



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 21, 2009

No. 110

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 21, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN T. SALAZAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

CALIFORNIA'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT'S PERSPECTIVE ON HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, last night I had a telephone town hall with constituents in my district. As I made the call, I informed them that we were going to discuss any subject they wanted, but I wanted to concentrate on health care. As a result, I had one of the largest responses I ever had. Thousands of people

got on the line. Most times, there were no less than 1,400 people on the line. I didn't choose them by party. I didn't choose them by income. I didn't choose them by occupation. It was random, calling people in my district.

The response was overwhelming, overwhelmingly negative with respect to the plans they hear about that are coming from the White House, the Senate and the House. Why were they negative? They were negative because the people in my district were concerned about whether or not the government was going to dominate health care in this country, and those who were satisfied with their plans—even though they had some imperfections, even though they had some desire to have them improved, but by and large had made choices with respect to their plans—wondered whether their freedom of choice would be taken away by the government plan presented by the President and by the leadership in both the Senate and the House. It was interesting, they also were very concerned about the cost. When they hear the word \$1 trillion, they begin to think that this particular plan has real problems. As we discussed the various aspects of it, they referred me to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office's report that disappointed the White House and the Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate because the report suggested that this program cannot pay for itself, that we're talking about at least \$1 trillion to be imposed on the American people.

The dialogue that I had with my constituents was very lively. They were also concerned about the fact that we have Medicare and Medicaid—as we call it in California, Medi-Cal—that is on an unsustainable path to bankruptcy. This has been pointed out by the director of CBO as well as many others outside the halls of Congress and outside the Federal Government. So the American people are trying to

tell us that they are concerned that we have an unsustainable program already that we have not faced up to; and on top of that, we're going to impose this new national health plan. It was interesting because the President and the Democratic leadership have said that, look, the public option is just that. It's not going to destroy the private sector. Yet constituents in my district were very, very clear as to their understanding of the necessary impact of this program. They also were concerned about the promises made in this plan. I guess you could sum it up in these words: First entitlement and then rationing. When government takes over a program like medical care, and when it promises everything, and when you see the track record with respect to Medicare and Medicaid, you understand that at some point in time, we're going to hit the fiscal wall, and government's only ability to control cost at that point in time—if you look historically at other government-centered health programs around the world—is through rationing.

You can look at it in Canada. You can look at it in Great Britain. You can look at it in every country around the world. And frankly, I do not want—and my constituents told me last night they do not want the imposition of a government bureaucrat between them, as patients, and their doctors.

Interestingly, last night in one of our committees marking up that case, that question was posed: Could we say in the plan that there would not be the intervention of a government bureaucrat to dictate to your doctor as to what your health care should be? That specific amendment was voted down almost on a party-line vote. Every Democrat on the committee, save one, voted against that prohibition; and every Republican voted for it. In other words, it

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8411

was crystal clear. The amendment presented last night before that committee was: In this plan, can we at least promise the American people there will not be intervention by a Federal bureaucrat to dictate the care you will receive or not receive from your doctor? That specific public policy prohibition was voted down.

If you believe that health care delivered by the Federal Government is superior to what you get now, go to your local DMV and see if you'd like them making the decision with respect to your medical care.

PAYGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this week the House will debate legislation and give the principle of pay-as-you-go, or PAYGO, the force of law. Quite simply, supporting PAYGO means that we agree to pay for what we buy; and it can be one of the most important actions we take for fiscal discipline in this Congress. PAYGO is essential because America faces unprecedented debt and a fiscal year 2009 deficit of \$1.7 trillion. A New York Times analysis found that 90 percent of that deficit is attributable to the economic downturn, Bush administration policies, and the extension of those policies. However we got into this hole, it's imperative that we find a way out of it. PAYGO is not a cure-all, not a solution entirely to our deficits. But it is an important and valuable start, and it is a proven first step to deficit reduction.

In the 1990s, the Clinton administration turned record deficits, accumulated by the two previous Republican administrations, into record surplus; and the PAYGO rule, supported on a bipartisan basis by Republicans and Democrats, was a key part in that fiscal transformation. As President Obama has recognized, and I quote, "It is no coincidence that this rule was in place when we moved to record surpluses in the 1990s and that when this rule was abandoned, we returned to record deficits that doubled the national debt."

Today we can once again use PAYGO to begin rolling back the dangerous fiscal situation that confronts us. Under statutory PAYGO, Congress will be required to find savings to balance the dollars we spend. On the one hand, it will constrain unnecessary spending and subsidies. On the other, it will force those in favor of tax cuts to explain exactly what they want to go without in return. In other words, pay for them. Of course none of those choices are easy, but it is exactly the avoidance of hard choices that saddles our children and grandchildren with the debt that confronts us. In addition, deficit reduction will mean fewer interest payments on our debt which, in

turn, will help us make sustainable entitlements in the priorities that matter most to the American people, including education, clean energy and health care.

The PAYGO law would apply to new policies that reduce revenue or expand entitlement spending. It will exempt extensions of current policy on the alternative minimum tax, the estate tax and middle-income tax cuts passed in 2001 and 2003 and Medicare payments to doctors. Some would criticize these exemptions, but I see them as an important way of keeping PAYGO credible and enforceable. It is clear that there is bipartisan support in Congress for extending those policies without offsets. Now, very frankly, I would vote for offsets; but we have seen that that does not happen in the United States Senate; and there is an inclination not to do it here. A PAYGO bill that does not exempt them would have to be waived again and again, turning the cause of fiscal discipline into an empty promise.

I find it much more sensible to make a fiscal discipline promise we can keep. I would also note that the exemptions in the House legislation are narrower than those sent to us in the President's original proposal. Most notably, they only apply to the middle-class tax cuts passed in 2001 and 2003 and not to tax cuts generally.

Mr. Speaker, pay as you go cannot remove us from our deficit hole in a single stroke, nor will it. That will take much hard work. PAYGO is not enough in and of itself, but it is absolutely necessary because it keeps us from digging the hole any deeper. It is tested and proven. We adopted this policy in a bipartisan way in 1990. We reaffirmed that policy in a bipartisan vote in 1997, with Speaker Gingrich and President Clinton reaching agreement on that proposition. Yes, it's tested and proven, as I said. I hope that all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, will support it when it comes to the House floor later this week.

