterly on the basis of estimates by the Secretary, and proper adjustments shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No amounts may be made available to the Corporation under this section after fiscal year 2010, except to the extent that—

(A) for fiscal year 2011, the Corporation provides matching amounts from non-Federal sources equal in the aggregate to 50 percent or more of the amount transferred to the Fund under subsection (b); and

(B) for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2011, the Corporation provides matching amounts from non-Federal sources equal in the aggregate to 100 percent of the amount transferred to the Fund under subsection (b) for the fiscal year.

(2) GOODS AND SERVICES.—For the purpose of determining the amount received from non-Federal sources by the Corporation, other than money—

(A) the fair market value of goods and services (including advertising) contributed to the Corporation for use under this Act may be included in the determination; but

(B) the fair market value of such goods and services may not account for more than 80 percent of the matching requirement under paragraph (1) for the Corporation in any fiscal year.

(3) RIGHT OF REFUSAL.—The Corporation may decline to accept any contribution in-kind that it determines to be inappropriate, not useful, or commercially worthless.

(4) LIMITATION.—The Corporation may not obligate or expend funds in excess of the total amount received by the Corporation for a fiscal year from Federal and non-Federal sources.

(d) CARRYFORWARD.—

(1) FEDERAL FUNDS.—Amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (b)(2) shall remain available until expended.

(2) MATCHING FUNDS.—Any amount received by the Corporation from non-Federal sources in fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014 that cannot be used to meet the matching requirement under subsection (c)(1) for the fiscal year in which amount was collected may be carried forward and treated as having been received in the succeeding fiscal year for purposes of meeting the matching requirement of subsection (c)(1) in such succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 5. TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEES.

Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) FEES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—No later than September 30, 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a fee for the use of the System and begin assessment and collection of that fee. The initial fee shall be the sum of—

''(I) $10 per travel authorization; and

''(II) an amount that will at least ensure recovery of the full costs of providing and administering the System, as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED.—Amounts collected under clause (i)(I) shall be credited to the Travel Promotion Fund established by section 4 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009. Amounts collected under clause (i)(II) shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury and made available to pay the costs incurred to administer the System.

''(iii) SUNSET OF TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEE.—The Secretary may not collect the fee authorized by clause (i)(I) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014.''.

SEC. 6. ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Corporation may impose an annual assessment on United

States members of the international travel and tourism industry (other than those described in section 2(b)(1)(C) or (H)) represented on the Board in proportion to their share of the aggregate international travel and tourism revenue of the industry. The Corporation shall be responsible for verifying, implementing, and collecting the assessment authorized by this section.

(b) INITIAL ASSESSMENT LIMITED.—The Corporation may establish the initial assessment after the date of enactment of the Travel and Tourism Promotion Act at no greater, in the aggregate, than $20,000,000.

(c) REFERENDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may not impose an annual assessment unless—

(A) the Corporation submits the proposed annual assessment to members of the industry in a referendum; and

(B) the assessment is approved by a majority of those voting in the referendum.

(2) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting a referendum under this subsection, the Corporation shall—

(A) provide written or electronic notice not less than 60 days before the date of the referendum;

(B) describe the proposed assessment or increase and explain the reasons for the referendum in the notice; and

(C) determine the results of the referendum on the basis of weighted voting apportioned according to each business entity's relative share of the aggregate annual United States international travel and tourism revenue for the industry per business entity, treating all related entities as a single entity.

(d) COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall establish a means of collecting the assessment that it finds to be efficient and effective. The Corporation may establish a late payment charge and rate of interest to be imposed on any person who fails to remit or pay to the Corporation any amount assessed by the Corporation under this Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Corporation may bring suit in Federal court to compel compliance with an assessment levied by the Corporation under this Act.

(e) INVESTMENT OF FUNDS.—Pending disbursement pursuant to a program, plan, or project, the Corporation may invest funds collected through assessments, and any other funds received by the Corporation, only in obligations of the United States or any agency thereof, in general obligations of any State or any political subdivision thereof, in any interest-bearing account or certificate of deposit of a bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System, or in obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

SEC. 7. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

Title II of the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 201 the following:

"SEC. 202. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

''(a) OFFICE ESTABLISHED.—There is established within the Department of Commerce an office to be known as the Office of Travel Promotion.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director shall be a citizen of the United States and have experience in a field directly related to the promotion of travel to and within the United States.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Director shall be responsible for ensuring the office is carrying out its functions effectively and shall report to the Secretary.

''(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall—

''(1) serve as liaison to the Corporation for Travel Promotion established by section 2 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 and support and encourage the development of programs to increase the number of international visitors to the United States for business, leisure, educational, medical, exchange, and other purposes;

''(2) work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security—

''(A) to disseminate information more effectively to potential international visitors about documentation and procedures required for admission to the United States as a visitor;

''(B) to ensure that arriving international visitors are generally welcomed with accurate information and in an inviting manner;

''(C) to collect accurate data on the total number of international visitors that visit each State; and

''(D) enhance the entry and departure experience for international visitors through the use of advertising, signage, and customer service; and

''(3) support State, regional, and private sector initiatives to promote travel to and within the United States.

''(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Within a year after the date of enactment of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and periodically thereafter as appropriate, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce, the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security, and the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs describing the Office's work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out subsection (c)(2).''.

SEC. 8. RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Title II of the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121 et seq.), as amended by section 7, is further amended by inserting after section 202 the following:

"SEC. 203. RESEARCH PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Travel and Tourism Industries shall expand and continue its research and development activities in connection with the promotion of international travel to the United States, including—

''(1) expanding access to the official Mexican travel surveys data to provide the States with traveler characteristics and visitation estimates for targeted marketing programs;

''(2) expanding the number of inbound air travelers sampled by the Commerce Department's Survey of International Travelers to reach a 1 percent sample size and revising the design and format of questionnaires to accommodate a new survey instrument, improve response rates to at least double the number of States and cities with reliable international visitor estimates and improve market coverage;

''(3) developing estimates of international travel exports (expenditures) on a State-by-State basis to enable each State to compare its comparative position to national totals and other States;

''(4) evaluate the success of the Corporation in achieving its objectives and carrying out the purposes of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009; and

''(5) research to support the annual reports required by section 202(d) of this Act.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal years 2010 through 2014 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.''.

SA 1348. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1347 proposed by Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

This section shall take effect 5 days after enactment.

SA 1349. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

This section shall take effect 4 days after the date of enactment.

SA 1350. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment S. 1349, proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''3''.

SA 1351. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

At the end insert the following: This section shall become effective 2 days after enactment of the bill.

SA 1352. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1351 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

Strike ''2'' and insert ''1''

SA 1353. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1352 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 1351 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; as follows:

Strike ''1'' and insert ''immediately''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commitee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the

session of the Senate on June 19, 2009, at 10:30 a.m. in room 325 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIAMI DADE COLLEGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 814 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 814) to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of land held by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, to facilitate the construction of a new educational facility that includes a secure parking area for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 814) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 814

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Miami Dade College Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF PRISONS LAND TO MIAMI DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Attorney General shall convey, without consideration, to Miami Dade College of Miami Dade County, Florida (in this section referred to as the ''College''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land held by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, consisting of a parking lot approximately 47,500 square feet and located at 35 NE 2 Street, for the purpose of permitting the College to use the parcel as a site for a new educational building that includes a parking area, of which not less than 118 secure parking spaces shall be designated for use by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice.

(b) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Attorney General determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the option of the Attorney General, to the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the property. Any determination of the Attorney General under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) SURVEY.—If the Attorney General considers it necessary, the Attorney General may have the exact acreage or square footage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) determined by a survey satisfactory to the Attorney General. The College shall bear the cost of the survey.

(d) EXEMPTION.—Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall not apply to the conveyance of land under subsection (a).

RECOGNIZING THE DEMOCRATIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PEOPLE OF ALBANIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 80, S. Res. 182.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 182) recognizing the democratic accomplishments of the people of Albania and expressing the hope that the parliamentary elections on June 28, 2009, maintain and improve the transparency and fairness of democracy in Albania.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to this measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 182

Whereas the people of Albania have made extraordinary progress from authoritarian government and a closed market to a democratic government and market economy in less than two decades;

Whereas the Republic of Albania, with the advice and consent of this Senate and the governments of the other member countries, was officially admitted to full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on April 2, 2009;

Whereas the Thessaloniki Declaration of 2003 confirmed that the countries of the Western Balkans are eligible for accession to the European Union once they have fulfilled the requirements for membership; and

Whereas the Government of Albania has accepted numerous specific commitments governing the conduct of elections as a participating state in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) urges the Government of Albania to fulfill the commitments it has made to the OSCE with respect to the conduct of its upcoming elections, and to ensure that those elections are free and fair;

(2) urges the Government of Albania to expedite the implementation of its voter identification card program to minimize the possibility of disenfranchisement and provide as many cards as possible to eligible voters prior to the election;

(3) commends the positive step taken by the Government of Albania to reduce the cost of the voter ID card significantly and avoid charges of a poll tax; and

(4) expresses its hope that credible democratic elections in Albania will contribute to a strong and stable government responsive to the wishes of the people of Albania and strengthen Albania's standing within NATO and European institutions.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR ALL IRANIAN CITIZENS WHO EMBRACE THE VALUES OF FREEDOM, HUMAN RIGHTS, CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND RULE OF LAW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 193, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the resolution I submitted, on behalf of myself, Senator LIEBERMAN and others, is exactly the same as has been introduced by Congressmen BERMAN and PENCE in the House of Representatives. It is the exact same resolution. It expresses support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, rule of law, and for other purposes.

The resolution expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law, and for other purposes. It condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and progovernment militias as well as the ongoing government suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cell phones and affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

Basically, what this is is a resolution that has been introduced in both Houses, which affirms America's fundamental respect and commitment to human rights, to people no matter where they reside in the world.

It is unfortunate, in a way, that this resolution is required since the administration does not want to ''meddle,'' and the President has refused to speak out in support of these brave Iranian citizens, most of them young, who are risking their very lives to protest what was clearly an unfair and corrupt election.

What we are seeing in Iran today is sort of a sequence of events that should worry all of us who have watched this before. The demonstrators, some beaten, some killed, the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calls together the participants in the election and then says there should be no more demonstrations and strong action will be taken.

That is coupled with ejecting the world's media from Iran—first restricting it and then forcing them out so as not to record events. Unfortunately for the Iranian mullahs, Twitter has become an incredible means of communication, as well as cameras in cell phones. The word is still coming out as to the degree of oppression that is being practiced by the Iranian Government.

There is a lot I wish to say today about what is going on in Iran; the fact that we, the United States of America, have a long history of speaking out on behalf of people who are oppressed, who are victims of a corrupt election. We stood tall, America did, for the workers in Gdansk, in solidarity with Lech Walesa. We stood tall for the people of Prague during the Prague Spring, and we were not afraid, as Ronald Reagan was not, to go to the Berlin Wall and say ''Take down this wall,'' and call an evil empire what it was, an evil empire.

One of the ironies of this situation that I wish to address very briefly is that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's political adviser said Thursday that the United States will regret its interference in Iran's disputed election. In other words, our President says he does not want to go meddle and at the same time, of course, they are accusing us of doing exactly that.

He, the adviser, said:

> I hope in the case of the elections they realize their interference is a mistake and that they don't repeat this mistake. They will certainly regret this. They will have problems reestablishing relations with Iran.

In the history of this country, since July 4, 1776, we affirmed the fundamental rights of all people throughout the world, and that is the inalienable rights granted by our Creator to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That commitment to human rights was there then and it is there today. The United States of America must, and this body must, affirm our support for fundamental human rights of the Iranian people who are being beaten and killed in the streets of Tehran and other cities around Iran. We are with them.

It is not an accident that the signs ''Where is my vote?'' are in English. They are waiting for an expression of support from the Government and the people of the United States of America. I think this resolution is an important way to do so.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 193

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law;

(2) condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro-government militias, as well as the ongoing government suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cellphones; and

(3) affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, AND FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to S. Res. 196.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 196), expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 196

Whereas since the June 12 Iranian presidential elections, there have been increased restrictions on freedom of the press in Iran and limitations on the free flow of information among the Iranian people;

Whereas newspapers and news services have been restricted by the Government of Iran, preventing the publication of specific articles, blocking the transmission of some news broadcasts, and cancelling of foreign press credentials;

Whereas websites and blogs have been blocked in Iran, including social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter;

Whereas numerous Iranian journalists have been arrested, detained, imprisoned, or assaulted since June 12;

Whereas foreign journalists have been prevented from covering street demonstrations, confined to their hotels, and told their visas would not be renewed;

Whereas non-Iranian government news services, including the Associated Press, have been told they may not distribute Farsi-language reports;

Whereas Iranian journalists were instructed by the Government of Iran to report solely from their offices;

Whereas on June 13, the leading mobile phone operator in Iran, the government-owned Telecommunication Company of Iran, was suspended for over 24 hours;

Whereas short message service (SMS) in Iran has been blocked, preventing text message communications and blocking internet sites that utilize such services;

Whereas on June 14, an Al-Arabiya correspondent was instructed by the Iranian Ministry of Information to change a story and its Tehran bureau was subsequently closed;

Whereas shortwave and medium wave transmissions of the Farsi-language Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's (RFE/RL) Radio Farda have been partially jammed since June 12; and

Whereas satellite broadcasts, including those of the Voice of America's Persian News Networkand the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), have been intermittently jammed since late May: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) respects the sovereignty, proud history, and rich culture of the Iranian people;

(2) respects the universal values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in Iran and throughout the world;

(3) supports the Iranian people as they take steps to peacefully express their voices, opinions, and aspirations;

(4) supports the Iranian people seeking access to news and other forms of information;

(5) condemns the detainment, imprisonment, and intimidation of all journalists, in Iran and elsewhere throughout the world;

(6) supports journalists who take great risk to report on political events in Iran, including those surrounding the presidential election;

(7) supports the efforts of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) to provide credible news and information within Iran through the Voice of America's (VOA) 24-hour television station Persian News Network, and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's (RFE/RL) Radio Farda 24-hour radio station; and

(8) condemns acts of censorship, intimidation, and other restrictions on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran and throughout the world.

CONGRATULATING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to S. Res. 197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 197), congratulating the men and women of the National Archives and Records Administration on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 197

Whereas the National Archives was established by Congress in 1934 to centralize Federal recordkeeping;

Whereas the National Archives, now called the National Archives and Records Administration (in this resolution referred to as ''NARA''), serves democracy in the United

States by ensuring that United States citizens can discover, use, and trust the records of the United States Government;

Whereas NARA has grown from one building along the National Mall to 38 facilities nationwide, from Atlanta to Anchorage;

Whereas NARA administers regional archives, Federal records centers, Presidential libraries, the Federal Register, and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission;

Whereas the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom serves as the permanent home of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights and makes these founding documents available to more than 1,000,000 visitors each year;

Whereas the first issue of the Federal Register was published on March 16, 1936, and the Federal Register has not missed a publication date since, providing orderly publication of the official actions of the Federal Government;

Whereas the Electronic Records Archives is laying the foundation for preserving and providing public access to historically valuable electronic records, ranging from vast, complex databases to documents that detail the making of foreign and domestic policies;

Whereas the Presidential libraries are great treasures of the United States, serving as repositories and preserving and making accessible the papers, records, and other historical materials of Presidents of the United States;

Whereas the National Personnel Records Center serves as the official repository for records of military personnel, responding to 2,000,000 requests a year by veterans and their families for documents to verify military service;

Whereas the Information Security and Oversight Office is responsible to the President for policy and oversight of the Government-wide security classification system and the National Industrial Security Program;

Whereas the National Historical Publications and Records Commission promotes the preservation and use of the documentary heritage of the United States, which is essential to understanding the democracy, history, and culture of the United States, by providing grants in support of the archives of the United States and for projects to edit and publish non-Federal historical records of national importance;

Whereas NARA holds records, in the National Archives Building and its regional facilities across the country, that allow naturalized citizens to claim their rights of citizenship;

Whereas NARA works with Federal agencies, researchers, genealogists, lawyers, scholars, and authors to respond to their evolving needs, requirements, and methods;

Whereas NARA provides records management training, enhances reference services, works with partners to digitize its holdings, and improves access to the records of the United States;

Whereas NARA provides, through its Internet site, easy and convenient public access to many of the most important and most requested historic documents and valuable databases of the United States; and

Whereas inscribed on the facade of the National Archives Building are Shakespeare's words, ''What is past is prologue'', which aptly describe the records of the past preserved by NARA as the groundwork for the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the men and women of the National Archives and Records Administration on the occasion of its 75th anniversary;

(2) understands the vital role that records play in a democracy;

(3) recognizes the service that NARA has given to the democracy of the United States by protecting and preserving the records of the United States Government; and

(4) commends the efforts by NARA to support democracy, promote civic education, and facilitate historical understanding of the national experience.