RUSHING INTO A HEALTH CARE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I don't have the time to respond to the majority leader's comments about PAYGO. But I would just simply say that the Democrats passed a PAYGO policy when they first took over, and we're getting deeper and deeper into debt. If that's what PAYGO does, then woe be unto us if we sign on to it.

The President, the Speaker and the majority leader are all in a rush to pass legislation here. So much in a rush, they will not even give Members a chance to read the bills. Why is that? It's perhaps because they don't want people to know what's in the bills. But the American people want to get

health reform right, not just fast. Artificial deadlines for passing legislation serve a political purpose, not a legitimate purpose. I have promised that I will not vote for any health care legislation that is not publicly available in its final form for at least 72 hours in advance of a vote. Every Member of Congress should have time to read the health care bill they are asked to vote on, and the American people should be given this same common courtesy. Let's give them significant time to fully understand the details of a health care proposal rather than steamrolling partisan legislation through Congress. We should make August a national health care awareness month so that Americans can let their Member of Congress know where they stand before voting because we already know of many problems in the proposals that are being put forward. Number one, the bill contains zero savings from eliminating or even reducing waste, fraud and abuse. In an attempt to correct this egregious lack of oversight, Ways and Means Republicans offered six amendments during the committee's markup to reduce wasteful spending. All of them were rejected by the Democrats.

We know that the House Democrats' health care plan will increase Federal spending significantly, that coming directly from the CBO, appointed by the Democrats. We know that it's going to raise taxes on small businesses through surtax increases. Of taxpayers who file in the top brackets, more than half of them are small businesses. The Democrat plan, according to a study by the Tax Foundation, would raise the top tax rate in 39 States to more than 50 percent.

□ 1045

Significantly, it includes fines of up to \$500,000 on employers who make an honest mistake thinking they had provided what the government deemed "sufficient" coverage. It will impose an 8 percent payroll tax on employers who can't afford to offer health insurance to their employees, and on employers who do the right thing and offer health coverage to their employees but it is deemed insufficient by the government, and employers who are not paying at least 72.5 percent of an employee's premium or 65 percent for family coverage.

What they plan to do is take over more aspects of our life. Every piece of legislation that is passing out of this House this session is aimed at putting the government more in control of our lives and giving us less freedom. The health care bill is the worst of those. Cap-and-tax was horrible; this is even more horrible.

We must not rush into passing health care legislation. We must slow down and get things right. The American people are hurting. We know they are hurting. Unemployment is going up dramatically under this Congress and under this President, and we need to be

dealing with what we can do to create jobs and help individual families, not make things worse by killing more jobs and raising taxes. That's what PAYGO does. It is hard to make cuts in spending, easy to raise taxes, and that's what they plan to do. We shouldn't let them fool the American people again. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. We have got to stop letting the Democrats do these things, rushing bills through, hiding things in obscure language, and taxing us into high unemployment in this country.

RESTORE STATUTORY PAYGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the co-chairman of the Blue Dog Coalition which has long advocated for restoring statutory PAYGO as an important budgetary tool necessary to impose discipline in both chambers of Congress as it regards the collection and use of taxpayer money. I would like to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for his strong, steadfast, and unquestioned support for statutory PAYGO and for his words earlier this morning in support of this important legislation.

As I stated and as the majority leader has, this is an important budget tool to impose discipline. It is a tested and proven tool from the 1990s that again, as has been mentioned, President Clinton and former Speaker Newt Gingrich agreed to back in the 1990s. I think it is imperative that opponents of this legislation explain more clearly why they lived with PAYGO with little or no complaint in the last decade, and the surpluses aided by such disciplines, and why they abandoned such discipline which led to a doubling of the national debt over the last 8 years.

We need to make priorities and tough decisions so as to ensure fairness to future generations. It is essential to adopt statutory PAYGO as one step, among many others, to ensure both economic and national security. It is not fair to future generations for the United States to in any way be beholden to foreign creditors. The interest on the national debt alone is more than we spend on education and veterans combined.

Statutory PAYGO is necessary to impose discipline in both Chambers. One of the earlier speakers mentioned that since adopting PAYGO in the House rules, that the deficits have worsened. Unfortunately, much of the legislation passed out of this Chamber that abides by House rules for PAYGO come back to this Chamber after action in the Senate that strips how we pay for our priorities. That's why again reinstating PAYGO as a budgetary tool in statute is necessary for both the House and the Senate, and fortunately is supported by the current administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ask the hard questions about what worked in the 1990s to produce budget surpluses, about what didn't work over the past 8 years to result in a national debt, a record national debt, and what tools are necessary to get us back on the path of fiscal discipline and surpluses once again. Statutory PAYGO is one key, one tool, among others, that will lead to the kind of tough decisions and priorities necessary to restore the fiscal health of the country.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today at a time of a great moment in the life of this country. The American people are hurting. We are facing in this country the worst recession in a quarter century. We have lost 2 million jobs since this Congress and this administration enacted a stimulus bill. The unemployment rate at the time we passed the stimulus bill was 7.5 percent. We were told that we had to spend that nearly \$800 billion, borrowed from future generations of Americans, so the unemployment rate wouldn't go over 8 percent. It is now 9.5 percent and rising.

We saw this Democratic majority pass a budget that will double the national debt in 5 years and triple it in 10, and that's if the economy starts to grow again, which sadly, few economists believe it will in the near future.

Now this summer we saw this majority, in the name of global warming, pass a national energy tax that will essentially raise the cost of energy for businesses and individuals by thousands of dollars per year.

And now comes health care reform, a government takeover of health care in this country financed with nearly a trillion dollars in tax increases. Yet my colleagues, many of whom I deeply respect, come to the floor this week to talk about something called PAYGO, fiscal discipline. Well, the truth is that in this majority and this administration, PAYGO means you pay and they go on spending.

The truth is we have got to come to terms with these difficult times. We have got to begin to demonstrate the priorities that businesses and family farms and working families are demonstrating at this time of national challenge and economic recession. Families and businesses are sitting down and prioritizing what should come first.

We ought to have national energy legislation to set us on a pathway toward energy independence. We ought to have health care reform that brings real competition into our economy and lowers the cost for consumers. But the first thing we ought to be doing is coming together and creating jobs.

We know how to create jobs. John F. Kennedy knew it, Ronald Reagan knew

it, George W. Bush knew it when the towers fell: fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C., and tax relief for working families, small businesses, and family farms.

The last thing we need right now is one more massive tax increase, one more government takeover of one more American industry. What we need is focus, and we need to prioritize what this Congress is working on. We ought to be asking what the American people are asking today with a heavy heart as they look at Washington, D.C.: Where are the jobs?

Health care, energy independence, other priorities, other talking points on Capitol Hill are not going to get the American people back to work. Congress should come together, men and women of goodwill and strong principle, and work in such a way that can restore this economy, and then work in a bipartisan way on the other major issues facing our country, so help us God.

RESTORE STATUTORY PAYGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the House will be taking up H.R. 2920 this week, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009, otherwise known as PAYGO.

This bill, sponsored by our majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), will renew our commitment to fiscal responsibility and protect core democratic values.

As the President said less than 2 months ago, the pay-as-you-go rule is very simple: Congress can only spend a dollar in one place if it saves a dollar in another. Just as families cut back on eating out at restaurants to pay for a new amenity, so too must Congress make difficult balancing decisions.

In fact, this rule was put in place when the country saw record deficits turn into record surpluses during the 1990s. It is no surprise to learn that when this rule was abandoned, we returned to record deficits that in turn doubled our national debt.

PAYGO legislation will reestablish this requirement that turned deficits into surpluses under the Clinton administration.

It is also critically important to pass PAYGO to ensure our fiscal health and stability as Congress considers health care reform legislation, a necessary item. We must be able to pay for this reform without unduly burdening our American taxpayers. To understand this critically important PAYGO legislation and the record deficits this country is facing, we must understand how we got here. We must move toward a more balanced budget which will initiate an era of fiscal responsibility and a stronger long term fiscal position. PAYGO is an important and critical piece of legislation in that process.

First, a number of factors have brought us to this cash-strapped position. Under the previous administration, the PAYGO principle was abandoned, reckless tax cuts were passed for the wealthy and two wars were funded outside of the budget process. On top of that, our economy has seen one of the most severe recessions since the Great Depression. Congressional efforts to get the economy moving again have proven to be fairly effective thus far, but they have come at a price.

Understanding these problems and the long term fiscal restraints, what does the PAYGO legislation do? It will require that all new policies reducing revenues or expanding entitlement spending enacted during a session of Congress be offset over 5 and 10 years. As Congress did in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, PAYGO will include an exemption for legislation designated as an emergency.

PAYGO will require any future extension of upper income tax cuts to be offset, as well as force a serious examination of wasteful subsidies in the budget and tax loopholes that can be eliminated to benefit more worthwhile programs. This means that PAYGO will force advocates of tax cuts to acknowledge the costs and show how they will be paid for, as well as ensuring that we can afford to fund America's most important priorities consistently for future generations.

Certain exemptions on discretionary programs funded in the appropriations process will be granted under PAYGO. These programs are the low income home energy assistance program, our Head Start program, Pell grants, the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children, and housing assistance.

PAYGO will also establish an enforcement mechanism in nonexempt mandatory programs at the end of year if Congress has not already paid for the cost of all legislation enacted during that given year.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a priority for the President. He understands, as we do, that we must balance short-term deficit spending for economic recovery with a commitment to restoring fiscal discipline in the long term. The large deficits that we inherited as a result of the reckless borrow-and-spend policies of the previous administration have put pressure on funding for important priorities such as health care, education and clean energy jobs. We must ensure that regardless of who is in power, PAYGO will be a powerful impediment to reckless tax cuts financed by debt.

Mr. Speaker, the people of our country elect us to come to Washington to represent them in the best way that we can. After years of unrestrained spending, budget gimmicks and rampant waste, as well as fraud and abuse in Federal spending, it is clear we cannot continue along that same fiscal path. We are in a deep fiscal hole. However, with the right tools, including a statu-

tory PAYGO budgeting process, we can reverse this dangerous trend and begin to put the country back on a fiscally sustainable path.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I support H.R. 2920 and encourage our colleagues to do the same.

□ 1100

FINANCIAL REGULATORY REFORM UNDER THE GROWING FED: A RECIPE FOR TOTAL GOVERNMENT CONTROL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address the critical issue of regulatory reform in our financial markets. In 1912, a year before he became President, Woodrow Wilson ominously stated "waiting to be solved lurks the great question of banking reform." So here we are almost 100 years later, and we are facing the same lurking question.

The Treasury Department recently issued an 85-page white paper containing five main objectives for reforming or financial markets. Although a few of these objectives may sound good on paper, the devil is always in the details. A closer look at this new plan reveals a fundamental change to our financial system and economy that will stifle the innovation and competition fostered by the traditional American free enterprise system, giving way to a future of Big Government propping up all companies that are "too big to fail."

Specifically, the Obama financial regulatory reform plan calls for ceding the Federal Reserve a vast amount of additional authority with the power to create new requirements for capital and liquidity and for any firm "whose combination of size, leverage, and interconnectedness could pose a threat to financial stability if it fails." The Fed, which has failed in the past as a regulator, will be allowed to oversee almost all aspects of any financial company in the United States and its foreign affiliates. Specifically, the Fed will be able to regulate, lend to and close down companies not normally under their control if they deem them to be a danger to the economy.

My colleagues, this is total government control. Additionally, the Treasury will be given more powers as well, such as the ability to appoint a conservator or receiver to "stabilize" any large financial firm that is failing, any large financial firm. This will be done in lieu of bankruptcy proceedings, and the result will almost certainly lead to those "too big to fail" institutions, backed by the United States Government, having the upper hand in the market, particularly when it comes to raising funds, and smaller competitors will be forced out down the line. Thus, we are destined for an economy dominated by what essentially are govern-

ment-backed entities, like the Fannie Maes and Freddie Macs.

Big government backed by an all-powerful Federal Reserve isn't the answer to our financial problems. We cannot erode the components of our free market economy because we are afraid to let the market work. It will devastate the innovation and competition that has traditionally driven the American economy.

Another issue worth mentioning when discussing regulatory reform of financial markets is the issue of transparency and possible conflicts of interest. Bill Gross of Pimco, a private financial institution that manages the world's largest mutual fund, is heavily involved in the mortgage securities market and is an open proponent of the Treasury's public-private investment program. Interestingly, in the spring of 2008, Pimco actually presented a plan in Washington, D.C. for a public-private partnership, very similar to the plan that Geithner came out with this year. Pimco is now hoping to be one of the companies that the Treasury picks to help buy up some of the \$1.25 trillion in mortgage bonds that have sank big institutions like Bank of America and Citicorp.