OBSERVING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to S. Res. 198.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 198), observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this week people all across the Nation are engaging in the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. It was in June of 1865, that the Union soldiers landed in Galveston, TX, with the news that the war had ended and that slavery finally had come to an end in the United States. This was 21½ years after the Emancipation Proclamation, which had become official January 1, 1863. This week and specifically on June 19, we celebrate what is known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day.'' It was on this date, June 19, that slaves in the Southwest finally learned of the end of slavery. Although passage of the thirteenth amendment in January 1863, legally abolished slavery, many African Americans remained in servitude due to the delayed dissemination of this news across the country.

Since that time, over 145 years ago, the descendants of slaves have observed this anniversary of emancipation as a remembrance of one of the most tragic periods of our Nation's history. The suffering, degradation and brutality of slavery cannot be repaired, but the memory can serve to ensure that no such inhumanity is ever perpetrated again on American soil.

All across America we also celebrate the many important achievements of former slaves and their descendants. We do so because in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, son of former slaves, proposed such a recognition as a way of preserving the history of African Americans and recognizing the enormous contributions of a people of great strength, dignity, faith, and conviction—a people who rendered their achievements for the betterment and advancement of a nation once lacking in humanity towards them. Every February, nationwide, we celebrate African American History Month. And, every year on June 19, we celebrate ''Juneteenth Independence Day.''

Lerone Bennett, editor, writer and lecturer has reflected on the life and times of Dr. Woodson. Bennett tells us that one of the most inspiring and instructive stories in African American history is the story of Woodson's struggle and rise from the coal mines of West Virginia to the summit of academic achievement:

> At 17, the young man who was called by history to reveal Black history was an untutored coal miner. At 19, after teaching himself the fundamentals of English and arithmetic, he entered high school and mastered the four-year curriculum in less than two years. At 22, after two-thirds of a year at Berea College [in Kentucky], he returned to the coal mines and studied Latin and Greek between trips to the mine shafts. He then went on to the University of Chicago, where he received bachelor's and master's degrees, and Harvard University, where he became the second Black to receive a doctorate in history. The rest is history—Black history.

In keeping with the spirit and the vision of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, I would like to pay tribute to two courageous women, claimed by my home State of Michigan, who played significant roles in addressing American injustice and inequality. These are two women of different times who would change the course of history.

The contributions of Sojourner Truth, who helped lead our country out of the dark days of slavery, and Rosa Parks whose dignified leadership sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the start of the civil rights movement are indelibly etched in the chronicle of the history of this nation. Moreover, they are viewed with distinction and admiration throughout the world.

Sojourner Truth, though unable to read or write, was considered one of the most eloquent and noted spokespersons of her day on the inhumanity and immorality of slavery. She was a leader in the abolitionist movement, and a ground breaking speaker on behalf of equality for women. Michigan recently honored her with the dedication of the Sojourner Truth Memorial Monument, which was unveiled in Battle Creek, MI, on September 25, 1999. In April 2009, Sojourner Truth became the first African American woman to be memorialized with a bust in the U.S. Capitol. The ceremony to unveil Truth's likeness was appropriately held in Emancipation Hall at the Capitol Visitor Center. I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation to make this fitting tribute possible. Sojourner Truth lived in Washington, DC for several years, helping slaves who had fled from the South and appearing at women's suffrage gatherings. She returned to Battle Creek in 1875, and remained there until her death in 1883. Sojourner Truth spoke from her heart about the most troubling issues of her time. A testament to Truth's convictions is that her words continue to speak to us today.

On May 4, 1999, legislation was enacted which authorized the President of the United States to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I was pleased to coauthor this tribute to Rosa Parks—the gentle warrior who decided that she would no longer tolerate the humiliation and demoralization of racial segregation on a bus. I

was also pleased to coauthor legislation directing the Architect of the Capitol to commission a statue of Rosa Parks, which will be placed in the U.S. Capitol, making her the second African American woman to receive such an honor.

Her personal bravery and self-sacrifice are remembered with reverence and respect by us all. Over 55 years ago, in Montgomery, AL, the modern civil rights movement began when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat and move to the back of the bus. The strength and spirit of this courageous woman captured the consciousness of not only the American people, but the entire world. The boycott which Rosa Parks began was the beginning of an American revolution that elevated the status of African Americans nationwide and introduced to the world a young leader who would one day have a national holiday declared in his honor, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. President, we have come a long way toward achieving justice and equality for all. We still however have work to do. In the names of Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and many others, let us rededicate ourselves to continuing the struggle and the struggle for human rights.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the Juneteenth directors and event coordinators throughout my State of Michigan. They have worked tirelessly in the planning of intergenerational activities in celebration of Juneteenth. Ms. Marilyn Plumber is heading up three events in Lansing, MI, this week and coordinators in Flint, Detroit, Saginaw, and other areas around the State are observing Juneteenth through a wide range of programs over several days.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 198

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the southwestern States, for more than 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day'', as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 140 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national, and even global, event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to understand better the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

(B) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 22, 2009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 22; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 71, S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009. Further, I ask that the time between 4:30 and 5:30 be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and that the cloture vote on the Dorgan amendment occur at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be 3:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, because we were unable to reach agreement to begin the amendment process on the travel legislation, I filed cloture on the Dorgan amendment, as I have just announced, and the underlying bill in order to move along the process. We hope to be able to reach agreement on amendments prior to the cloture vote on Monday.

COMMENDING SENATOR MERKLEY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is now approaching 4 o'clock. The Presiding Officer has been in that chair since noon. That is a long time. I have sat there for a while but never as long as the Senator has—3 hours 40 minutes.

I have commented in recent days about the brilliance of the Senator from Oregon and the speech he gave on health care. There have been a lot of good speeches, but no one has given a better, more informative speech than the Senator from Oregon. I say that without any qualification.

The people from Oregon are fortunate to have the Senator from Oregon, JEFF MERKLEY. He is a wonderful human being, I say to everybody in Oregon—so well prepared, and he has extremely difficult committee assignments, which he handles with such confidence and grace. I appreciate very much the work he does for the State of Oregon and for our country.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 22, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:40 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 22, 2009, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

JOSEPH A. GREENAWAY, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR., ELEVATED.

BEVERLY BALDWIN MARTIN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE R. LANIER ANDERSON, III, RETIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CRAIG E. HOOKS, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE LUIS LUNA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK HENRY GITENSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ROMANIA.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, Friday, June 19, 2009:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RAND BEERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CATHERINE RADFORD ZOI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENERGY, EFFICIENCY, AND RENEWABLE ENERGY).

WILLIAM F. BRINKMAN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ANNE CASTLE, OF COLORADO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HOWARD K. KOH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

LAURIE I. MIKVA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MARTHA J. KANTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JANE OATES, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

HERBERT M. ALLISON, JR., OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JEFFREY D. ZIENTS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANDREW J. SHAPIRO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL-MILITARY AFFAIRS).

ERIC P. SCHWARTZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POPULATION, REFUGEES, AND MIGRATION).

BONNIE D. JENKINS, OF NEW YORK, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS COORDINATOR FOR THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS.

ERIC P. GOOSBY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE AND COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS GLOBALLY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ZACHARY J. LEMNIOS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING.

JAMIE MICHAEL MORIN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

INEZ MOORE TENENBAUM, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

INEZ MOORE TENENBAUM, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2006.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES J. CARROLL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM T. LORD

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES W. KWIATKOWSKI
BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY S. LAWSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL DEBORAH S. ROSE
BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWIN A. VINCENT, JR.

To be brigadier general

COLONEL STEPHEN M. ATKINSON
COLONEL PAUL L. AYERS
COLONEL DANIEL S.V. BADER
COLONEL DARYL L. BOHAC
COLONEL JOSEPH J. BRANDEMUEHL
COLONEL TIMOTHY T. DEARING
COLONEL SHARON S. DIEFFENDERFER
COLONEL JONATHAN S. FLAUGHER
COLONEL ROBERT M. GINNETTI
COLONEL JOHNATHAN H. GROFF
COLONEL JAMES D. HILL
COLONEL ZANE R. JOHNSON
COLONEL JOSEPH K. KIM
COLONEL KEITH I. LANG
COLONEL ROBERT W. LOVELL
COLONEL JOHN P. MCGOFF
COLONEL GUNTHER H. NEUMANN
COLONEL PAUL A. POCOPANNI, JR.
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER A. POPE
COLONEL CAROLYN J. PROTZMANN
COLONEL CARLOS E. RODRIGUEZ
COLONEL JOSE J. SALINAS
COLONEL WAYNE M. SHANKS
COLONEL WILLIAM H. SHAWVER, JR.
COLONEL JAMES C. WITHAM
COLONEL SALLIE K. WORCESTER
COLONEL WANDA A. WRIGHT
COLONEL WAYNE A. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8034:

To be general

GEN. CARROL H. CHANDLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL STEVEN J. ARQUIETTE
COLONEL ROBERT J. BELETIC
COLONEL SCOTT A. BETHEL
COLONEL CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.
COLONEL SCOTT D. CHAMBERS
COLONEL CARY C. CHUN
COLONEL RICHARD M. CLARK
COLONEL DWYER L. DENNIS
COLONEL STEVEN J. DEPALMER
COLONEL IAN R. DICKINSON
COLONEL MARK C. DILLON
COLONEL SCOTT P. GOODWIN
COLONEL MORRIS E. HAASE
COLONEL JAMES E. HAYWOOD
COLONEL PAUL T. JOHNSON
COLONEL RANDY A. KEE
COLONEL JIM H. KEFFER
COLONEL JEFFREY B. KENDALL
COLONEL MICHAEL J. KINGSLEY
COLONEL STEVEN L. KWAST
COLONEL LEE K. LEVY II
COLONEL JERRY P. MARTINEZ
COLONEL JIMMY E. MCMILLIAN
COLONEL ANDREW M. MUELLER
COLONEL EDEN J. MURRIE
COLONEL TERRENCE J. O'SHAUGHNESSY
COLONEL DAVID E. PETERSEN
COLONEL TIMOTHY M. RAY
COLONEL JOHN W. RAYMOND
COLONEL JOHN N. T. SHANAHAN
COLONEL JOHN D. STAUFFER
COLONEL MICHAEL S. STOUGH
COLONEL MARSHALL B. WEBB
COLONEL ROBERT E. WHEELER
COLONEL MARTIN WHELAN
COLONEL KENNETH S. WILSBACH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GILMARY M. HOSTAGE III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GLENN F. SPEARS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DOUGLAS J. ROBB

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DENNIS L. VIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL HAROLD G. BUNCH
BRIGADIER GENERAL STUART M. DYER
BRIGADIER GENERAL GLENN J. LESNIAK
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES D. LUCKEY
BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY W. TALLEY
BRIGADIER GENERAL LUIS R. VISOT

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MARK C. ARNOLD
COLONEL LAWRENCE W. BROCK III
COLONEL DWAYNE R. EDWARDS
COLONEL STEVEN J. FELDMANN
COLONEL FERNANDO FERNANDEZ
COLONEL JONATHAN G. IVES
COLONEL BUD R. JAMESON, JR.
COLONEL BRYAN R. KELLY
COLONEL JON D. LEE
COLONEL MARK T. MCQUEEN
COLONEL THERESE M. O'BRIEN
COLONEL LUCAS N. POLAKOWSKI
COLONEL PETER T. QUINN
COLONEL ROBERT L. WALTER, JR.
COLONEL JAMES T. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID M. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT W. CONE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KATHLEEN M. DUSSAULT
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK F. HEINRICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JANICE M. HAMBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) STEVEN R. EASTBURG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS P. MEEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH F. CAMPBELL
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. ORZALLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) TOWNSEND G. ALEXANDER
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID H. BUSS
REAR ADM. (LH) KENDALL L. CARD
REAR ADM. (LH) NEVIN P. CARR, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN N. CHRISTENSON
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL J. CONNOR
REAR ADM. (LH) KENNETH E. FLOYD
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM D. FRENCH
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP H. GREENE
REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE E. GROOMS
REAR ADM. (LH) EDWARD S. HEBNER
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHELLE J. HOWARD
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM E. SHANNON III
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES E. SMITH
REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT H. SWIFT
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID M. THOMAS
REAR ADM. (LH) KURT W. TIDD
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL P. TILLOTSON
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK A. VANCE
REAR ADM. (LH) EDWARD G. WINTERS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL W. BROADWAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SEAN F. CREAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PATRICK E. MCGRATH
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN G. MESSERSCHMIDT
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL M. SHATYNSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RON J. MACLAREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBIN L. GRAF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID G. RUSSELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KURT L. KUNKEL
CAPT. JONATHAN A. YUEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KATHERINE L. GREGORY
CAPT. KEVIN R. SLATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ANN E. RONDEAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOSEPH D. KERNAN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RICHARD C. ZILMER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN R. DASUTA AND ENDING WITH BETH M. DITTMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF THOMAS J. SOBIESKI, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN E. BLAIR AND ENDING WITH PETER T. TRAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSHUA D. ROSEN, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK W. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH STEVEN W. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY A. LEWIS, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. ARNHEITER AND ENDING WITH JAMES W. TURONIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 23, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRET T. ACKERMANN AND ENDING WITH D060652, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 23, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KINDALL L. JONES AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM J. NOVAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHARON E. BLONDEAU AND ENDING WITH KAREN D. CHAMBERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA D. LANGE AND ENDING WITH ROBERT SANTIAGO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WALTER A. BEHNERT AND ENDING WITH ZACHARIAH P. WHEELER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARTHUR R. BAKER AND ENDING WITH ANITA M. YEARLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS C. AYER AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY O. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. OGUINN AND ENDING WITH TRACY L. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LARRY D. BARTHOLOMEW AND ENDING WITH KENNETH A. WADE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAWN B. BARROWMAN AND ENDING WITH REBA J. MUELLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAUREN J. ALUKONIS AND ENDING WITH LUCY D. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER H. GUEVARA AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD CANER AND ENDING WITH CHARLES W. WHITE, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BEAULIEU AND ENDING WITH JAMES A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STUART W. SMYTHE, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF EDWARD P. NAESSENS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DONALD R. ANDERSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SANDRA M. KEAVEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THAMIUS J. MORGAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CONSTANCE ROSSER AND ENDING WITH AVERY E. DAVIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NORMA G. SANDOW AND ENDING WITH PAUL J. SINQUEFIELD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES W. HIPP AND ENDING WITH ANITA M. KIMBROUGHJACOB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL E. BANKS AND ENDING WITH RICK A. SHACKET, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARLTON L. DAY AND ENDING WITH MARK W. WEISS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT W. CRAWLEY AND ENDING WITH JAMES T. ZAWROTNY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18, 2009.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. CAPELLI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. HAUSCHEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER G. BUCKLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARVIN F. BURGOS AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN ALAN CRISTINA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2009.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL V. ACQUAVELLA AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. TULLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW B. AARON AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. SILLDORFF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DALE E. CHRISTENSON AND ENDING WITH FRANK VACCARINO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THERESE D. CRADDOCK AND ENDING WITH LEITH S. WIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. BENNETT AND ENDING WITH KENNETH S. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD T. ALLERTON AND ENDING WITH TODD A. ZVORAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT K. RINEER AND ENDING WITH MARY P. COLVIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 21, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUDI C. HERRING AND ENDING WITH LUIS M. TUMIALAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 1, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VINCENT G. AUTH AND ENDING WITH MARTHA P. VILLALOBOS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SALVADOR AGUILERA AND ENDING WITH DENNIS W. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL M. BATES AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. ADAMETZ AND ENDING WITH RICHARD L. WHIPPLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTEN ATTERBURY AND ENDING WITH CONSTANCE L. WORLINE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL L. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH DONALD J. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUIS A. BENEVIDES AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY H. WEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN A. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH PETER G. WOODSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VINCENT P. CLIFTON AND ENDING WITH PATRICK J. COOK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. BUTLER AND ENDING WITH JON E. CUTLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BARRY C. DUNCAN AND ENDING WITH JAMES E. PARKHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. BIANCHI AND ENDING WITH SARAH WALTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA M. BAUER AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH E. STRICKLAND, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CLEMIA ANDERSON, JR. AND ENDING WITH RICHARD C. VALENTINE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH R. BRENNER, JR. AND ENDING WITH GREG A. ULSES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN G. BISCHERI AND ENDING WITH TODD J. SQUIRE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY A. BENDER AND ENDING WITH DAVID H. WATERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT J. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH EDWARD B. ZELLEM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICKEY S. BATSON AND ENDING WITH FRANK A. SHAUL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANGELA D. ALBERGOTTIE AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL L. THRALL,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. BEAULIEU AND ENDING WITH GREGORY A. MUNNING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT F. ADLEY AND ENDING WITH PATRICK W. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. BALLOU AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN F. WILLIAMSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANN M. BURKHARDT AND ENDING WITH JACKLYN D. WEBB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEIDI C. AGLE AND ENDING WITH THOMAS A. ZWOLFER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAMES F. ELIZARES, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF STACY R. STEWART, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN E. MARONICK AND ENDING WITH TAMARA A.L. SHELTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL T. BATES AND ENDING WITH GARY P. KIRCHNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARY R. BARRON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL M. NORMILE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH R. DAVILA AND ENDING WITH JOHN M. TARPEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARCIA R. FLATAU AND ENDING WITH LINNEA J. SOMMERWEDDINGTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN W. HARRIS AND ENDING WITH GEORGE L. SNIDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL C. BURNETTE AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN S. JOYCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DWAIN ALEXANDER II AND ENDING WITH THOMAS E. WALLACE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES F. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH JULIE A. ZAPPONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM E. BUTLER AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN D. WALLNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT J. CAREY AND ENDING WITH BRIAN S. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2009.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING MS. ARLENA CHRISTIAN-BROWN ON THE OCCASION OF HER 92ND BIRTHDAY

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Ms. Arlena Christian-Brown on the occasion of her 92nd birthday.