In addition, the Federal Reserve has also looked to Pimco to specifically ask for advice on which banks needed more taxpayer TARP funds to stay afloat. Pimco's close relationship with the Treasury and the Fed should not allow it to be the beneficiary of billions of dollars gained through Federal contracts and preferential investment opportunities, particularly with Geithner's public-private investment program he has proposed.

Mr. Speaker, a free market is an economic system in which individuals, rather than the government, make the majority decisions regarding economic activities. In a free-market economy, the government's function is limited, and it should act in a way as an umpire and issue regulatory procedures. The Obama financial regulatory reform plan will move us away from our free-market system and towards a future where the free market is negated by government over-involvement in the private financial sector. We are moving toward a system of permanent interdependence of big companies' reliance on big government. This is fundamentally un-American, and the long-term consequences of such a plan are dire.

Let's not make Washington, D.C. the bailout capital of the world for every private company in America. Let those companies suffer the consequences for their risky actions. Instead, let's be good stewards of taxpayer dollars, keeping in mind that more regulation doesn't mean better regulation and a powerful Federal Reserve isn't the answer to all of our financial problems.

BLUE DOGS ENDORSE PAY-AS-YOU-GO LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the pay-as-you-go legislation that the House will be considering later this week. This is a bill that the Blue Dogs and I have endorsed for the last several Congresses. It is a priority of this President and of the House leadership and of more than 165 cosponsors of this legislation. I'm always intrigued by those who would oppose PAYGO, like my friend, Mr. PENCE from Indiana, who spoke earlier that basically criticized the deficit spending that has occurred, I assume that he would be critical of that in the last previous administration and this administration, but yet he seems to oppose the one tool that we have that has proven to control deficit spending.

The principle is simple, Mr. Speaker. If you have new spending programs, then you have to pay for them. It is very simple. PAYGO was one of the tools that led this country in the 1990s to record surpluses. However, that tool, PAYGO, and others that were in place, were allowed to expire under President Bush and the Republican leadership of this body in 2002.

Those who claim that PAYGO didn't work need simply to look at the numbers. When it was on the books, we had balanced budgets and even record surpluses. But after it was allowed to expire, we saw the explosion of new spending programs and spiraling deficits to go along with it. By putting PAYGO back into law, we will get back on the path toward fiscal responsibility and long-term sustainability.

It is no secret by anybody that works in this place and now even out in the country, that we have an unsustainable budget picture looking forward. When you have a budget hole, Mr. Speaker, the first rule of thumb, the first rule you need to follow is stop digging. PAYGO does that by ensuring that new programs that are enacted must be paid for. We owe it to our children and to their children to stop digging this hole deeper.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this PAYGO legislation in order to return to fiscal discipline.

PAYGO WILL BRING ABOUT FISCAL DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I'm here, too, to join in advocacy for the PAYGO legislation that is going to come before the House floor this week. PAYGO is what it sounds like. If we have a new program, we have to find a way to pay for it, either through cuts or revenues. If we have a proposed tax cut, we have to find a way to pay for it, either in a

reduction in programs elsewhere or a shifting of priorities and spending.

It is a very simple, elemental approach. If you're going to buy something, you have to pay for it. Families know it, in their family budgets, they have to do it all of the time. And government really is no different. It is no different because in the end, if we borrow money, at some point we are going to have to pay it back. We have gotten into a habit in this Congress of not paying for things, in some cases, expenditure programs, and in other cases tax cuts.

We have had some back and forth this morning with our friends on the other side of the aisle, and without getting into the blame game, which doesn't get us anywhere, there is an irrefutable fact, and that is that in the past 8 years with the tax cuts, with Medicare part D that was not funded, with a war in Iraq and a war in Afghanistan on the credit card, we have gone from the largest surplus in the history of this country to the largest deficit in the history of this country.

What it means is that our kids and our grandkids are the ones who are going to have to pick up the tab. Aside from the fact that that is obviously unfair and none of us wants to pass the burden of debt for our spending on to others, it really is going to restrict what it is that generation can do to meet its own challenges to educate its kids, to provide health care to its kids and themselves and to provide for the national defense.

We have the capacity to impose on ourselves the same rule that families have to impose on themselves every month when they sit around the kitchen table and go over their checkbook and try to figure out how, at the end of the month, they are going to make the checkbook balance. And that is to accept the burden of the discipline of paying for our tax cut proposal or our spending proposal when we make the proposal.

Voters know that. They want fiscal responsibility. In fact, their concern about the deficit rightly is at the top of their agenda. We have had extraordinary circumstances here that have required extraordinary actions with the economy going off the cliff, with the stimulus spending and with the legacy of a war in Iraq and Afghanistan on the credit card.

We have restored truth in budgeting so that those two things, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, are now on the budget. So it is painful because we are seeing in black and white what the cost of those enterprises are, and we know that we are going to have to pay for them. We are not trying to hide it. We are being direct.

The American people are entitled to that candor, and they are entitled to have us respond by making certain that we, going forward, adopt pay-as-you-go principles. It is not just good in theory, and it is not just good for conservatives or liberals. It is good for everybody.

I'm a big supporter, I think most of us are, that in this country we achieve the goal of having all of our citizens covered by health care. Every citizen should be covered and have access to health insurance. Every citizen should help pay for it. And if you lose your job, you shouldn't lose your health care. The President has acknowledged that as worthy as that goal is, we must pay for it. And the health care bill that we are now considering has to be paid for. What a difference from what happened with the prescription drug program that was largely put on the credit card and it is not able to sustain itself or pay for itself.

One of the reasons it is so important to have PAYGO is that it imposes the discipline on us to kick the tires of a program. Health care is a great example. We need it. We have good health care in this country. But the cost is going up at two or three times the rate of inflation, two or three times the rate of profit growth, two or three times the rate of wage growth. So people are falling behind. The middle class is getting squeezed. They are facing higher co-pays and deductibles. By adopting PAYGO, it is forcing us to look at our delivery system and ask yourselves how can we reform the delivery of health care to make it more efficient and provide more value for less money?

In fact, there are examples after examples of how we have, in many cases, excess utilization. So this bill is going to be helpful to all of us. And it is very important that we pass this legislation.

GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE WILL LEAD TO RATIONING

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, right now Americans all across the country are dealing with this tough economy, many by tightening their belts and by managing their family budgets. Unfortunately, they are looking to Washington, and they are seeing this Congress that is being run by people that don't get what the American people are dealing with across the country.

Spending is out of control here in Washington by this administration and by this Congress. Look at the proposals that we are debating today. Health care in America needs reforms. But with all of the problems that exist, we still have some of the best medical care in the world. In fact, people that live in countries that have a government-run plan and who have the means, come to America to get care because in those countries, government takeover of health care has led directly to rationing of care. And so what are we facing today? We are facing a plan by the President, Speaker PELOSI and others here to have a government takeover of America's health care system.

When you read this bill, and you hear all of this great rhetoric, you hear the

President saying that if you like the plan you have, you can keep it. The problem is, the bill doesn't allow you to keep your health care plan. There is actually a section in their government takeover that allows a health care czar, some bureaucrat in Washington that was never elected to anything, to be able to take away your health care if they don't think that it complies with these new Federal requirements. So if you like what you have, this health care czar can take it away from you.

In fact, if you're uninsured—and all we hear about is the uninsured and that we need to address the problem of the uninsured, and I agree. The thing is when you really break down the numbers and when you look at who is really uninsured, you get to a number of about 7 million people. Once you strip away the illegal aliens and you take away the people who choose not to get health care who are currently eligible, you end up with 7 million Americans. That is a number we can address without blowing up all of the things that work for over 300 million Americans.

□ 1115

But in their plan, they actually tax some of those very people that are uninsured.

The Congressional Budget Office just gave testimony last week. Unfortunately the chairman of the committee threw the public out of the meeting. It was a secretive meeting that they wouldn't even allow the public to come into. I guess after they heard the testimony, you can see why, because the testimony said, number one, that the costs in this bill are out of control. All of the savings that we heard, that were promised, don't even exist. That's the Congressional Budget Office's testimony.

But then they talked about the taxes, over \$580 billion in new taxes on businesses in their health care bill. There's over \$240 billion of penalties that would be applied to American families that maybe don't go along with this new government takeover of health care. There's \$29 billion of taxes on uninsured people in their bill. The Congressional Budget Office gave the specific testimony that this bill, this government takeover of health care, adds \$29 billion in new taxes on the backs of uninsured Americans. And this is as they're running around saying that they want to help uninsured Americans. I know a lot of uninsured Americans out there that don't think \$29 billion of new taxes on their backs is the kind of help that they want. When you look at this bill, you start to realize that what they're doing, what they're proposing, is the very government takeover where rationing of care would exist, where a government bureaucrat can get in between the relationship of you and your doctor. It's the same thing that's happened in Canada, it's the same thing that's happened in England, where unfortunately just yester-

day we saw the story of a 22-year-old who was denied lifesaving care, denied a transplant by this government bureaucracy that exists in England that rations care.

I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee where this bill is currently being debated. We were in committee till 12:30 in the morning last night. We had an amendment that would have prohibited a Federal bureaucrat in Washington from interfering between the relationship of an American citizen and their doctor. That's the most sacrosanct relationship that should exist. Nobody should come between the relationship between you and your doctor. Yet they voted down that amendment. So clearly this is about rationing. Their proposal is not about reforming health care, because there's bipartisan agreement on the reforms that need to be made to address the real problems that exist in health care. What their bill is about is a government takeover. It's growing government more. It's adding more to the Federal deficit. Hundreds of billions of dollars by CBO testimony would be added to the Federal deficit, at a time when Americans are saying, Congress, Washington, control spending. Get a grip. People saw that the stimulus didn't work. There are no jobs.

This bill is a horrible idea. Government should not be taking over our health care system and interfering in the relationship between us and our doctor.

MAKING STATUTORY PAYGO A REALITY

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

Mr. MELANCON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If we do not begin paying our bills today, we will continue to short-change future generations who face higher taxes and cuts to Federal investments in priorities such as education, health care and national security. In order to ensure our long-term fiscal sustainability, we must all work together and return to the proven, effective pay-as-you-go rules that brought our Federal budget to balance in the 1990s.

We now have a President who is committed to changing the fiscal course of this country. Together, we are committed to putting an end to the reckless fiscal policies and out-of-control spending of the past that has given us the record deficits we see today. To that end, the President has charged Congress with passing statutory PAYGO, and we have an obligation to see that this critical piece of legislation reaches his desk for signing.

Our Federal Government simply cannot continue to live beyond its means, mortgaging our future on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Re-instituting statutory PAYGO will send

a message to the American people that their government is serious about putting the country back on stable economic footing. The time to act is now. The President has put his words into action and I look forward to working with the Blue Dogs and my colleagues in the House and the Senate to make statutory PAYGO a reality again in this country.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, American families and small business owners are struggling with high health care costs. They're also struggling with access to a doctor; getting to see a doctor and establishing a relationship with that doctor so that you can really lead a healthier life-style, building the kind of trust that's necessary so that the doctor knows the patient and knows what it's going to take to lead them along a healthier pathway and having the patient trust the doctor so that the advice that they're being given is something that they will adhere to. American families are struggling, small business owners are struggling, and we have to do something about this.

Republicans believe we should reform health care, but we need to do it responsibly and in a very, very thoughtful way so as to not disrupt the system that we currently have. If you have health insurance that you like that leads to a relationship with a doctor, you can keep it. But we don't want to see a system completely devastated or disrupted. We want to build off of what works.

I am a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, and we worked on the bill in the House which outlines the President's plan; and that bill doesn't do near enough to provide good, accessible health care. Furthermore, it's a very expensive bill. The Congressional Budget Office has just started looking at this and it's seeing a very expensive bill that's going to add significantly to the deficit.

As a physician who has practiced medicine for over 20 years, I look at this and I say, whoa, wait a minute, let's get this right. It's more important to get it right than to rush into something and do it very hastily and cause disruption in the health care system where we have some things that are working. One of the speakers earlier mentioned the fact that we've got in fact in effect the finest health care in the world. We've got the most highly trained doctors and nurses. We have people from all over the world coming here to train. We have those who live in other countries who come here to get their health care. But we have a cost problem, we have an insurance problem, and we need to fix that, and we need to make sure that insurance

coverage is meaningful and really leads to access to a doctor for every American.