Ms. Christian-Brown was born on July 11, 1917, in Bonita, LA, to West and Classie Christian. She is the second of 19 children, and the oldest daughter living today.

Currently, Ms. Christian-Brown is a resident of Jones, Louisiana and together with her late beloved husband, Ross Brown, raised eight children.

Ms. Christian-Brown has been an active member of her community, attending and participating in church throughout her life. Over the years, Ms. Christian has served as an usher, choir member and a mother on the motherboard.

As her friends and family prepare to join together on July 11 to celebrate this exciting birthday, Ms. Christian-Brown continues to exemplify how dedication, hard-work, patience and a strong faith can make a difference in her community. She has instilled fairness, honesty and religious conviction in her children and grandchildren.

Today, Ms. Christian-Brown is the proud grandmother of 19 grandchildren, 13 great-grandchildren (one deceased) and one great-great-grandchild.

I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Christian-Brown a very happy 92nd birthday.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. J. GRESHAM BARRETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of the House passed version of H.R. 2847.

Requesting Member: Congressman J. GRESHAM BARRETT

Bill Number: H.R. 2847

Provision: Title I, International Trade Administration

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Clemson University

Address of Requesting Entity: 201 Sikes Hall, Clemson, SC 29634

Description of Request: The purpose of this appropriation is to provide $350,000 to the National Textile Center at Clemson University. These funds will be used to support research and development, undergraduate and graduate education, and technology transfer at Clemson University in the area of polymers, fibers, and textiles research. Activities carried out with these funds will include research projects with direct military implications, as well as training of students, both of which support industry in the United States. I certify that neither I nor my spouse has any financial interest in this project.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF BLUFORD AND BETTY WARD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today in recognition of Bluford and Betty Ward on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

Bluford Ward and Betty Crutchfield met growing up in the small farming community of Allentown, Florida. The two met while in school at Allentown School, now known as Central High School, and their friendship grew into something more over the years. Bluford and Mrs. Betty married on June 20, 1959 at Calvary Baptist Church, right down the road from where they grew up.

Bluford and Betty Ward live the American dream. They began their life together in Allentown where they live to this day. Bluford and Betty are the proud parents of three children—Sherry, Terry, and Jennifer—and four grandchildren. I am honored to call Bluford and Mrs. Betty my friends.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Ward on their 50th wedding anniversary. They are truly an outstanding family from the First District of Florida.

ONE RIOT, ONE RANGER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2009

Mr. POE of Texas. About 100 years ago, there was a fight brewing in Dallas. Back then there was a different type of 9–1–1. When you needed to bring in the big guns, you knew who to call. So the Dallas mayor made his urgent plea for help and was waiting anxiously for the Calvary to ride into town, so to speak. As Captain Bill McDonald stepped off the train, the mayor was elated, but wondered out loud where the rest of 'em were? "Hell! ain't I enough? There's only one prize-fight!" Those words have become synonymous with the Texas Rangers: One Riot, One Ranger.

This past weekend I had the honor and privilege to speak to over 300 Texas Rangers in Waco, Texas. I was like a kid in a candy shop! Some were not active Rangers anymore, but don't think that made any real difference in their appearance or demeanor. Just like a Marine; once a Ranger, always a Ranger. There is no "ex-Ranger."

As I mingled through the sea of starched shirts, jeans and cowboy hats, I thought I had died and gone to Heaven. You can always spot a Ranger. Long, lean and mean with a silver star made out of a Mexican sliver dollar and six guns. It was like I was talking to Gus McCray and Woodrow Call of Lonesome Dove. The legends of the greatest law enforcement agency ever known were alive and well. And me, a mere U.S. Congressman, was getting to hang out with them!

The Texas Rangers can be traced back to the earliest days of Texas history, technically long before we were Texas. They are the oldest law enforcement organization on the North American continent with statewide jurisdiction. Stephen F. Austin got a few men together to protect the early settlers from Indians in the early 1800s. They got their name from their primary duty—patrol the range and keep the peace. For over 200 years, their purpose hasn't really changed.

In 1835, at the beginning of the Texas Revolution, the Corps of Rangers was established; and in 1847, they officially became known as the Texas Rangers. Twenty-five men under the command of Silas M. Parker were designated to protect the frontier between the Brazos and the Trinity; ten men under Garrison Greenwood were assigned to the east side of the Trinity; and 25 men under D.B. Frazier to patrol between the Brazos and the Colorado. They did what even the U.S. Army could not do—protect the settlers from the Indians.

Through the years the Texas Rangers have increased and decreased in numbers and their charges have varied, but their duty has never waivered. During the Texas Revolution, while the Texians' focus was on defeating Santa Anna's army, the Rangers focused on protecting the settlements from Indians. During the Mexican-American War, they became know as the "Los Diablos Tejanos"—the Texas Devils, for their fierce protection of the frontier.

Their storied history can fill pages and pages; their duties and contributions are just too long to list. But, the famous words of Captain Bill McDonald have evolved into the Ranger creed and pretty much say it all: "No man in the wrong can stand up against a fellow that's in the right and keeps on a-comin."

They have been the focus of legend, lore, radio shows, Hollywood movies and television dramas. One Ranger, and the outlaw who wronged him, even made their way to my courtroom. Back in 1988, the Lone Ranger flew into Houston Intercontinental Airport to speak at a charity for disabled kids. When he left town a baggage handler stole his luggage. (Yes, the real Lone Ranger; some people know him as the actor Clayton Moore, but believers know he is actually the Lone Ranger.)

Inside this bag were his twin ivory handled Colt .45s—might as well have been the Hope Diamond itself.

Well, when it came to sentencing I really had no choice in the matter. This was the Lone Ranger after all and he had been wronged. It was my duty as a Texan and a man of the law to punish this outlaw in the name of everything holy and sacred—600 hours shoveling manure at the Houston Police Department Mounted Patrol stables.

And through it all, I refused to reveal the true identity of the Lone Ranger. I allowed him to remain ''masked'' and wear his white hat in the court—even over the loud objections of the defense attorney. I was not about to go down in history as the man who un-masked the Lone Ranger!

These lawmen have always had a certain swagger; a certain something about them that made them Rangers. Another legendary Ranger, who lived up to his nickname, ''Rip'' (Rest in Peace) Ford said this about the men that served under him: ''A large proportion . . . were unmarried. A few of them drank intoxicating liquors. Still, it was a company of sober and brave men. They knew their duty and they did it. While in a town they made no braggadocio demonstration. They did not gallop through the streets, shoot, and yell. They had a specie of moral discipline which developed moral courage. They did right because it was right.''

Whether they be fact or fiction, Texas Rangers are a special breed. But, would we really expect anything less from Texas? Nowadays they mainly work alone. They are the finest law enforcement agency in the world.

By the way, Ranger Captain Bill McDonald successfully stopped the Dallas Prize Fight Riot—by himself.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. RITA S. JONES

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Rita S. Jones who is retiring as superintendent of Great Valley School District in Chester County, Pennsylvania after faithfully serving more than 39 years as a dedicated teacher and outstanding administrator.

Dr. Jones started her distinguished career in a third-grade classroom in Johnstown, Ohio in 1971. She came to Pennsylvania in 1978 as assistant superintendent/director of special projects in the Downingtown School District and then became superintendent in the Daniel Boone School District in 1986. For the last 16 years, Dr. Jones has served as superintendent at Great Valley.

Dr. Jones has earned the respect of parents, teachers and staff for her excellent leadership and contagious optimism while challenging teachers and students to work hard and maximize their potential. Fellow educators throughout the state recognized Dr. Jones' commitment to a high standard of educational excellence in 1998 when she was named Pennsylvania Superintendent of the Year.

After the school day ended, Dr. Jones continued serving her community by giving her time and talents to the Brandywine Branch of the American Red Cross, The March of Dimes, Chester County Futures and several other professional and civic organizations.

Colleagues and friends will celebrate her wonderful career on Monday, June 22, 2009 during a dinner at The Desmond Hotel and Conference Center in Malvern.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Dr. Rita S. Jones for her 39 years of distinguished service as a teacher and administrator and recognizing her unwavering commitment to educational excellence.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of H.R. 2847, FY2010 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010:

Requesting Member: Congressman RALPH M. HALL

Bill Number: H.R. 2847, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

Account: National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Texas Tech University

Address of Requesting Entity: 19th and University Avenue, Mail Stop 2131, Lubbock, TX 79404

Description of Request: I have secured $1,000,000 for the Engineering Support For Extended Human and Robotic Space Flight Missions with Texas Tech University at Abilene. Funding for this project will contribute directly to NASA's initiative of returning to the moon and further exploring Mars. For human and robotic missions, the center for Space Sciences is addressing the need for a decrease reliance on mission control due to the communication delays that occur in long distance missions. For human missions the center is also addressing the need for greater autonomy in dealing with the physical needs of the astronauts, including long term water recycling, which currently limits the habitation period possible without re-supply, and the ergonomics and human factors aspect of human performance in zero and reduced gravity environments. The major research areas will include recyclable/renewable water resources, autonomous/renewable control systems and ergonomics/human factors crew support. This project supports the space flight industry and related programs throughout Texas. I certify that neither I nor my spouse has any financial interest in this project.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. MURIEL A. HOWARD

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Dr. Muriel A. Howard of Western New York. After serving as president of Buffalo State College for 13 years, Dr. Howard will leave to become the president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in Washington, D.C. It is my privilege to highlight Dr. Muriel A. Howard as a woman whose extraordinary efforts as president of Buffalo State College have forever shaped and enhanced this fine institution in the 27th Congressional District.

Born in North Carolina, Dr. Howard was raised on a farm in Wilmington along with her five siblings. Dr. Howard learned at an early age the importance of hard work and social responsibility. Her parents and grandparents instilled the importance of education in their children. Dr. Howard always sat in the front row, excited and eager to learn. When her parents chose to move the family to Queens, education remained the top priority. Her mother drove her children to the best school in Queens.

Dr. Howard continued her education at City University of New York's Richmond College where she received a degree in sociology and a minor in education. Dr. Howard also has a master's degree in education from the University at Buffalo, and a doctorate of philosophy, in educational organization, administration, and policy from the University at Buffalo. At Harvard University, she earned a certificate in the Institute for Educational Management.

Accordingly, University at Buffalo presented Dr. Howard with leadership opportunities. She served as vice president of public service and urban affairs for 23 years, becoming the first woman to serve as vice president at SUNY Buffalo. Dr. Howard's distinction as one of Western New York's finest leaders led to the honor of being named the seventh president of Buffalo State College—the first woman president at the institution.

At Buffalo State College, Dr. Howard challenged the status quo and transformed it into a diversified college. The college is now known for its leadership in arts and culture because of the new $30 million Burchfield Penney Art Center that would not have been possible without her efforts.

Nationally, Dr. Howard has been a leader in education. She has been involved on a number of boards including: the American Council of Education; the Division III President's Council of the National Collegiate Athletics Association; the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Merchants Insurance Company, Farm Credit Services of Western New York, and the Fleet Bank Community Relations Advisory Board.

Dr. Howard also has served the great state of New York through many organizations such as the New York State Department of Education Commissioner's Council on Higher Education, the New York State Blue Ribbon Commission on Youth Leadership and the State University of New York Advisory Council on Teacher Education to name a few.

Her unrelenting devotion and selfless service will be missed at Buffalo State College and

in the Western New York community. On behalf of the Western New York Community, I thank Dr. Muriel A. Howard for her friendship, and for her service to Western New York and Buffalo State College. I congratulate Dr. Howard on this most recent achievement and wish her the best of success as she assumes the role of president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in Washington, D.C. I look forward to continuing the partnership we've formed and with gratitude and admiration, I ask all Members of Congress to join me in honoring an extraordinary woman of New York's 27th Congressional District, Dr. Muriel A. Howard.

IN RECOGNITION OF VEGAN EARTH DAY 2009 AT PIERCE COLLEGE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Vegan Earth Day 2009. On June 21, 2009 members of the community will promote and celebrate the healthy and environmentally sound, vegan lifestyle, abstaining from the consumption or use of animals or any animal bi-products.

Studies show that a vegan saves a ton and a half of carbon emissions per year. Vegans also require much less water in the production of their food. With the effects of climate change becoming more evident and water becoming more of a precious commodity, these individuals are leading the way to a cleaner and greener future by promoting the consumption of fruits, vegetables, nuts, grains and other organic foods. I also stand in recognition of the event's organizer, Bob Linden, as he continues to demonstrate outstanding leadership on conservation, humane treatment of animals, and healthy eating habits. This year's Vegan Earth Day will feature environmental and health experts, live music, animal adoptions and activities for kids that set the stage for other organizations across the country to follow in their footsteps.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor of the program coordinator, Bob Linden, Pierce College, and the event volunteers as they celebrate Vegan Earth Day. I stand in recognition of the important contributions such an event will add to the promotion of living environmentally-conscious lifestyles across the country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, during an absence yesterday, I regrettably missed rollcall votes No. 365, No. 378, No. 388, and No. 395. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 365: "no"; rollcall No. 378: "no"; rollcall No. 388: "yes"; rollcall No. 395: "no."'

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I missed one vote. I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 365, on agreeing to the Hodes of New Hampshire Amendment to H.R. 2847, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING EFFORTS TO END HOMELESSNESS IN HUDSON COUNTY

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor efforts in my district to end homelessness. County and municipal governments, non-profit organizations, and business leaders, with guidance from the federal government, have joined together to end chronic homelessness. For nearly three years, the Alliance to End Homelessness in Hudson County has worked collaboratively to develop the ten-year plan with input from government officials, non-profit organizations, and those agencies working closely with Hudson County's homeless population. The Alliance's ten-year plan consists of 45 action steps to end homelessness that includes building 650 units of housing and providing health care and support services to homeless individuals and homeless families dealing with temporary dislocation due to fire, job loss, domestic abuse and other crisis. This collaboration is important because wide support is needed to solve this problem. Recognizing that, United Way of Hudson County is honoring TD Bank for their work to end homelessness; Governor Jon Corzine for his leadership in the state on this issue; and Dr. Philip Mangano the former Executive Director of the U.S. Interagency Council to End Homelessness for his guidance and advice in establishing Hudson County's Alliance. So I rise today to offer my support to the United Way of Hudson County and the Alliance to End Homelessness in Hudson County and I wish them continued success in their fight against homelessness.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO GOLDEN HERITAGE FOODS

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise to pay a very special tribute to an exceptional company located in Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. Golden Heritage Foods, a successful honey processing and distribution company, was named the 2009 "Enterprise of the Year."

Madam Speaker, there is no question that local businesses serve as one of the key building blocks of our state. Golden Heritage Foods was established in 2002 through the joining of Barkman Honey Company located in Hillsboro, Kansas, and Stoller's Honey in Latty, Ohio. Since that time, the company has grown to become the second leading producer of branded retail honey sales and the top provider of honey in the United States to the food service industry.

While the company itself is relatively young, their legacy was well established prior to its founding due to over 40 years of hard work and dedication exhibited by both the Barkman and Stoller families. Not only has Golden Heritage Foods provided quality products since their opening, they have also created over 100 jobs for the citizens of Kansas and Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to Golden Heritage Foods and its founders, Brent Barkman and Dwight Stoller. Our communities are well served by having dedicated entrepreneurs who assist in the growth and prosperity of our great nation. On behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Ohio, I am proud to recognize this great company on being named Van Wert, Ohio's 2009 "Enterprise of the Year" and wish them success in all future endeavors.

WE STAND UNITED FOR FREEDOM

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to show support for those in Iran who are standing up for their rights and for those who seek freedom across the globe.

Tyrants who use violence and fear to suppress the voices of their citizens who seek freedom lose their legitimacy to govern.

Those who seek freedom and liberty across this globe must know that the American people stand with you.

We stand with you because we have a supreme desire to live up to the belief espoused in the founding document of our nation—

We hold these truths to be self evident—that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

And to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That is why we stand consistently with nations who conduct free, fair, and open elections.

That is why we stand with citizens of nations who are brave enough to stand up and demand their freedom.

America does not seek to impose any individual on the Iranian government or the Iranian people.

But America will always stand with those who peacefully demand their voices are heard.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE L. FORBES

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of George L. Forbes and in

recognition of his deep commitment to country and community. George L. Forbes is being honored today with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). For 17 years, Mr. Forbes has served as President of the NAACP, and helped support their mission of ''ensuring the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons'' and eliminating racial discrimination in our country.

George Forbes has committed his life to serving and helping others. He served in the United States Marine Corps from 1951 to 1953. He taught social studies in the Cleveland public school system while completing his own education. In 1964, George was elected to the Cleveland City Council and his impressive career in public service included being Majority Leader of Cleveland City Council, Co-Chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party, and the longest serving City Council President in the city's history. In 1971 George co-founded Cleveland's first black-owned law firm, Forbes, Fields, & Associates Co. L.P.A.

The NAACP is not the first to bestow high honors on this remarkable man. His vocation for bettering the lives of those around him has earned him recognition from the Black Affairs Council, Cleveland State University Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, the National Association of Securities Professionals, the National Action Network Inc., and Baldwin Wallace College where he taught courses in Political Science. With this outstanding record of service, it's no wonder that the Cleveland Plain Dealer named Mr. Forbes as one of the 50 most influential people in Cleveland's history.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of George L. Forbes as he receives the Lifetime Achievement Award from the NAACP. Mr. Forbes is the prime candidate for this prestigious recognition. His legacy and unwavering commitment to public service will serve as inspiration to others for decades to come.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of H.R. 2892—the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010.

Requesting Member: Congressman PETER T. KING

Bill Number: H.R. 2892

Account: Science & Technology/Research, Development, Acquisition, & Operations

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Long Island Forum for Technology

Address of Requesting Entity: 111 West Main Street, Babylon, NY 11706

Description of Request: $1,000,000 will be used to continue a pilot program to identify and transition advanced technologies and manufacturing processes that will achieve significant productivity and efficiency gains in the homeland security industrial base. It is an appropriate use of taxpayer funds because this project will increase quality while reducing the costs of products delivered to first responders.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOSEPH WILLIAM McCRAY, JR.

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, the city of Mobile and indeed the entire state of Alabama recently lost a dear friend, and I rise today to honor him and pay tribute to his memory. Joseph William McCray Jr. was a devoted family man and an outstanding community leader.

A native of Pensacola, Mr. McCray was raised in the Carver's Court neighborhood in north Mobile. He was a graduate of Central High School and attended Tennessee State University.

A veteran of the U.S. Army, Mr. McCray dedicated over three decades to the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Area Agency on Aging serving as the nutrition coordinator. He was instrumental in the development and operation of nutrition centers for the elderly in Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia counties. Following his retirement, he served as the director of the U.J. Robinson Memorial Adult Day Care Center. He had also served as the District 2 commissioner for Mobile's Human Relations Commission.

Mr. McCray joined the Mobile Area Mardi Gras Association (MAMGA) in the early 1970s and quickly became involved in all of the association's committees, including serving as financial secretary. He was instrumental in organizing MAMGA's joint functions with the Mobile Carnival Association. In 1992, Mr. McCray was elected as the third president of MAMGA and served until 1996. He is one of only a few men widely known as ''Mr. Mardi Gras.''

Mr. McCray was a past president of 100 Black Men of Greater Mobile, and he recently received their coveted Achievement Award. He was also a 3rd Degree Knights of St. Peter Claver and was a past president of the Comrades Social Club. An active member of his church, Prince of Peace Catholic Church, Mr. McCray served on the Parish Council, the Building and Grounds Committee, and many other affiliations within the parish.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering a man who dedicated his life to south Alabama. Mr. McCray will be dearly missed by his family—his wife of 44 years, Faye C. McCray; his son, Joseph McCray III; his sisters, Jolita Dorsett and Severia Norton; and his grandchildren, Julian Christopher and Reagan Michelle McCray—as well as the countless friends he leaves behind.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them during this difficult time.

INCREASING THE LEVEL OF EXPERTISE AND CULTURAL AWARENESS IN AFGHANISTAN

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, today I introduced legislation along with my colleague from Washington, Mr. LARSEN, to enhance the ability of General McChrystal to bring our mission in Afghanistan to a successful completion.

One of the key problems facing our mission in Afghanistan is the limitation on service for nearly all military and most civilians deployed there. Nearly all Americans serve no longer than 12 months, costing the overall U.S. effort critical military, language and personal relationship experience needed to sustain momentum in the war effort.

General McChrystal intends to implement a ''classic counterinsurgency campaign'' designed to win the support of the Afghan people and drive a wedge between them and the Taliban. In a tribal culture like Afghanistan, it will be essential for General McChrystal to have people with established, personal relationships with local leaders in order for his strategy to succeed.

Our legislation authorizes a $250,000 incentive bonus for servicemembers to agree to serve in Afghanistan for the duration of the mission, up to six years. This bonus would be paid at the end of their service in Afghanistan. The bill authorizes an additional $250,000 incentive bonus for a servicemember who volunteers for the duration who scores a 4.0 on the Foreign Service Institute test for the dominant languages of Pashto and Dari. These soldiers would receive a payment of $500,000 at the completion of their service in Afghanistan.

These ''for the duration'' volunteers would quickly become the elite of our effort, bringing the most skills to bear for senior commanders and troops in contact with the enemy. The knowledge they would bring cannot be taught in the U.S., it can only be gained through experience in the field. Just a handful of these soldiers in each Afghan province will make a world of difference.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF A&W RESTAURANT

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 90th anniversary of A&W, a famous and treasured American company.

Founded in Lodi, California, a city I am honored to represent, meals and root beer floats at A&W are a tradition for many families.

A&W started as a root beer stand owned by Roy Allen, who sold root beer for a nickel a mug on a downtown corner. The soda proved so popular that the company quickly expanded to four sites, and the concession evolved into what is thought to be the country's first ''drive-in.''

Later, Mr. Allen asked Frank Wright, one of his employees, to join him in business and the two formed the partnership that became A&W.

There are more than 675 A&W All American Food outlets in 15 countries and territories around the world, and A&W produces the world's number one selling root beer.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating A&W's 90 years of exceptional service.

HONORING FRED H. SWANSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Mr. Fred H. Swanson. On June 29, 2009, after 26 years, Fred is retiring from his position as Director of the University of California Kearney Research and Extension Center near Parlier, California, a tenure that saw the transformation of a quiet UC field station into a world-class agricultural research facility.

Mr. Swanson's journey began only five miles from Kearney on the family farm. Upon graduating from high school, Fred left for college to the University of California, Davis. In 1965, upon receiving his Bachelor of Science Degree in Viticulture, the adventurous side of Fred led him to take a position growing food for thousands of workers who were tasked with constructing dams in West Pakistan. Three years later, the job finished with West Pakistan's electricity capacity successfully doubled and the 35-acre farm effectively turned over to the Pakistan army. With the completion of this project, Mr. Swanson returned to California where he took a post managing a vineyard in the McDowell Valley of Mendocino County.

Mr. Swanson was then hired as a UC Cooperative Extension viticulture farm advisor for Fresno County, a position he held for 10 years. Fred then returned to expand his own farming operation while helping others with their farms. During this time, Fred met the legendary viticulture specialist Fred Jenson which led Mr. Swanson to apply for the open directorship at the Kearney Ag Station.

Since 1983, Fred has made outstanding contributions to the Kearney Ag Station. One of his early additions was the purchase of 75 acres of farmland across the street from the original parcel. With this purchase, the total amount of land available for research grew to 330 acres with 45 different varieties of agricultural crops including stone fruit, nut crops, raisins, wine and table grapes, specialty vegetables, blueberries and kiwifruit being grown on this acreage.

In 1989, Swanson made one of his most visible improvements with the construction of a two-story state of the art laboratory, office and meeting complex. This laboratory and office complex provided UC scientists, recognized worldwide for their pioneering agricultural research, the facilities needed to further their research. Additionally, under Fred's direction, a 20,000 square foot greenhouse complex was completed in 2003. This complex continues to give Valley agricultural scientists access to 24 high quality greenhouse modules with computer controlled heating, cooling and lighting systems. Among his many awards, Fred's accomplishments have been recognized by the University of California, Davis through the Award of Distinction from the College of Ag & Environmental Sciences and the Citation for Excellence by the Cal Aggie Alumni Association.

Madam Speaker, it goes without saying that Mr. Swanson's dedication and accomplishments to the San Joaquin Valley's agriculture community have gained him respect and appreciation from all who have worked with him and know him. With retirement now a reality, Fred is preparing to spend more time with his wife Cheryl, as well as enjoying fishing and hunting trips. We owe Fred a magnificent collective thank you. I honor Fred Swanson, before you my colleagues, for his productive years of service to agriculture and the nation.

IN HONOR OF ELLEN PSENICKA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Ellen Psenicka, whose forty-year tenure as reporter, editor and publisher of the award-winning Neighborhood News, continues to enlighten, entertain and unite Cleveland's southeast community every Wednesday, highlighting current events along our city streets—from the neighborhoods of Slavic Village, to the streets of Garfield Heights, to the steps of Cleveland City Hall.

Ellen grew up in Sandusky, Ohio and went on to attend Ohio University, where she earned a Bachelor's degree in Journalism. Shortly following graduation, in June, 1969, Ellen was hired as a reporter by Jim Psenicka, publisher of the Neighborhood News. A few years later, Jim and Ellen were married, and they worked in dedication to each other, to the newspaper and to the community until Jim's passing in 2001. At that time, Ellen accepted the torch of leadership passed to her by Jim, and she continues to carry on his legacy of excellence in journalism, and his commitment to the Greater Cleveland Community.

Ellen's spirit of volunteerism and focus on the betterment of the community is evident throughout Southeast Cleveland and its suburbs. Her kind and humble nature draws people to her, and she has garnered the admiration and respect of everyone she knows. She is a longtime member of the Garfield Heights Historical Society and serves as a board member for Cleveland Central Catholic High School. She is currently serving her second term as President of the Kiwanis of Southeast Cleveland. As a member and leader in Kiwanis, Ellen has been instrumental in leading several fundraising efforts aimed at local student scholarship awards, and recently, a fundraiser and recognition dinner honoring Dr. Javier Lopez which raised greatly-needed funds for his medical missions to Central America. Ellen has always reached out with a generous heart wherever and whenever needed. Her efforts in volunteerism also include her tireless dedication in her efforts to save St. Michael's hospital.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Ellen Psenicka, as she celebrates her 40th Anniversary with the Neighborhood News. The Neighborhood News is read by tens of thousands of people weekly, and continues to inform and unite us all. Ellen's commitment to bringing us the news of the neighborhood and her generosity as a community leader and volunteer serves to brighten and strengthen our entire community.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SHERIFF EDWARD JACKSON ''JACK'' DAY

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, Thomasville and indeed all of Clarke County recently lost a dear friend, and I rise today to honor him and pay tribute to his memory.

Edward Jackson Day, known to his friends and family as ''Jack,'' served the people of Clarke County as a law enforcement officer for nearly four decades—as a sheriff's deputy, chief deputy, and eventually as sheriff of Clarke County. He devoted his 71 years to his family, his faith, and to keeping the residents of Thomasville and surrounding communities safe.

Jack began his law enforcement career as an auxiliary state trooper in 1967, and was promoted to a full-time deputy three years later. In 1978, he became chief deputy under Sheriff Roy Sheffield. When Sheriff Sheffield retired in 1993, Jack was appointed sheriff of Clarke County and served in that capacity until his retirement in January of 2007. He was a past president of the Alabama Sheriff's Association and a member of the National Sheriff's Association, the Fraternal Order of Police and the Democratic Executive Committee. In addition, Sheriff Day was an avid hunter and a member of Oliver Lodge No. 334 F&AM.

Sheriff Day was also an active member of his church, Pineview Baptist Church, where he served as a deacon. He served on the board of the Southwest Alabama Children's Advocacy Center, as well as the advisory boards of the Department of Youth Services and Life Tech community. He was also a former board member and chairman of the Boys and Girls Club.

As he prepared to retire as sheriff, Jack noted, ''You learn to take the bad times with the good times. We've had some tragedies, but we've had a lot more good times and I'm glad for that. You always remember you're there to protect and serve the people.''

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering a dedicated community leader, a friend to many throughout south Alabama, as well as a wonderful husband, loving father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. Jack Day will be dearly missed by his family—his wife, Wilma Gates Day; his son, Mayor Sheldon Allison Day; his daughter, Daphne Elaine Day; his two sisters, Mary Ellen Day Parten and Jerry Ann Day Little; his five grandchildren, Jeffrey Devin Deas, Brittney Elaine Deas, Leslie Allison Dellinger, and Kaitlin Elizabeth Day and Thomas Zachary Day; and his three great-grandchildren, Carrigan Elizabeth Day, and Malya Elizabeth Deas and Devin Baine Deas—as well as the countless friends he leaves behind.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them all during this difficult time.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM MAYOR SCARCELLA OF STAFFORD, TEXAS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, public officials looking for ways to increase economic growth and attract new residents and businesses to their cities, counties, or states could learn a lot from the city of Stafford, Texas, and Mayor Leonard Scarcella. Stafford has flourished since 1995 when, under Mayor Scarcella's leadership, the city eliminated the property tax.

Thanks to the absence of property taxes, Stafford residents enjoy cheaper mortgages and have more disposable income than similarly situated residents of towns with property taxes. The extra income as a result of the freedom from property taxes is particularly beneficial during today's tough economic times.

The loss of property tax revenue has not deprived Stafford residents of quality city services; in fact, Stafford resident Alice Rolston told the Houston Chronicle that the police check on her home when she is on vacation, many homeowners living in towns with high property taxes can't count on that type of service.

Entrepreneurs looking to start up businesses are attracted to Stafford because of the lack of property taxes, Fortune magazine ranks Stafford the 36th best American city to start and run a small business.

While Stafford sales, franchise, and permit fees account for some of its ability to operate without a property tax, the major factor in the city's success is the city's fiscally prudent management. Stafford Councilman Cecil Willis says the mayor watches every penny in the city's budget. City employees often perform two or more functions and the city council even debates whether to authorize the purchase of light bulbs and pencils.

Madam Speaker, Mayor Scarcella is also a good argument against term limits, as he is one of the few elected officials who remains as committed to low taxes today as when he led the fight to eliminate the property tax. Mayor Scarcella should serve as a role model to us all in how to effectively govern without burdening the people with excessive taxes.

HONORING DR. TONY STEWART

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise to y to express great sadness about the untimely passing of Elizabeth City-Pasquotank Public Schools Superintendent Dr. Tony Stewart.