Republicans have ideas on how to do this. It incorporates three basic principles: Information for you to make decisions for your family or for your small business, to make cost comparisons, to create transparency, information among physicians so that we don't duplicate tests and run up the costs. These are all important things. Information is very important throughout the system and we believe that we can incorporate this in a very cost-effective way.

Secondly, choice. Americans want choices. They like to shop. Let's give Americans a wide range of choices to meet their family needs or their small business needs in health care. If we do that, that will create competition and that will start to drive the costs down of health insurance premiums which we're all struggling with. It will make it more affordable and we'll get more people on it. We can address the uninsured by targeting our response as one of the previous speakers said.

Finally, we need to put families back in control of their health care destiny. There should be nothing between the doctor and the patient in this. That's the essence of good, high quality health care, and that's the only way we're going to control the cost ultimately, by fostering and strengthening that doctor-patient relationship and making it something that every American has. That's how we'll fix health care. Republicans have those ideas and many more and we'll be glad to share them as this debate goes further with the American public.

INTRODUCING THE ADULT EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you as a member of the Education and Labor Committee. It is a pleasure to stand before you today to speak about the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act of 2009, known as H.R. 3238, legislation that my friend and colleague Representative PATRICK KENNEDY of Rhode Island and I introduced on Thursday, July 16, 2009.

As we all know, our Nation is facing one of the most difficult economic times in history. Technology and globalization, coupled with the economic recession, are causing low-wage and low-skilled workers to become particularly vulnerable. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment among individuals with less than a high school diploma has risen from 7½ percent in December of 2007 to almost 15 percent in April 2009. The unemployment rate for high school graduates with no college degree has increased from 4.6 percent to 9.3 percent. Currently, the U.S. ranks 11th among

OECD countries in the percent of young adults with a high school diploma. We should be especially concerned that we are the only country in which younger adults are less educated than the previous generation. More than 40 million adults across our country have basic skills needs or limited proficiency in English that keep them from participating fully in work, in family and community activities.

In 2007, more than 25 million adults ages 18 to 64 had no high school credential. In 2006, 18,400,000 adults spoke English less than "very well" according to the U.S. Census Bureau. In my congressional district alone, there are 154,000 adults without a high school diploma. In addition, another 444,000 adults speak a language other than English or do not speak English "very well." In Texas, we have 3.8 million adults who do not have a high school diploma. This is unacceptable. We must do much more to educate our adult learners and assist them in acquiring the 21st century skills they need to succeed in the workplace.

In my conversations with business leaders in my congressional district and across the country, they have shared their desire for a highly educated and trained workforce. Employers need highly skilled workers to compete globally, particularly in high-growth industries and occupations such as health care.

Despite these alarming statistics and realities, we have not made adequate investments in our adult education delivery system. Our adult education and workforce training delivery systems are in great need of reform. In many States, thousands of adult learners are experiencing long waiting lists for adult literacy services to increase their basic literacy skills or improve their English skills. More than 77 percent of community-based literacy programs currently report waiting lists. Current funding reaches only 2.8 million of these adults each year and thousands more are on those waiting lists that I mentioned for adult literacy services.

A report issued this month by the President's Council on Economic Advisers, *Preparing the Workers of Today for the Jobs of Tomorrow*, underscores that our modern economy requires workers with higher skills and the need to employ workers with education and training beyond the high school level.

In closing, I want to say that the report identifies key limitations to our education and training system, including low completion rates, limited accountability, poor coordination among different programs and excessive bureaucratic restrictions on the use of training funds.

If we are to remain competitive in the global economy, we must invest in high quality adult education and workforce training programs that lead to family-sustaining jobs in careers with the promise of advancement and post-secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, I invite Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to

sign on as cosponsors to this legislation.

The "Adult Education and Economic Growth Act," H.R. 3238, strengthens our adult education and workforce training systems, increases economic growth in local communities and supports President Obama's call to once again lead the world college degrees by 2020.

This legislation provides adult learners with greater access to obtain basic literacy or workplace skills, including English as a Second Language. This bill assists adults in gaining admission to job training programs and post-secondary education.

This legislation provides adequate resources for innovative educational and workforce programs, so that states can bridge the gap between adult education and occupational skills training. Our adult learners will be better served by having access to integrated approaches to education and workforce training.

This legislation expands access by ensuring that federal funding formulas accurately take into account the adult education and workforce skills needs of individual states, including the number of adults who are limited English proficient.

This legislation increases access to adult education, literacy, and workplace skills through the use of technology.

This legislation increases access to correctional educational programs and provides added accountability in the system.

This legislation invests in lower skilled workers by providing employers with a tax credit.

We must reform our adult education and workforce delivery systems if we are to provide adults with the educational opportunities and 21st century skills needed to acquire family-sustaining wages and remain globally competitive.

JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for 2½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to express the deepest concern for the fact that unemployment rates have risen to 13.7 percent in the Inland Empire. There are those who believe that the solution to almost every problem facing America involves more government spending here in Washington. I am committed to the fact that just the opposite is the case. We must do everything that we possibly can to create a taxing system that encourages private sector growth.

The sooner we get back to the point of creating job opportunities in the private sector and recognizing that growth of government for the sake of government is not the answer, the sooner we will solve this problem. The jobs for San Bernardino and Riverside County lie in the private sector. So let's create an environment of opportunity and hope for those who are looking for jobs for the future.

COMBATING ADULT ILLITERACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague, Chairman RUBÉN HINOJOSA, for his work on this issue of adult illiteracy which he just spoke about.

Just like RUBÉN HINOJOSA and his district in Texas, in my State of Rhode Island where unemployment rates continue to rise, 23 percent of the adult population in my district alone lacks a high school diploma. Last June when the National Commission on Adult Literacy released its report, it served as a wake-up call for all those concerned with the quality of our adult workforce. The commission found that 80 to 90 million adults in this country have deficiencies in basic education and that our investments in adult education and training were reaching less than 3 percent of those who need it. That's why we need to ensure that our adult education and workforce training programs have the tools and resources they need to prepare our workers for the next generation of jobs in energy, in health care and in technology. We need to improve the way we deliver adult education and workforce training programs and the way we provide career paths to higher growth fields through greater involvement with business leaders, State agencies and adult education community and workforce leaders. We need to better leverage employers to provide educational programs to their employees. We need to enhance the use of technology to improve quality learning access and delivery of adult education, literacy and workplace skills services.