Dr. Stewart has served as superintendent for the past nine years, and he had earned the respect of the community as a talented and dedicated educator who worked tirelessly to ensure every student received the best possible education. I will remember him for always stressing the responsibility and importance of working to make a difference in the lives of others.

He started his career in 1963 as a teacher, assistant principal and athletic director at Spotsylvania High School in Virginia before serving as a principal for several other schools in Virginia. Dr. Stewart's first job as a superintendent was at Culpeper County Schools in Virginia, where he served for 13 years starting in 1981. He became superintendent of North Carolina's Burke County Schools in 1994, where he served until coming to Elizabeth City-Pasquotank in 2000.

Dr. Stewart received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Appalachian State University and completed postgraduate work at the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech University. He received his doctorate in education from Nova Southeastern University in 1995 and also completed the Principal's Executive Program at the University of North Carolina that same year.

Madam Speaker, I ask that everyone join me in offering our deepest condolences to his family, friends, loved ones, community and colleagues. Dr. Stewart has been a tremendous asset to the community and he will be greatly missed.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION LAND CONSERVATION ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be joined today with Representatives ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, GERALD CONNOLLY, ROB WITTMAN, DONNA EDWARDS, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, FRANK WOLF and STENY HOYER to introduce legislation National Capital Region Land Conservation Act of 2009. The legislation amends the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930, authorizing appropriations of up to $50 million per year for cost share grants to State, regional and local governments to acquire land in the greater Washington Metropolitan area (as defined by the U.S. Census) for a variety of conservation, environmental and recreational purposes. The program would be administered by the U.S. National Park Service.

Few cannot help but notice the green spaces that make up the central core of our nation's capital. Were it not for some visionaries at the turn of the 19th Century, however, our nation's capital would be a different place today. There would be no Mall, monument core, Rock Creek Parkway, Union Station, Lincoln Memorial or Tidal Basin. These icons that define the city today were part of the 1902 McMillan plan, named after Senator James McMillan of Michigan, who chaired the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. The commission Senator McMillan established to draft the master plan included some of the greatest American architects, landscape architects and urban planners of the day including such luminaries as Daniel Burnham, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. and Charles McKim and sculptor August Saint-Gaudens. The commission's plan, in many respects, was an early form of urban renewal that removed many of the slums that surrounded the Capitol, replacing them with new public monuments, open spaces and government buildings.

As visionary as the plan was, it also took some vision and political muscle to make it a reality. That credit falls largely to two Members of Congress: Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas and Rep. Louis Cramton of Michigan. Both Members embraced the vision and worked over a period of years to enact legislation to advance the McMillan plan. Best known among these laws is the Capper-Cramton law of 1930 authorizing land purchases and creating today's the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Today, more than a century since the McMillan plan and more than 70 years since the enactment of Capper-Cramton, the time is now for a new plan, one that is responsive to the development patterns and demographics that were never envisioned at the turn of the last century. In 1902, the population of the District of Columbia was 278,000. Outside a few dirt roads and a few railroad junctions that ran into Northern Virginia and Maryland, the suburbs didn't exist. Dairies and farming hamlets populated Northern Virginia and Montgomery and Prince Georges County, Maryland.

Today, the District is home to 600,000 residents and swells to more than 1,000,000 during the workday. A network of roads and heavy rail radiate out from the city, like spokes on a wheel, linking more than 5,300,000 people who are spread out into the suburbs and fringe communities that consider themselves part of the greater metropolitan Washington, D.C. region. Today, we need a program for the greater metropolitan region.

We also need a program that helps lead the way in public investments to preserve the green infrastructure of parklands, fresh drinking water sources, steep slopes, stream valleys, forests, wetlands, wildlife corridors, scenic view sheds, historic sites and land buffering national monuments, battlefields that surround the national capital region and are endangered of being lost to development. Safeguarding these green assets is critical to this region's economy, quality of life, and environmental protection. Green infrastructure have been long recognized as essential elements of urban design and critical to safeguarding our region's drinking water supplies and restoration of the nationally important Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac River, truly our "Nation's River."

Unless we act now to protect the remaining green infrastructure around our Nation's Capital, we run the risk of permanently degrading the environment in and around Washington, D.C. Between 1990 and now, the region's population grew by about 10 percent but the amount of impermeable surface grew about 40 percent. Forecasts predict that by the year 2030, the Greater Washington, D.C. region will grow by an additional 2 million persons.

I believe Congress can and should help the nation's capital address this growing need to preserve this region's green infrastructure by amending the time honored and visionary CapperCramton Act. The original Act gave life to many of the elements that we appreciate and consider invaluable today. It is time once again to act and preserve our source of fresh drinking water, connect this region's network of nonmotorized trails, provide buffers to protect scenic vistas along the Potomac particularly above Great Falls, and in Charles and Saint Mary's Counties in Maryland, and pocket parks in the more urbanized parts of the region.

I encourage you to support this act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, along with 136 of my colleagues, I was unable to return to the House floor in time for an unexpected recorded vote on a motion to rise late in the evening of June 16, 2009. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted ''no'' so that the House would consider an amendment to assess the economic impact of the delay in enacting the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

IN TRIBUTE OF DR. RANDOLPH E. BROOKS

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, later this month, doctors of optometry from around the country will assemble at the Gaylord Resort at National Harbor for Optometry's Meeting®, the American Optometric Association's 111th annual convention. On Saturday, June 27th, Dr. Randolph E. Brooks of Saccasunna, New Jersey will be elected as the association's 88th president. Randy's enthusiasm and many contributions to his profession earned him this prestigious recognition.

Doctors of optometry are the nation's largest eye care profession serving patients in nearly 6,500 communities nationwide, and in more than 3,500 of these communities they are the only eye doctors. Dr. Brooks has dedicated his life to serving the public both as an optometrist and a community leader.

Dr. Brooks' dedication and motivation will propel him to a most successful term as he leads the American Optometric Association in its mission to improve eye care in the United States.

Dr. Brooks has compiled an impressive record in his profession and his community. After graduating from the State University of New York at Albany, Dr. Brooks enrolled at the New England College of Optometry and later established Advanced Eyecare Associates, a three doctor practice in New Jersey with specialty interests in ocular disease, contact lenses, pediatric eye care and vision therapy. Starting out in 1977 in Budd Lake, New Jersey and later moving to Ledgewood, Dr. Brooks has grown his practice to a staff of fifteen at the Ledgewood facility.

Dr. Brooks was first elected to the American Optometric Association's Board of Trustees in 2000. Prior to the election to the AOA Board, Dr. Brooks was twice named the New Jersey Society of Optometric Physicians' Optometrist of the Year. He also is a past president of the New Jersey Society of Optometric Physicians. Randy's leadership record extends to his community service as a Paul Harris Fellow of the Roxbury Rotary Club, past president of the Mount Olive Lions Club, and as a Board of Directors member of Temple Shalom.

Dr. Randolph Brooks has distinguished himself in the Northwestern New Jersey community through his unique vision and spirit. I wish to convey heartfelt congratulations to Randy and his family on the occasion of his installation as the 88th president of the American Optometric Association, as well as many thanks for working to enrich the lives of those around him.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Dr. Randolph E. Brooks.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MR. CHRIS C. DE LANEY

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, south Alabama and indeed the entire state recently lost a dear friend, and I rise today to honor him and pay tribute to his memory.

Chris C. De Laney, a devoted family man, lawyer, and philanthropist was dedicated to the continued growth and prosperity of Mobile. A 1948 graduate of the University of Alabama Law School, Mr. De Laney was the first attorney for the University of South Alabama (USA) and was instrumental in the school's negotiations to obtain the old Mobile General Hospital.

He also helped found The University of South Alabama foundation as well as USA Hospital, Southland and Doctor's hospitals, the Historic Blakely Foundation, The Southland Foundation, The Dauphin Island Foundation, and First Small Business Investment Company of Alabama.

Mr. De Laney was appointed as Mobile's acting district attorney in 1979. He also served as chairman of the Alabama Consumer Protection Council, chief executive officer and chairman of Altus Bank, as well as many other business, civic, and religious organizations including Boy Scouts of America and the Isle Dauphine Club.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering a dedicated community leader and friend to many throughout Alabama. Mr. Chris De Laney will be deeply missed by his family—his loving wife of 64 years, Cleo J. De Laney; his four sons, David C. De Laney, Bryan C. De Laney, Michael C. De Laney, and Robin C. De Laney; his nine grandchildren; and his four great grandchildren—as well as the countless friends he leaves behind. Our thoughts and prayers are with them all at this difficult time.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2009

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal yaer ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bill.

This legislation makes significant investments in two of our nation's top priorities—protecting Americans at home and in their communities, and encouraging scientific research and innovation.

One of the fundamental responsibilities of our government is ensuring the safety and security of our citizens by keeping our streets and neighborhoods safe. One of the most successful crime fighting programs in recent history is the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program. This bill provides $802 million overall for the program and $282 million for COPS hiring grants. When combined with the $1 billion provided in the Recovery Act, more than 7,000 police offices will be hired nationwide, 287 of those in New Jersey.

Through this bill, the Office of Justice Programs will receive $2.2 billion, $155 million over the Fiscal Year 2009 level. Programs such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants Program will receive $529 million to assist state and local law enforcement agencies in their efforts to control domestic crime as well as combat violent crimes, particular gang and drug-related criminal activity.

The bill also provides $400 million ($11 million over the 2009 level) to the Office on Violence Against Women to aid in the prevention and prosecution of violent crime against women. Funds allocated by this bill will be used to strengthen the services available to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

In the area of science funding, the bill provides over $30 billion to support research at the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The appropriations in this bill support the plan to double funding for basic research, as expressed by Congress in the American COMPETES Act. History shows that our country and our economy benefit when the federal government invests in our national innovation and intellectual infrastructure.

This bill helps our students succeed in a global job market by investing $1 billion to support all aspects of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education from kindergarten through graduate school. It is imperative that we ensure our future generations are equipped with the skills they need to be capable participants in a scientific and technological workforce. Our economic growth is intertwined with our ability to remain competitive in the areas of Science and Technology. I want to thank the subcommittee chair, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, for demonstrating a commitment to make meaningful investments in science education to guarantee the success of our children in this global market place.

I also am pleased that the bill includes over $2 billion to study global climate change, undoubtedly one of the greatest challenges facing our Nation. Over $700 million will be used by the National Science Foundation and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for climate change research and educational programs. The Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory in my district is leading the national effort in climate change research by employing sophisticated mathematical models and computer simulations to improve our knowledge and ability to predict climatic behavior and

trends. An additional investment of over $1.3 billion will be used to develop measurement techniques and for green building initiatives nationwide. It is vital to both our economic and our national security that we take whatever measures are necessary to gain a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms that drive global warming in order to implement the full range of measures necessary to combat it.

Finally, this bill also ensures that we will be able to conduct an accurate decennial Census in 2010. On top of the $1 billion that was provided for the Census in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, this bill matches the President's request for $7.4 billion to conduct the largest and most advanced Census in our nation's history.

Mr. Chair, I commend the committee for bringing us a bill that reflects the priorities of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

HONORING A LOCAL MUSICIAN'S CAREER

HON. ADAM H. PUTNAM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, a great education is a well-rounded education. This means students should not only be exposed to technical subjects such as math and the sciences, but the humanities and arts as well. Today I wish to honor the life and career of a woman who made great contributions to Florida's music culture as well as inspiring many young students, Mrs. Billye-Mullins Smith.

A resident of Winter Haven, Florida, Mrs. Smith was a musician, music educator, and music composer who has impacted the life of many young school children since the mid–1940s. She authored the Opus I Music Study program, which provided a great study for aspiring young musicians. Her late husband, Carroll Smith II, provided the lyrics for the song she composed entitled, ''I Want To Wake Up In The Morning Where The Orange Blossoms Grow,'' which is more commonly known as, ''The Florida Song.''

This song touched many Floridians statewide. It originally started as a piece to be played in front of the Winter Haven Lions Club meeting with her husband singing backed by her piano. In short order, this piece made its way from the Lions Club meeting into elementary school classrooms. Since then, several generations grew up singing about the orange blossoms and birds of the great state of Florida.

Mrs. Smith was honored on Sunday, March 22, 2009 at the Lakeland Center in the Yourkey Theater.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PERMANENT FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGESHIPS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced, along with my colleagues Congressman WALLY HERGER, Congressman DAN LUNGREN, Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, Congressman BUCK MCKEON, Congressman DEVIN NUNES, and Congressman GEORGE RADANOVICH, which would create four new permanent district court judgeships and one temporary district court judgeship in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, as well as designate Bakersfield, California, as a place of holding court for the Eastern District of California.

For the year ending September 30, 2008, according to the most recent data available from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Eastern District of California had 1,305 pending cases per judge, a 50.2% increase since 2003, and weighted filings of 970 per judge, a 26.5% increase since 2003, which is substantially above the weighted filing standard used by the Judicial Conference of the United States to determine when additional judgeships are needed. Moreover, in 2008, the Eastern District of California had the highest number of pending cases and weighted filings per judge of all other district courts in the Ninth Judicial Circuit, including the district courts that serve Los Angeles and San Francisco.

In the 2005 Biennial Judgeship Survey, the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended four additional permanent judgeships for the Eastern District of California. Specifically, the report states:

''The Court is requesting three permanent judgeships and conversion of the temporary judgeship to a permanent position based on a steadily increasing and consistently high weighted caseload. The Judicial Conference has recommended conversion of the temporary position since 1997, and also recommended one permanent judgeship and one temporary judgeship in 1997 and 1999, two permanent judgeships since 2001, and three permanent judgeships in the 2003 survey.''

More recently, during the March 2009 biannual meeting, the Judicial Conference voted to ask Congress to create sixty-three new federal judgeships, fifty-one of which would be for district courts. Within this proposal, the Judicial Conference recommended the Eastern District of California receive four additional permanent judgeships and one temporary judgeship. My bill seeks to implement the Judicial Conference's recommendations for the Eastern District of California, which includes at its southern-most point, Kern County, which I represent.

My bill would also designate Bakersfield, California, as a place of holding court for the Eastern District of California. Such a designation does not require or imply a district court be located in Bakersfield. This designation would simply make Bakersfield eligible to have the Eastern District of California locate a district court judge there should caseload require. Under current law, the City of Fresno, the City of Redding, and the City of Sacramento are all currently designated as a place of holding court for the Eastern District of California.

The current population of Bakersfield is 315,837, which is similar in size to Fresno (pop. 470,508) and Sacramento (pop. 460,242), and significantly larger than Redding (pop. 89,780). That said, Bakersfield is a fast growing city in California and, due to affordable housing and its proximity to Los Angeles, is expected to continue to grow in the future. To that end, the City's population is projected to grow by more than 14 percent to over 557,000 by 2015 and Kern County is projected to grow by more than 24 percent to nearly one million over the next decade, growth well above the 8.7 percent national population growth rate projected by the U.S. Census Bureau for 2010 to 2020.

Furthermore, Kern and Inyo Counties currently account for almost 23% of the Fresno division civil filings and 9% of Eastern District civil filings. As these counties continue to grow, it is reasonable to assume that filings will increase, and this designation provides the Eastern District of California the flexibility to locate a district judge in Bakersfield in the future.

In terms of geography, the Eastern District of California is the largest judicial district of the four federal district court districts in California, encompassing over 87,000 square miles (34 of California's 58 counties) and almost 600 miles long. According to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of California, this judicial district is the eighth most populous and physically the tenth largest of all 94 U.S. District Court judicial districts in the United States. Thus, travel within the sprawling Eastern District is time-consuming, not to mention expensive.

Furthermore, there is no major metropolitan area designated as a place of holding court in the southern region of the Eastern District of California. Redding is located in the north of the judicial district, Sacramento is located in the north central area of the district, and Fresno is located in the south central area of the district. A designation for Bakersfield would make the largest city in the southern part of this judicial district at minimum eligible to have a district court judge in the future.

The Sixth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution guarantees ''the right to a speedy and public trial.'' In order to preserve this constitutional right in the Eastern District of California, I fully support the Judicial Conference's judgeship recommendations, as well as making Bakersfield, California, eligible as a place of holding court. My bill would ensure the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California has the requisite number of judges to execute its duties in a timely manner for the citizens the Court serves, ensure the Court has the resources to adjudicate current and future cases, which are only expected to increase, and ensure the equitable administration of justice in California.

HONORING KIRK LINDSEY

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kirk Lindsey for his dedication to his family and community. Mr. Lindsey passed away on Wednesday, June 10, 2009, at Doctors Medical Hospital in Modesto, California surrounded by friends and family. Mr. Lindsey was 62 years old.

Kirk Lindsey was born on May 12, 1947 in San Jose, California, to Robert and Carol Lindsey. He attended Abilene Christian University where he earned a Bachelors of Science degree in Business Administration. He also participated in the Masters of Business Administration program at Pepperdine University. In 1969, Mr. Lindsey was commissioned into the United States Army after completing ROTC at Hardin Simmons University in Abilene, Texas. After serving in Korea Mr. Lindsey returned to California in 1971.

Mr. Lindsey became President of Brite Transportation System, Incorporated, in Riverbank, California; a company he founded in 1972. Brite Transportation was created to transport agricultural products and products of preservation. In 1976, Mr. Lindsey became the Managing General Partner of B&P Bulk, also an agricultural trucking company. Between the two companies there are offices currently operating in Riverbank, El Centro, Hanford and Woodland, California.

Mr. Lindsey was always very involved with his community. At the time of his passing, he served on the California Transportation Commission which is responsible for the programming and allocation of funds for the construction of highway, passenger rail and transit improvements throughout California. He was appointed to this position by former Governor Gray Davis on November 10, 2000, and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on April 7, 2004 (reappointed on February 14, 2008). He had previously served as commissioner of that organization. He was the current chairman of the Stanislaus County Private Industry Council, President of the Modesto Chamber of Commerce and a past President of the California Trucking Association. Mr. Lindsey was a founding member of the Riverbank Chamber of Commerce, served as Vice-President of the California Casualty Insurance Board and served on the Board of Directors of Parkridge Christian Estates. He worked closely with the Stanislaus Economic Development and Workforce Alliance and the California Workforce Investment Board.

Mr. Lindsey placed a special emphasis on education. He was the founder and President of the Beyer High School Educational Foundation. He served on the school's accreditation committee, was past President of the Beyer Booster Club and was a committee member for the Beyer Crab Feed for eighteen years. This past school year Mr. Lindsey completed his twentieth year as Beyer High School's boys and girls swimming and water polo coach. Outside of the school, he served on board of the Stanislaus Partnership in Education.

Through all of his community involvement, he made time for family, church and travel. His passion was traveling; he visited over seventy-five countries. He was a member of the Davis Park Church of Christ since 1972.

Mr. Lindsey was preceded in death by his father. He is survived by his mother, Carol Lindsey of San Jose; his wife, Cyndi of Modesto; his sister Anne Lucier of Sacramento; his daughters, Shannon Suesens and her husband John of Sacramento, Whitney Lindsey and Tiffany Lindsey of Modesto and Ashleigh Lindsey of Portland, Oregon; and grandson Brendan Suesens of Sacramento. He is also survived by his nieces, Christine and Courtney Lucier of Sacramento, Stacy Gorton of Seattle, Washington and his grand-nephew Cameron Lucier of Sacramento.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to posthumously honor Kirk Lindsey. I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Lindsey's life and wishing the best for his family.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2009

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes:

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010.

This legislation will fund the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and several other independent agencies. These collective agencies and departments allow our nation to continue to invest in critical science research, like climate change, education, and state and local law enforcement.

At a time when our nation is in need of rebuilding, and our communities to be made safer for our children, this bill will provide $3.4 billion for state and local law enforcement and crime prevention grants, including more than $800 million for Community Oriented Police Services (COPS), to help keep our streets and neighborhoods safer, $400 million for the Office on Violence Against Women, and $2 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

To help these children grow up in a safe environment, and move into adulthood with the opportunity that a better education will present, the bill offers $1 billion for Science Education, and over $18 billion for NASA. Overall, it provides nearly $31 billion for science as part of a commitment to America's innovation and competitiveness.

A vote in support of this bill is a vote in favor of our security, our liberty, and the hope of our future through education.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2847.

FATHERS DAY 2009

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, as we recognize Fathers Day 2009, probably never before has fatherhood been so challenged. The traditional position of fathers in American society and in the family as an institution is in serious trouble.

On a recent flight back to Washington I happened to open a local newspaper to birth notices. Nearly half of the births recorded were out of wedlock and about a dozen of the birth notices did not identify a father. In fact, today 28% of Caucasian, 51% Hispanic, and 70% African American children are born out of wedlock, while white males face a challenging role, their African American counterparts' fatherhood role has been dramatically eroded.

As we reflect on the plight of fatherhood in our community some sobering facts reveal a crisis that cannot and should not be ignored. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that not having a father has serious economic consequences. There are nearly twenty million children living in a single parent household. With no father present these households account for 45% of our poverty rate. The U.S. Department of Justice found that 46% of unwed mothers would leave poverty if they married the fathers of their children. A recent examination by the National Fatherhood Initiative revealed that African American newborns today are tremendously disadvantaged. Today, half of all children and 80% of African American children can expect to spend at least part of their childhood living apart from their fathers.

These staggering figures portray an absence in our society that is detrimental to our nation's youth. We must understand the consequences that result from denying our children a proper upbringing. Although Fathers Day is a time to celebrate and rejoice with our loved ones, we cannot forget about the increasing number of our children that are being raised without a father. Children growing up without a father are more likely to have behavioral problems, and be incarcerated. Those children are less likely to attend college, become married, and form healthy relationships.

Unfortunately this trend has become prevalent in our communities. As a result this problem has become repetitive through generations at an alarming rate. We must work to raise awareness of the positive effects fatherhood has on a child's life. We must also find ways to stem the decline of meaningful relationships between a father and his child in our society.

I recently read a commentary on The Importance of a Loving Father by Dr. Walter E. Barker, a Florida licensed Marriage and Family Therapist. "Fathers are very important to their sons' and daughters' development. A mother gives the child unconditional love and acceptance and the father's love is more conditional on the child's finding success and accomplishment out in the larger world. He wants his children to find what makes them happy and then take that gift and talent to make a contribution to the larger society. Fathers want their children to have a strong work ethic and to be willing to assert themselves in the world."

By supporting the family structure, better education and job training we can begin to reverse the diminished role of fathers in our country. We must all work to help raise awareness on this pressing issue. The importance of fatherhood should not be overlooked by our society if we are to ensure a promising future for the children in America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEAN HELLER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. HELLER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, a motion to reconsider, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING WALTER DICKERSON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, it is with both pride and pleasure that I rise today to honor the long and distinguished career of Walter Dickerson, on the occasion of his retirement as director of the Mobile County Emergency Management Agency.

Born in Claiborne, Maryland, Walt graduated from Robert Russa Moton High School in 1965. Following his graduation, he joined the United States Marine Corps and went on to serve for 21 years, working his way up through the enlisted, warrant officer, and commissioned officer. He earned a Bachelor's degree in business management from National University. He retired from the Marine Corps after 21 years of service as a decorated Vietnam veteran.

Following his time in the Marines, Walt served as the Integrated Logistics Support Manager for the AAI Corporation and was the department head of Integrated Logistics Support at Teledyne Power Systems. In 1996, he joined the Mobile County Emergency Management Agency, where he has served in a number of capacities including plans and operations officer, director of plans and operations, and executive director and area director of homeland security.

Walt's true gift to the Mobile community was manifested through his efforts during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. He received the Blacks in Government Port City Chapter Community Service Award for his contribution to the community following Hurricane Katrina, and he testified twice before Congress on Mobile's successful preparation and response to Hurricane Katrina. He was also recognized by the Alabama Senate, the Mobile County Commission, and the Mobile City Council for his performance during Hurricanes Ivan, Dennis, and Katrina.

Walt is a member of the Port City Chapter of Blacks in Government and the International Association of Emergency Managers. He is the past president of the Society of Logistics Engineers as well as the Alabama Association of Emergency Managers. He is also greatly involved in the community serving as chairperson for the Tommie Agee Charity Foundation, vice president of the Gulf City Golfers Association, the Mobile Area Mardi Gras Association, Summit to Advance Values in Education, and American Legion Post 77. He is a 32nd Mason and a Shriner. Walt is also a charter member of Mobile's Monford Pointe Marine Association.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dedicated community leader and friend to many throughout Alabama. I am certain that his family, his many friends, and the countless people who have benefited from his hard work and dedication join me in praising his accomplishments and extending thanks for his service to the city of Mobile and the state of Alabama. On behalf of a grateful community, I wish Walt the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 380, I was present the entire eight hours. Due to a apparent machine malfunction, I was not recorded as voting. This amendment is both fiscally responsible and addresses another excess in spending that continues to drive upward our national debt, crippling current economic growth and saddling future generations with an unacceptable burden which will strangle taxpayers and reduce critical essential benefits to social services, especially seniors.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

RECOGNIZING JUNETEENTH

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June 19, 2009, or "Juneteenth," the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the ending of slavery in the United States.

The observance of June 19th as the African American Emancipation Day originated in Galveston, Texas in 1865, and is now celebrated around the United States. This day was chosen because it was on June 19th that the Union soldiers landed at Galveston, Texas with news that the war had ended and that the enslaved were now free—a full two and a half years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation became official on January 1, 1863. The day was largely celebrated within African-American communities until the Civil Rights movement, when Reverend Ralph Abernathy called for people of all races, economic levels, and professions to come to Washington, D.C. to show support for the poor at the Poor People's March on Juneteenth in 1968. Many of the participants returned home and initiated Juneteenth celebrations in their own communities.

Every year, the celebration of Juneteenth grows in popularity across the United States. It is a day when we recognize and remember the evils of slavery and the suffering it caused. But it is also a day that celebrates African American freedom and emphasizes education and achievement with celebrations, guest speakers, picnics and family gatherings. Participants of all races, nationalities and religions celebrate and take the time to reflect on the past and rejoice in the present and future.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to note that in California's 37th Congressional District the city of Carson, Compton, and Long Beach, which I am proud to represent, celebrated Juneteenth in a very special way. In Long Beach, The MusicUntold Orchestra and Chorale performed the Bicentennial Symphony, by composer Roy Harris, which is considered the most powerful musical statement ever made on slavery in the United States. Ollie Woodson, formally of the Temptations, performed at the Carson celebration and the Compton celebration featured Howard Hewitt and the Whispers.

As we celebrate Juneteenth, Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to recognize this day and take a moment to honor the women and men that dedicated their lives to ending slavery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, for the entire legislative day of June 18, 2009, I have an excused absence to attend my son's school graduation. If I were present, I would have voted "no" on Rollcall votes No. 356, 359, 360, 361, 362, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387, 389, 391, 393, 395, 397, 399, 401, 403, 405, and 407.

I would have voted "aye" on Rollcall votes No. 357, 358, 363, 365, 371, 384, 388, 390, 392, 394, 396, 398, 400, 402, 404, 406, and 408.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, on Rollcall No. 356, I intended to vote "yes."

The motion would have struck $97.4 million from the Federal Prison System in the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010. It would have brought funding in line with the President's request.

I believe the level of spending in the underlying bill was irresponsible in light of the crushing level of debt that America is facing. This amendment was a small step in a broader effort that I supported to make this a fiscally responsible bill.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO DESIGNATE THE ''DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE'' IN PORTLAND, OREGON

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located as 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Northeast Portland, Oregon as the ''Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office.'' This post office shall serve to remind us of the civil rights leader who inspired a nation and served as a catalyst for change. Our nation has come a long way since the days of the civil rights movement and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream of equality and brotherhood between all people continues to inspire.

In fact, this bill is a result of a community effort led by local letter carriers Jamie Partridge and Isham Harris. In 2007, Mr. Partridge and Mr. Harris collected employee signatures supporting this naming, as well as letters of support from the Piedmont and Concordia Neighborhood Associations, and the Sabin Community Association.

I am pleased to carry their effort forward and am proud that Representatives WU, DEFAZIO, WALDEN, and SCHRADER, the full Oregon Congressional delegation, have joined as original cosponsors in the House. Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY will soon introduce companion legislation in the Senate.

Naming one of our community's postal facilities after one of the century's most inspiring leaders is a personal reminder of Dr. King's achievements and the work that remains to be done. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure the swift passage and enactment of this bill.

CONGRATULATING THE ANDERSON LADY ORANGE

HON. JEAN SCHMIDT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Anderson Lady Orange on winning Ohio's 2009 Division III Women's Lacrosse State Championship, for the second year in a row. In the past three seasons, the Lady Orange have a record of 44 and 11, including 15 wins this season.

Led by Head Coach Paul Eldridge, Anderson defended their state title by defeating Bexley 9–8. Scoring in the championship game for the Lady Orange was Kate Shingleton—five goals, Shelby Smith—two goals, Caroline Eldridge, and Chelsea Ritter. Goalie Ashlee Heckard finished the game with five saves. Senior Kate Shingleton was named the tournament's Most Outstanding Offensive Player.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating these talented young women for their historic lacrosse season and wish them the best of luck in all their future endeavors. Go Lady Orange!

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF PERKINS BRAILLE AND TALKING BOOK LIBRARY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Perkins School for the Blind on being recognized by the Library of Congress as the 2008 Talking Book Library of the Year.

The Perkins School for the Blind, the first school for the blind in the United States, began with its founding over 175 years ago. Within a few short years, Perkins became known for its effective instructional techniques, including teaching Laura Bridgman, the first known deaf blind person to be educated. Perkins School is also responsible for nurturing the talents of Helen Keller, who came to Perkins on her way to breaking down barriers and perceptions about what people who are blind or deaf blind can accomplish.

Since first joining Congress, I've held the deep belief that there is no reason why anyone living in our country should not have equal opportunity to the literary genius of our nation and world. This belief, has led me to support efforts like that of the Perkins School, which always innovate with accessibility in mind.

The Perkins Braille and Talking Book Library, for over 174 years, has distinguished itself as a leader in providing innovative literary accessibility to those amongst us with visual and other disabilities.

In 2008, the Perkins School Braille and Talking Book Library circulated over 442,935 book and magazines, served 22,814 borrowers, and loaned over 5,000 play machines and accessories. The great staff of the Perkins School researched 13,164 title inquiries and found over 89 percent of those titles in an accessible format.

The Perkins School for the Blind should be commended for their tremendous effort to educate not only those with visual and other disabilities, but all of us. Because of the work of institutions like the Perkins School for the Blind, millions of individuals actively learned that with training and opportunity, those with visual and/or other disabilities can attain self-sufficiency and independently thrive throughout their lives.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to congratulate the Perkins School for the Blind.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, consistent with the Republican Leadership's policy on earmarks, I am submitting the following earmark disclosure information regarding project funding I had requested and which was included within the legislation H.R. 2647, as reported. To the best of my knowledge, none of these six requests: (1) are directed to an entity or program that will be named after a sitting Member of Congress; (2) are not intended to be used by an entity to secure funds for other entities unless the use of funding is consistent with the specified purpose of the earmark; and (3) meet or exceed all statutory requirements for matching funds where applicable. I further certify that neither my spouse, nor I, have any personal financial interests in these requests.