The Adult Education and Economic Growth Act which RUBÉN HINOJOSA and I are introducing will do all of these things in order to provide those employed and unemployed with the ability to attain the skills they need to compete in an ever-changing workplace.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

THE ADULT EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH (AEEG) ACT OF 2009

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

1. Will refocus the adult education and workforce skills system to make postsecondary and job training readiness a primary goal.

85 percent of GED graduates have to take at least one remedial course before they can enroll in postsecondary education. We need to do a better job preparing them for success in school and in work, rather than getting them to an arbitrary finish line that actually leaves them short of where they need to be.

2. Will give incumbent workers greater access to the workforce skills training and adult education systems.

It is too hard for people already on the job to receive workforce skills training and adult education. It's not enough to get someone into a job, we need to get them into a career. That means continued training, even after a worker is on the job.

Only 3 to 4 percent of the workers with the most limited literacy proficiencies receive basic skills training from their employers. Our bill will create greater incentives for employer involvement in the education of their employees.

3. Will ensure that federal funding formulas accurately take into account the adult education and workforce skills needs of individual states.

Federal funding formulas are outdated, and especially penalize states with a high proportion of non-native English speakers. Our legislation will ensure a fairer distribution of federal funds.

4. Will increase the use of technology in workforce skills training and adult education.

Technology has greatly increased our ability to reach workers at times and places convenient to them. By 2006, 73 percent of American adults were online, including those at the lowest literacy levels. We cannot reach all of those needing services without deploying technology to provide services outside the classroom walls.

5. Will increase access to correction education programs and provide for added accountability in the system.

Offenders with education and training are statistically less likely to commit crimes after release. There is a direct correlation between education level and recidivism: the higher the education level, the lower the recidivism rate. A decrease in recidivism reduces costs to taxpayers and keeps our communities safer.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

God of mercy and goodness, may this midday moment of prayer and dedication be received as a welcome gift by all, refreshing Your people and clarifying our purpose in serving this Nation.

Bless the work that Congress has begun this day. Rectify any defects and strengthen its integrity. Let us finish the tasks You set before us in a way that pleases You and gives glory to this Nation and Your Holy Name, both now and forever.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.

PAULSEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAULSEN 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.

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. 951. An act to authorize the President, in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the historic and first lunar landing by humans in 1969, to award gold medals on behalf of the United States Congress to Neil A. Armstrong, the first human to walk on the moon; Edwin E. "Buzz" Aldrin, Jr., the pilot of the lunar module and second person to walk on the moon; Michael Collins, the pilot of their Apollo 11 mission's command module; and, the first American to orbit the Earth, John Herschel Glenn, Jr.

S. Con. Res. 11. 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.

IN SUPPORT OF STATUTORY PAYGO

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I rise today in strong support of statutory pay-as-you-go legislation, which will be taken up this week by the House. This bill demonstrates our commitment to fiscal responsibility and will restore the policy that led us from deficit spending to debt to surpluses.

We have to reduce our deficit spending. If we don't, we will not be able to invest in vitally important priorities like health care, education, and clean energy.

PAYGO is very simple: All the policies that cut taxes or reduce revenues must be paid for or offset over 5 and 10 years. All policies that expand entitlement spending must be paid for over 5 and 10 years. Discretionary spending is not subject to PAYGO, and exceptions could be made for emergencies.

This makes common sense and families live by it every day. If you spend more in one area of the family budget, you have got to cut back in other areas. It's about time that our government start living by the same rule.

DON'T TAX EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I ran a small business. And in that small business I offered a health insurance benefit to my

employees. I offered a pension benefit to my employees. Both of these plans were as a result of a 1974 Federal law called ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, that allows employers to offer health plans to their employees and pension plans to their employees across State lines.

Over the years, employers now provide health insurance to their employees, to the total of about 132 million Americans that today get their health insurance through their employer.

But in the Democrat health care plan, I noticed this morning in an article from *The Wall Street Journal* there's a provision in there that, in their bill, after 5 years all employer plans will have to be approved by the Department of Labor and the new Health Choices Commissioner, who will set Federal standards for what is an acceptable health plan.

Now, these employers are providing these plans to their employees. They're trying to provide a benefit their employees want and need. And now the Federal Government is going to decide what your health plan is going to look like.

I would suggest that a lot of employers in America are going to look at this and decide, You know, this really isn't worth it. Under their plan, if you're an employer and you don't provide health insurance, you have to pay an 8 percent payroll tax to the Federal Government. Eight percent.

Now, most employers probably pay more than this for their health care. And so, as a result, I would think a lot of employers are just going to pay the 8 percent tax and allow their employees to be shoved into the government-run plan.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, some 23 million Americans would lose their benefits from their employers and be forced into government health care. According to the Lewin Group, 114 million Americans would be forced into the government plan.

This is not what the American people want. And if you put an 8 percent tax on payroll, guess what? Employers are going to hire less people. And most of my constituents are asking, Where are the jobs? And if you tax employment through this health care plan or you tax employment under this crazy national energy tax, you're going to create less jobs in America.

At a time when we need jobs and we need our economy going again, we don't need to be taxing employers and taxing employment, because we're going to get a lot less of it.

SUPPORT PASSAGE OF STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act. This com-

monsense measure will help bring fiscal responsibility back to Washington. With the national debt at almost \$11.6 trillion, Congress needs to start showing some discipline.

I launched my "Do More With Less" campaign to cut inefficient spending and reduce the debt. I have been proud to support billions of cuts in the fiscal year 2010 appropriations bills. And I have called on the Treasury Secretary to use returned bailout funds to pay back what we owe.

I am also pleased to be an original cosponsor of the PAYGO bill. By requiring that Congress offset spending dollar-for-dollar, this legislation will ensure that Washington makes the tough choices it takes to get our country back on track.

PAYGO helped produce the budget surpluses of the late 1990s, and it will help us restore the balance now.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support passage of this bill.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of Americans are losing their jobs and families are desperately seeking employment, this Congress and this administration have made job creation a secondary concern. As a result, they have squandered a golden opportunity to put people back to work.

Frankly, the American people have just had enough. They have had enough of a stimulus bill that has wasted hundreds of billions of dollars and not staved off job loss. They have had enough of the national energy tax that will impose extraordinary job-killing taxes on the people of this country. And now, Mr. Speaker, they have had enough of talk of a health care bill that not only will fail to deliver the access and quality that we need, but it will cripple small businesses by imposing an 8 percent payroll tax on them.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: Where are the jobs? Congress and this administration have been asleep for too long—and we can do better.