Project Title: Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT)

Amount: $1.5 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Research and Development, Army

Address of Requesting Entity: Attensity, Inc., 90 South 400 West, Suite 600, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project, in conjunction with the University of New York at Buffalo, would fund research and development of an ''all-source'' fusion tool for collecting open-source data from the web, blogs, social networking sites, and RRS feeds, to provide more effective defense intelligence analysis and improving military decision making in asymmetric warfare situations

Project Title: PCC Apron NW End Taxiway A

Amount: $5.1 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Military Construction, Air Force

Address of Requesting Entity: Hill AFB, Utah. 75th Air Base Wing, Hill AFB, Utah 84056

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project would correct runway deficiencies and allow for more aircraft to be prepared for flight at the same time that airstrip landing and take-off operations are being conducted, increasing military readiness, safety, and reducing jet fuel costs

Project Title: Propellant Conversion to Fertilizer Program for Tooele Army Depot

Amount: $3.4 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Research and Development, Army

Address of Requesting Entity: Archtech, Inc., 14100 Park Meadow Drive, Chantilly, VA 20151

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project would fund new conventional ammunition demilitarization method at Tooele Army Depot, Utah, as an environmentally-responsible alternative to the Army's current ''open-pit, open-burn'' method of disposal

Project Title: Repair Technology Insertion Program (RepTIP)

Amount: $5.2 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Research and Development, Air Force

Address of Requesting Entity: General Atomics Inc., 16969 Mesamint Street, San Diego, CA 92127

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project would fund the development of repair

and overhaul technologies that increase productivity and reduce the cost of sustaining weapons systems in military depots, and incorporates Level II roller bearing refurbishment, heat tolerant tube fabrication, inside-diameter protective coatings to metals, heat-treat, and foundry process improvements for the 309th Maintenance Wing, Ogden Air Logistics Center, at Hill AFB, Utah

Project Title: Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost (SRSL)

Amount: $4.5 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Research and Development, Air Force

Address of Requesting Entity: Space Dynamics Laboratory, Utah State University, 1695 North Research Park Way, North Logan, Utah 84341

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project would continue previous-years' efforts in conjunction with the Air Force Research Labs to develop and demonstrate technologies for new, low-cost space systems with military utility. Current space-based reconnaissance assets are cost-prohibitive and too massive to be used in a quick-reaction tactical environment. This effort could lead to providing local field commanders a dedicated space asset for tactical actionable intelligence under the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) construct

Project Title: UAV Sensor and Maintenance Development Center

Amount: $5.5 million

Requesting Member: ROB BISHOP (UT)

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: Research and Development, Air Force

Address of Requesting Entity: Space Dynamics Laboratory, Utah State University, 1695 North Research Park Way, North Logan, Utah 84341

Matching Funds: None

Detailed Spending Plan: Not applicable

Description and Justification of Funding: Project would provide technical assistance to the Ogden Air Logistics Center at Hill AFB, Utah, in the areas of developing, calibrating, and integrating sensors and other payloads onto Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), which will facilitate future development of UAV capability within the military

JUNETEENTH

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, today, June 19th, marks the anniversary of what has become known as Juneteenth,'' the name given to emancipation day by African-Americans in Texas. On that day in 1865, Union Major-General Gordon Granger read General Orders, No. 3 to the people of Galveston. It stated:

''The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of personal rights and rights of property . . .

It was an event in the early days of the 19th century, and especially in the darkest of hours during the Civil War that turned brother against brother and cost nearly 600,000 American lives, that few would ever have believed was possible, Madam Speaker.

And yet here in America, where the words ''all men are created equal'' were formally recognized by government for the first time in history as a self-evident truth, we recognized that reducing the status of a black man to less than human simply because he was black was something that was both abominable to God, and fundamentally incompatible with the principles of human freedom on which America was built.

Abraham Lincoln realized that truth, Madam Speaker. He said this about our Founding Fathers:

''In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on, and degraded, and imbruted by its fellows. They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, were entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began—so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

Mr. Lincoln helped us decide as a nation, Madam Speaker, that regardless of what it cost, we would choose to once again recognize Imago Dei, the image of God in man, and although millions never would have believed it possible, the United States chose to abolish slavery once and for all.

Yet today, Madam Speaker, few people who remember and celebrate Juneteenth realize that freedom has not yet fully come to all in the African-American community.

Today, Madam Speaker, in the land of the free and the home of the brave; in the same nation that threw off the yoke of slavery and overturned the abomination of a Supreme Court decision that said the black man was not a person and not worthy of protection under the law; today in America, Madam Speaker, the lives of one in two black unborn children are lost before they ever see the light of day for the first time.

And though some, captive to an invincible blindness, would deny this reality, Madam Speaker, we are all witness to what has been the deadliest form of discrimination in our country's history: the systematic elimination of millions. Today, fully one-half of all black Americans conceived in this country are killed before they are born, primarily at government-funded abortion clinics placed in our inner cities.

Every day, Madam Speaker, almost 1,500 unborn black children are aborted. Black babies are aborted at between four and five times the rate of that of white babies. The daily killing of 50 percent of unborn black American children has cost the lives of close to 14 million black children. That equates to no less than a genocide against black America. It is a tragedy that beggars my ability to describe.

This Juneteenth, as we recognize a great victory for human freedom and equality, Madam Speaker, we must also recognize that the most fundamental freedom and basic civil right of all—the right to live—especially for black Americans, has never been more threatened or under attack.

But Juneteenth should also give us hope, because it shows us that nations caught up in something as tragic as slavery can rise to victory and change history.

Madam Speaker, I have a painting in my office depicting this floor and this chamber on Juneteenth, celebrating the end of slavery in America. It is a scene of pandemonium and celebration, illustrating the feeling of that day among men and women who realize something truly historic and great had happened—that an entire race of human beings had been recognized for the children of God that they were, and that America had been used to end the 7,000-year reign of the acceptance of human slavery in the world.

That picture gives me great hope, Madam Speaker, because it shows that even something as evil and entrenched in human society as was human slavery can be changed.

And Madam Speaker, because I have the privilege of living in America, I am just idealistic enough to believe that we can also rise to the occasion in this country and change history again, and end this tragic genocide called abortion on demand.

And you know the irony, Madam Speaker, is that it may be African-Americans, who were once enslaved in this country and who are now recognizing that abortion on demand is killing more of their little brothers and sisters than did slavery, who will be the ones to help lead America to place this modern day genocide behind us forever.

By the grace of God may it be so, Madam Speaker.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, I submit the following:

Requesting Member: Congressman JO BONNER

Bill Number: H.R. 2892

Account: State and Local Programs/Emergency Operations Center

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Mobile County Commission

Address of Requesting Entity: 205 Government Street, Mobile, AL 36644

Description of Request: Provide $800,000 for the initial federal share of construction of a new Emergency Operations Center in Mobile, Alabama. Mobile County is home to one of the country's ten largest ports with a new container terminal and a number of chemical manufacturing facilities. As a gulf-front county, Mobile County faces an annual risk of severe hurricanes and flood related emergencies. A new Emergency Operations Center is necessary for the all-hazards approach Mobile

County Emergency Management Agency must take in response to these diverse natural and potentially terrorist threats. Mobile County's existing Emergency Operations Center no longer has the necessary space or the appropriate equipment to meet the County's needs, given the leadership role the County has taken in regional planning and preparation for man-made and natural disasters. The County will use $200,000 of the requested funds for interoperable communications equipment; $125,000 for computer hardware/software/infrastructure; $150,000 for Incident Management Software; $150,000 for Information Management Display System; and $175,000 for Engineering Design. This project specifically furthers National Homeland Security strategic goals by facilitating an integrated federal, state and local response to disasters of all types. The City of Mobile and the County of Mobile will provide a 25% local cost-share.

HONORING 11TH DISTRICT BASEBALL STANDOUTS

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize two exceptional high school athletes from Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have distinguished themselves among our nation's top amateur baseball players. With the third pick in the 2009 Major League Baseball Amateur Draft, the San Diego Padres selected Cartersville High School outfielder Donavan Tate, and three picks later, another Northwest Georgian, East Paulding County High School pitcher Zack Wheeler was selected by the San Francisco Giants with the sixth pick overall.

Donavan Tate made quite a name for himself in high school while leading his Purple Hurricanes to back to back state baseball championships. In his senior season, he batted .474 with nine home runs and 42 RBIs.

Zack Wheeler was also dominant in high school, striking out 149 batters in 76 innings this season and finishing with an unblemished 9–0 record and a 0.54 ERA—including a no-hitter in the state playoffs. Zack's fastball hovers in the high 90s so it is no surprise that the Giants used their first pick to bring this young right hander to their organization.

As an avid baseball fan, it is truly an honor to have two of the top six draft picks for 2009 call Georgia's 11th Congressional District home. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the talent and hard work of these two athletes and wishing them the best of luck as they start this new chapter of their lives.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. STEVE BUYER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the House Republican standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I received as part of H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

Requesting Member: Congressman Steve Buyer

Bill Number: H.R. 2647

Account: DoD RDT&E, Technology Transfer

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Technology Service Corporation

Address of Requesting Entity: 116 West Sixth St., Suite 200, Bloomington, IN 47404

Description of Request: Provide an earmark of $3,000,000 to continue support of the National Radio Frequency Research, Development, and Technology Transfer Center, which provides an efficient method of transitioning new technologies into DoD programs of record to provide for performance improvements at lower cost for the war fighter.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS

SPEECH OF

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2009

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a group of truly exceptional women who live in my Congressional District and whose service to our country was honored today by the passage of a bill awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Air Service Pilots of World War II.

Inspired by the attacks on Pearl Harbor, Margot DeMoss (Riverside, CA), Mary Ann Roberta Dreher (San Clemente, CA) and Jane Fohl (San Clemente, CA) answered our Nation's call to duty by joining the Women Air Service Pilots of World War II, also known as the WASP.

Created on August 5, 1943, the WASP was charged with the critical task of delivering battle-ready planes from the factory line to military bases around the world. After just 16 months, the WASP had established itself as a premier ferrying squadron. Of the more than 25,000 women that applied for training, only 1,879 were accepted to participate in the rigorous program that would eventually produce 1,074 outstanding female pilots.

The WASP founder, world famous aviator Jacqueline Cochran, challenged the status quo by asking for permission to commission WASP directly as Service Pilots, a procedure used routinely with male pilots but prohibited for women. She lobbied passionately, but eventually lost her battle both with the Comptroller General of the Army Air Force and in the halls of Congress, leading to the WASPs disbanding in 1944.

I believe that these women pioneers deserve to be acknowledged not just for their remarkable bravery and sacrifice, but for reminding us all that an uncompromising commitment to America—to its values, ideals and traditions—is a unifying force. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2014, Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN's bill, awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Air Service Pilots of World War II, and I am pleased that the women of WASP will finally receive the recognition they so rightfully deserve.

HONORING TERRY BRADLEY

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Terry Bradley upon his retirement as the Superintendent of the Clovis Unified School District. Superintendent Bradley will be honored by the Clovis Unified School District at a reception to be held Thursday, June 18, 2009.

Superintendant Bradley has been in education for forty-three years. Prior to moving to the Central Valley, he was a teacher and school business administrator for ten years. In 1986, while working for Clovis Unified School District as the chief business official, he received his doctorate degree in school management from the University of LeVerne. Dr. Bradley served as the chief business official for twenty-six years, and then was appointed to the Superintendent position on July 1, 2002.

Dr. Bradley has been a visiting professor at the University of Southern California, the University of San Francisco and California State University, Fresno. He has held leadership positions in several professional organizations, including the Association of School Business Officials, the California Association of School Business Officials, and the Association of California School Administrators (past chairman). He is a past chairman, and currently serves, on the Board of Directors for both Californians for Schools and the Coalition of Adequate Student Housing. Dr. Bradley is also active in the California Association of School Business Officials' mentoring program, where he helps to develop leadership and professional skills in future school business officers.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Terry Bradley upon his retirement from Clovis Unified School District. I invite my colleagues to join me in wishing Superintendent Bradley many years of continued success.

IN HONOR OF FRANKLIN D. MELLOTT, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Commander Franklin D. Mellott, United States Navy, upon his retirement after twenty three years of service to the United States Navy and to the Nation.

Commander Mellott has served the United States Navy with distinguished service over his exceptional career. His devotion to the Navy and the Nation is inspiring.

My initial experience with Commander Mellott began when his service commenced in 2006 as Executive Officer for Naval Air Station Lemoore, which is located in my 20th Congressional District in Kings County, California. I met with Commander Mellott at the base to introduce myself and my staff and from that day on, a great working relationship was formed. Commander Mellott served as Committee Chair for my 20th District Academy

Committee. During this time, he devoted countless extra hours to coordinating the committee and assisting my office with academy nominations. Whether we were calling Frank to ask a question or to follow up on issues my office was working on with the base, Frank was always professional, courteous and helpful. His volunteer service to my office will always be remembered.

It is so fitting that the President of the United States has presented Commander Franklin Mellott with the Meritorious Service Medal for his outstanding leadership as Executive Officer of NASL. I ask that excerpts from the Citation be printed.

''For outstanding meritorious service as Executive Officer, Naval Air Station Lemoore, California, from June 2006 to June 2009. Commander Mellott displayed extraordinary leadership and exceptional insight in supporting half the fleet's tactical air combat power at the Navy's largest and busiest master jet base. Brilliantly assisting the Commanding Officer in every facet of business and operations, he provided superior support to Commander Strike Fighter Wing Pacific, four operational air wings, 16 squadrons, and a work force of more than 10,000 military and civilian personnel through mishap-free control of more than 700,000 operational and training sorties. Under his leadership, the installation opened more than 2,500 cubic miles of new training airspace to the fleet, the largest new training airspace the Navy has developed in more than 25 years, completed several large military construction projects valued at over $150 million, provided support to 16 helicopters fighting wild fires in Northern California, and provided award winning services to a community of more than 25,000 constituents. Additionally, he helped orchestrate and align Navy efforts to preserve the strategic value of Naval Air Station Lemoore in the future with an exceptionally diplomatic strategy to influence current land-use decisions by local governments and to develop productive forums for perpetual engagement. Singularly responsible for good order and discipline aboard the installation, he balanced justice with mercy in the effective handling of countless delicate and emergent law enforcement and operational matters during his tour. His actions culminate a 23 year career of distinguished service to the Navy and the Nation. Commander Mellott's decisive, principled, and visionary leadership and inspiring devotion to duty reflected great credit upon him and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.''

Commander Mellott has always been available to myself and my staff and we are sad to say goodbye. He is a man of outstanding character and we will remain grateful for his unwavering dedication and exceptional insight.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I wish to express my sincere thanks for his hard work, selfless service, and dedication to the United States Navy.

I want to personally wish Frank continued success and my best wishes go out to his wife, Sheri, and his children; sons, Alex and Nathaniel and daughter, Francesca as they embark on their new endeavors in Pennsylvania.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2009

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes:

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2847, the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill. The bill provides $18.2 billion, $421 million above FY 2009 levels, for NASA, an agency which is critical to our nation's economy, competitiveness, and environment. It provides protection for the most important reason for NASA's historic and ongoing success: its workers. This bill extends a ban on involuntary layoffs until at least September, 2010, a provision for which I organized support among several Members of the Ohio delegation.

In Ohio, NASA Glenn is an economic anchor and a source of well paying jobs. In FY 07, the year for which we have the most recent data, the economic output of NASA Glenn alone in Ohio was $1.2 billion per year. It was responsible for over 8,000 jobs, and household earnings amounted to $402 million. NASA Glenn's expertise in renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies will be critical to Ohio's new green economy.

While the bill provided significantly less than the needed funding for space exploration, the administration is expected to submit a supplemental request for NASA exploration funds when president Obama's blue ribbon panel designed to review U.S. human space flight activities is complete.

The bill also contains a 13 percent increase in funding for the Legal Services Corporation. The American legal system is increasingly inaccessible for low and moderate income citizens. The costs and specialized knowledge associated with pursuing justice have left thousands on the outside looking in, unable to obtain even an opportunity to tell their side of the story. LSC provides funding to organizations that provide free and low-cost legal assistance to individuals and families who otherwise would not have the resources to pursue justice. I also commend the Committee for including language that begins to undo some of the restrictions that have been placed on LSC grantees in previous appropriations bills. This will allow LSC grantees to serve more clients and maximize their resources.

I am proud, therefore, to support this bill.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN ROBERT A. SHAFER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 2009

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual from my Congressional District who has dedicated his life to defending the people of this country and preserving the basic freedoms and liberties that we hold dear. Commanding Officer Captain Robert A. Shafer of the United States Navy is a true American hero and today I thank him for his 28 years of naval service. On Monday, January 22, 2009, Captain Shafer will be honored at his retirement and Change of Command Ceremony at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Corona, California.

Captain Robert A. Shafer graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1981. He was commissioned an Ensign and immediately began training as a Surface Warfare Officer in Coronado, California.

During his career, Captain Shafer's assignments included Combat Information Center Officer aboard the USS *O'Brien* (DD–975); Weapons Officer and Combat Systems Officer aboard the USS *Antietam* (CG–54); Executive Officer of the USS *San Jacinto* (CG–56); and Commanding Officer of the USS *Vincennes* (CG–49). Captain Shafer also completed seven deployments, primarily to the Western Pacific, Indian Ocean and the Arabian Gulf during this time.

Following his Division Officer tour, Captain Shafer attended the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. There he earned a Master of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering and completed the requirements for a Weapons Systems Engineering subspecialty. Additionally, he is a graduate of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College as well as the Naval War College.

Subsequent shore tours include duty as Executive Assistant and Instructor in the Department of Weapons and Systems Engineering, United States Naval Academy; and as Fleet Liaison for the Technical Director, Aegis Combat Systems.

His previous shore tour included assignment as Chief Staff Officer for PEO Theater Surface Combatants, Aegis Combat Systems Engineer, Director, Battle Force Systems Engineering, and duties as Military Deputy for the Director of Integrated Combat Systems for PEO Integrated Warfare Systems.

Captain Shafer's awards include the Meritorious Service medal with 3 Gold Stars, the Navy Commendation Medal with Gold Star, and the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal with 3 Gold Stars, as well as various unit and campaign ribbons which include five Battle ''E'' awards.

Captain Shafer will retire from naval service with more than just his experience, decorated career and remarkable accomplishments; his enduring legacy will serve as a shining example and constant reminder of what it means to be an American.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6829–S6860

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1306–1312, and S. Res. 193–198. **Pages S6845–46**

Measures Passed:

Congratulating the Pittsburgh Penguins: Senate agreed to S. Res. 194, congratulating the Pittsburgh Penguins on winning the 2009 Stanley Cup Championship. **Pages S6832–33**

Miami Dade College Land Conveyance Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 814, to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of land held by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, to facilitate the construction of a new educational facility that includes a secure parking area for the Bureau of Prisons, and the bill was then passed. **Page S6854**

Recognizing the Democratic Accomplishments of the People of Albania: Senate agreed to S. Res. 182, recognizing the democratic accomplishments of the people of Albania and expressing the hope that the parliamentary elections on June 28, 2009, maintain and improve the transparency and fairness of democracy in Albania. **Page S6854**

Expressing Support for Iranian Citizens: Senate agreed to S. Res. 193, expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law. **Pages S6854–55**

Expressing the Sense of the Senate on Freedom in Iran: Senate agreed to S. Res. 196, expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran. **Page S6855**

National Archives and Records Administration's 75th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 197, congratulating the men and women of the National Archives and Records Administration on occasion of its 75th anniversary. **Pages S6855–56**

Observing Juneteenth Independence Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 198, observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day. **Pages S6856–57**

Measures Considered:

Travel Promotion Act—Cloture Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S6839–40**

Pending:

Reid (for Dorgan/Rockefeller) Amendment No. 1347, of a perfecting nature. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1348 (to Amendment No. 1347), to change the enactment date. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1349 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1347), to change the enactment date. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1350 (to Amendment No. 1349), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6840**

Reid Motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with instructions. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1351 (to the instructions on the motion to recommit), to change the enactment date. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1352 (to Amendment No. 1351), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6840**

Reid Amendment No. 1353 (to Amendment No. 1352), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6840**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, June 23, 2009. **Page S6840**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Reid (for Dorgan/Rockefeller) Amendment No. 1347, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday, June 19, 2009, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 22, 2009 **Page S6857**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the bill at approximately 3:00 p.m., on Monday, June 22, 2009, and that the time from 4:30 p.m. until 5:30 p.m., be equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees; provided that at 5:30 p.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Dorgan/Rockefeller) Amendment No. 1347 (listed above); provided further, the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be 3:30 p.m., on Monday, June 22, 2009. **Page S6857**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Howard K. Koh, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Coordinator for Threat Reduction Programs.

Rand Beers, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

Catherine Radford Zoi, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy, Efficiency, and Renewable Energy).

William F. Brinkman, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy.

Anne Castle, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Laurie I. Mikva, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2010.

Eric P. Goosby, of California, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally.

Martha J. Kanter, of California, to be Under Secretary of Education.

Herbert M. Allison, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Eric P. Schwartz, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

Andrew J. Shapiro, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs).

Jane Oates, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Jeffrey D. Zients, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

Zachary J. Lemnios, of Massachusetts, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Inez Moore Tenenbaum, of South Carolina, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Inez Moore Tenenbaum, of South Carolina, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2006.

74 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

24 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

41 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, and Navy.

Pages S6840–44, S6857–60

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Joseph A. Greenaway, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Beverly Baldwin Martin, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Craig E. Hooks, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mark Henry Gitenstein, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania. **Page S6857**

Messages from the House: **Page S6845**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6845**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S6846**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6846–51**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6844–45**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6851–53**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6853–54**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 3:40 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 22, 2009. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6857.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Kathy J. Greenlee, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Aging, and Kathleen Martinez, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Disability.

Also, committee continued consideration of Affordable Health Choices Act, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Monday, June 22, 2009.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 2960–2987; 1 private bill, H.R. 2988; and 7 resolutions, H. Res. 565–571 were introduced. **Pages H7083–85**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7085–87**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 477, directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–167);

H. Res. 478, directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–168);

H.R. 2510, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to reimburse States for the costs incurred in establishing a program to track and confirm the receipt of voted absentee ballots in elections for Federal office and make information on the receipt of such ballots available by means of online access (H. Rept. 111–169);

H.R. 2728, to provide financial support for the operation of the law library of the Library of Congress, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–170);

H.R. 1016, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide advance appropriations authority for certain medical care accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, with amendments (H. Rept. 111–171);

H.R. 1345, to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the "Hatch Act" (H. Rept. 111–172); and

H.R. 1752, to provide that the usual day of paying salaries in or under the House of Representatives may be established by regulations of the Committee on House Administration, with amendments (H. Rept. 111–173); **Page H7083**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Weiner to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H7025**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H7025**

Consideration of Suspension: Agreed by unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the rules and adopt H. Res. 560. **Page H7033**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measure:

Expressing support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law: H. Res. 560, to express support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 405 yeas to 1 nay with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 411. **Pages H7034–39, H7040–41**

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010: The House passed H.R. 2918, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 413. **Pages H7027–33, H7039–40, H7041–53**

Agreed to the Kingston motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with amendments by a yea-and-nay vote of 374 yeas to 34 nays, Roll No. 412. Subsequently, Representative Wasserman Schultz reported the bill back to the House with an amendment and the amendment was agreed to by voice vote. **Pages H7051–53**

Agreed to:

McCarthy (NY) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 111–161) that requires $250,000 of the funds appropriated to the Library of Congress be allocated for the Civil Rights Oral History Project. **Pages H7050–51**

H. Res. 559, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 410, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 409. **Pages H7039–40**

Call of the House: The Speaker called the House to order and ascertained the presence of a quorum (395 present, Roll No. 414). **Page H7054**

Impeaching Samuel B. Kent, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas: The House agreed to H. Res. 520, impeaching Samuel B. Kent, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, for high crimes and misdemeanors. **Pages H7053–67**

The House agreed to Article I of the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 389 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 415. **Pages H7064–65**

The House agreed to Article II of the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 385 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 416. **Pages H7065–66**

The House agreed to Article III of the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 381 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 417. **Page H7066**

The House agreed to Article IV of the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 372 ayes with none voting "no" and 1 voting "present", Roll No. 418. **Pages H7066–67**

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Res. 565, appointing and authorizing managers for the impeachment of Samuel B. Kent, a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas. **Page H7067**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 23rd for morning hour debate. **Page H7071**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H7075.

Senate Referrals: S. Con. Res. 23 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and S. 814 was held at the desk. **Pages H7075, H7082**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7039–40, H7040, H7040–41, H7052, H7053, H7054, H7064–65, H7065, H7066 and H7066–67. One quorum call (Roll No. 414) developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H7054.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TRANSPORTATION, HUD, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies approved for full Committee the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies appropriations for FY 2010.

ECONOMIC CASE FOR HEALTH REFORM

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on The Economic Case for Health Reform. Testimony was heard from Christina Romer, Chair, Council of Economic Advisers.

ECONOMIC DISASTER AREA ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing entitled "The Economic Disaster Area Act of 2009." Testimony was heard from Representatives Cardoza and Costa; Tommy Jones, Mayor, City of Los Banos, California; and Bill Johnson, Director, Department of Economic and Community Affairs, State of Alabama.

COMBATING ARMS TRAFFICKING TO MEXICO

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere held a hearing on U.S. Efforts to Combat Arms Trafficking to Mexico: Report from the Government Accountability Office. Testimony was heard from Jess T. Ford, Director, International Affairs and Trade Team, GAO.

CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM ACT OF 2009

Committee on Homeland Security: Continued markup of H.R. 2868, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2009.

Will continue June 23.

COAST GUARD CIVIL RIGHTS/DIVERSITY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on a Continuing Examination of Civil Rights Services and Diversity in the Coast Guard. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security: VADM Clifford I. Pearson, USCG, Chief of Staff; and Terri A. Dickerson, Director, Office of Civil Rights; and CAPT. Stephen B. Latta, USN, (Ret.), Dean of Admissions, U.S. Naval Academy.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 22 through June 27, 2009

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 3:00 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 1023, Travel Promotion Act, and after a period of debate, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Dorgan/Rockefeller) Amendment No. 1347 at 5:30 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: June 23, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark up proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2010 for the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: June 23, Subcommittee on Personnel, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 9:30 a.m., SR–232A.

June 23, Subcommittee on Airland, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 11 a.m., SR–222.

June 23, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 2 p.m., SR–222.

June 23, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 3:30 p.m., SR–232A.

June 23, Subcommittee on SeaPower, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 5:30 p.m., SR–222.

June 24, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 9:30 a.m., SR–232A.

June 24, Full Committee, closed business meeting to mark up the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

June 25, Full Committee, closed business meeting to mark up the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

June 26, Full Committee, closed business meeting to mark up the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 22, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine over-the-counter derivatives, focusing on modernizing oversight to increase transparency and reduce risks, 3 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 23, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine, to hold hearings to examine high-speed passenger rail, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 24, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Colin Scott Cole Fulton, of Maryland, and Paul T. Anastas, of Connecticut, both to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–406.

June 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine impacts of highway trust fund insolvency, 10 a.m., SD–406.

June 25, Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife, to hold hearings to examine the impacts of mountaintop removal coal mining on water quality in Appalachia, 3:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 23, Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine drug trafficking in West Africa, 10 a.m., SD–419.

June 24, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Capricia Penavic Marshall, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service, Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

June 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Maria Otero, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Democracy and Global Affairs, 11 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 22, business meeting to continue consideration of Affordable Health Choices Act, subcommittee assignments, and any pending nominations, 3 p.m., SR–325.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 24, to hold hearings to examine type 1 diabetes research progress, 9 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 25, to hold hearings to examine S. 797, to amend the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act, the Indian Tribal Justice Act, the Indian Tribal Justice Technical and Legal Assistance Act of 2000, and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve the prosecution of, and response to, crimes in Indian country, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 24, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of A. Thomas McLellan, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Director of National Drug Control Policy, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, of California, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, and Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

June 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine ''The Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act.'', 10 a.m., SD–226.

June 25, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 417, to enact a safe, fair, and responsible state secrets privilege Act, S. 257, to amend title 11, United States Code, to disallow certain claims resulting from high cost credit debts, H.R. 985 and S. 448, bills to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media, and S. 396, for the relief of Marcos Antonio Sanchez-Diaz, 12 noon, SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: June 24, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs quality management activities, 9:30 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 23, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., S–407, Capitol.

Special Committee on Aging: June 24, to hold hearings to examine emergency preparedness, aging and special needs, 10:30 a.m., SD–562.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: June 25, to hold hearings to examine predatory lending and reverse redlining, 10 a.m., Room to be announced.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: June 23, to hold hearings to examine religious liberty, media freedom, and the rule of law in Russia, 10 a.m., SVC–203/202.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, June 24 and 25, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearings to review implementation of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, June 23, to mark up the following appropriations for fiscal year 2010: State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs; and Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies, 4 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, to mark up appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for Energy and Water Development, 9 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to mark up appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for Financial Services and General Government, 2 p.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, June 25, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Raising Thinking from the Tactical to the Operational Level: and II at the Services' and Joint Command and Staff Colleges, 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, June 23, hearing on Statutory PAYGO, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, June 23, hearing on The Tri-Committee Draft Proposal for Health Care Reform, 12 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

June 24, full Committee, to mark up the 401(k) Fair Disclosure and Pension Security Act of 2009, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 23, 24 and 25, Subcommittee on Health, hearings on draft health reform legislation, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 24, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, and the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, joint hearing on U.S.-Africa Trade Relations: Creating a Platform for Economic Growth, 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 24, hearing entitled "Regulatory Restructuring: Enhancing Consumer Financial Products Regulation," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 24, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled " Maintaining the Federal Reserve's Role and Independence in Monetary Policy," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 25, full Committee, hearing entitled "Legislative Options for Preserving Federally-and State-Assisted Affordable Housing and Preventing Displacement of Low-Income, Elderly and Disabled Tenants," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Improving Consumer Financial Literacy under the New Regulatory System," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 24, hearing on the July Summit and Beyond: Prospects for U.S.-Russia Nuclear Arms Reduction, 10 a..m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, hearing on Somalia: Prospects for Lasting Peace and a Unified Response to Extremism and Terrorism, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Asia, The Pacific and the Global Environment, hearing on Japan's Changing Role, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia, hearing on A Regional Overview of South Asia, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 23, to continue markup of H.R. 2868, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2009, 5:30 p.m., Cannon.

June 24, Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, hearing entitled "FY2010 Budget for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 24, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 537, Requesting that the President and directing that the Attorney General transmit to the House of Representative all information in their possession relating to specific communications regarding detainees and foreign persons suspected of terrorism; H.R. 1478, Carmelo Rodriguez Military Medical Accountability Act of 2009; H.R. 1843, John Hope Franklin Tulsa-Greenwood Race Riot Claims Accountability Act of 2009; and H.R. 984, State Secret Protection Act of 2009, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on Accountability, Transparency, and Uniformity in Corporate Deferred and Non-Prosecution Agreements, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, June 24, hearing on H.R. 2499, Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 25, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2708, Indian Health Care Improvement Act Amendments of 2009, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, June 23, oversight hearing entitled "The Future of the V–22 Osprey: Costs, Capabilities, and Challenges," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 24, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, hearing entitled "FEHBP's Prescription Drug Benefits: Deal or No Deal?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 25, full Committee and the Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, to continue joint hearings entitled "Bank of America and Merrill Lynch: How Did a Private

Deal Turn Into a Federal Bailout?, Part II ," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Information, Policy, Census and National Archives, hearing entitled "Census Data and Its Use in Federal Formula Funding," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, June 23, to consider the following bills: H.R. 2892, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010; and H.R. 2647, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, June 24, to mark up the following bills: H..R. 2965, Enhancing Small Business Research and Innovation Act of 2009; H.R. 2729, To authorize the designation of National Environmental Research Parks by the Secretary of Energy, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1622, To provide for a program of research, development, and demonstration on natural gas vehicles, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing on The Science of Security: Lessons Learned in Developing, Testing and Operating Advanced Radiation Monitors, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 25, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on Assessing Cybersecurity Activities at NIST and DHS, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, June 24, hearing entitled "Health IT Adoption and the New Challenges Faced by Solo and Small Group Healthcare Practices," 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 24, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, to mark up the Surface Transportation Authorization Act of 2009, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 25, full Committee, hearing on Recovery Act: 120-Day Progress Report for Transportation Programs, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 24, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2379, Veterans/Group Life Insurance Improvement Act of 2009; H.R. 2713, Disabled Veterans Life Insurance Enhancement Act; and H.R. 2774, Families of Veterans Financial Security Act, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 24, to continue hearing on Health Reform in the 21st Century: Proposals to Reform the Health System, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

June 25, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, joint hearing on Highway and Transit Investment Needs, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

June 25, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on Trade Advisory Committee System, 1:30 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, June 25, executive, briefing on Iran, 3 p.m., 304 HVC.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will resume consideration of S. 1023, Travel Promotion Act, and after a period of debate, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Dorgan/Rockefeller) Amendment No. 1347, of a perfecting nature, at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 23

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E1503
Barrett, J. Gresham, S.C., E1503
Bishop, Rob, Utah, E1513
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1513
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1506, E1507, E1509, E1512, E1514
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1508
Buyer, Steve, Ind., E1515
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1515, E1516
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1507, E1515
Ellison, Kieth, Minn., E1512
Etheridge, Bob, N.C., E1511
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E1512, E1514
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1504
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1515
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1504
Heller, Dean, Nev., E1512
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1504
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1509
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E1512
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1506
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E1506
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1505, E1505, E1507, E1516
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E1509
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E1505
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1505
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E1510
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E1506
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E1513
Mica, John L., Fla., E1511
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E1505
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1503
Moran, James P., Va., E1508
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1508
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1503
Putnam, Adam H., Fla., E1510
Radanovich, George, Calif., E1511, E1515
Reichert, David G., Wash., E1509
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1512
Schmidt, Jean, Ohio, E1513
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E1505
Sires, Albio, N.J., E1505

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.