SUPPORT THE HEALTH CARE PLAN

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

Mr. BACA. America's health system is not working. We cannot stay with the failing system that we now have. What good is an insurance card if there's no real access to services? What good is the current system if I have a senior under Medicare, like in my district, scared that their doctors won't see them any more?

We also need a health care reform that gets past the politics and past the rhetoric that every single person is covered.

I stand here to advocate for those without a voice, for those who cannot afford to travel to Washington, D.C. I stand here to advocate for a viable public option to compete with the private sector.

I stand here to advocate for American families. And I stand for the American families who are busting at the seams, trying to make ends meet, and hoping one day they won't get sick.

I urge my colleagues to advocate for all American families and pass health care reform that is needed for all American people in this country.

WE CAN AND MUST DO BETTER

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

Mr. PENCE. In the midst of the worst recession in 25 years, after months of runaway Federal spending, bailout, record deficits, and a national energy tax, now comes a government takeover of health care paid for with nearly a trillion dollars in tax increases.

Before we move on to the next big government scheme of this administration, the American people are asking, Mr. President, where are the jobs?

Make no mistake about it, the President's health care bill would do nothing to lower the cost of health care and would be a disaster for the American economy. If ObamaCare passes—according to the experts—if ObamaCare passes, you will probably lose your health insurance and you might just lose your job.

The American people know we can do better. We must do better. For the sake of our economy and reform, I implore my Democratic colleagues, say "no" to a government takeover of health care and higher taxes and say "yes" to a bipartisan majority in this Congress that is committed to fiscal discipline, reform, and putting Americans back to work.

REINSTITUTE PAYGO

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

Mr. CHILDERS. It's a privilege to come to this House floor today to express my steadfast support for pay-as-you-go legislation that is scheduled to be introduced this week. As a member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, I believe reinstating PAYGO is vital to restoring confidence with the American people that Washington and this Congress are indeed serious about reducing the Federal deficit and not continuing the reckless spending policies so often associated with Washington over the past decade.

The people of north Mississippi and the American people all understand that at some point the bills have to be paid. Going from a \$5 trillion debt at the end of the Clinton administration

to a now over \$11 trillion debt, it is not hard to imagine the daily frustrations I see every weekend at home on the faces of individuals and families struggling in this economic downturn.

It is time for Congress to start operating just as the families in my district do and adopt statutory PAYGO as the law of the land.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this landmark legislation.

HEALTH CARE WITHOUT RAISING TAXES AND COSTING JOBS

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. We can have health care reform without raising taxes and costing jobs. The health care version currently being debated in Congress is recognized and called by many as a prescription for disaster—disaster as it relates to ensuring quality and affordable health care and disaster as to the impact it would have on our economy.

Governors across the country, Republicans and Democrats, are fearful it would only add additional costs to an already unsustainable system. The Mayo Clinic says this bill misses the opportunity to help create higher quality, more affordable health care for patients. In fact, they say it will do the opposite.

CBO last week stated that it would worsen our economic outlook by increasing deficits and driving our Nation more deeply into debt.

There are many reasons to be skeptical of this plan: the job loss, the additional debt, the government intrusion between you and your doctor and your health care decisions.

Some continue to say, It's better than nothing. When you are sick or your son or daughter is sick, you don't want the doctor just to do something. You want them to do the right thing.

□ 1215

HEALTH CARE SCARE TACTICS WILL NOT WORK

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago Frank Luntz wrote the speeches for Newt Gingrich to come out here and scare the American people about the Clinton health reform. They succeeded 15 years ago. What have the people gotten since then? Nothing. The number of people have gone up and up and up and up who do not have health insurance. So here they are all arrayed out here again today one at a time. Folks, they are here to scare you again. Mr. Speaker, the people are smarter this time.

In the election of 2008, they elected a President who said he would bring

health care reform to this country, and they gave the Democrats an overwhelming majority because they are tired of the fear machine. Now I know you all have your talking points. Frank Luntz pulled them out of the drawer, shined them up for 2008 and said, Hey, boys, here's the speech that worked in 1994. Use it again. It won't work, Mr. Speaker. The people want health care reform, and we're going to give it to them.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the lady on television said, "Where's the beef?" The American people are now saying, "Where's the jobs?" One of the things that the President promised was jobs for this country. The Speaker said, It's about jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, but the national unemployment is 9.5 percent, and in the Midwest it's in double digits. Are those the jobs?

Yes, the Democrats have given us some jobs. They've given us this cap-and-tax bill which is going to stick a tax collector in everybody's pocket, destroy small businesses, and destroy jobs in the country. They've given us 33 czars at \$170,000 a year to reward their cronies who helped them get elected up here by creating new jobs in Washington for them.

Last night the Energy and Commerce Committee voted to put a bureaucrat between a doctor and his patient to tell him how he's going to treat that sick person. That's a new job they want to create. They've got this idea that if they throw enough money to ACORN, they're going to create jobs for ACORN—if they can keep the indictments away from them. These are not jobs.

THE IMPROVING JOB MARKET

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friends wanting to talk about jobs. They have the arguments that they want to pursue, but they don't want to let the facts get in the way of their argument. Let's start with the report we received today from the Federal Reserve.

We know that jobs fell off a cliff last fall and earlier this year as part of the Bush administration's efforts for jobs. Private nonfarm employment fell by 670,000 jobs on average per the month from January to April, but declines slowed to 312,000 in May and 415,000 in June. The May and June declines in construction jobs were the smallest since last fall.

Job declines and temporary employment applications slowed noticeably, and employment in nonbusiness services turned up in May and increased further in June. That's why we have

the stock market going up. That's why consumer confidence is going up is because this is working, even if my friends' arguments are not working.

JOBLESSNESS IS NOT JUST A TALKING POINT

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this ain't a talking point. Last night I talked to one of my constituents. This man is an unemployed truck driver. His statement to me was a very clear one: Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs?

He said, You guys back there in Washington have put together a so-called stimulus bill that cost me—he's still a taxpayer—\$1 trillion, and now you plan to take over the entire health care system in this country? He said, It would be devastating. I am looking for a job as a truck driver again, and with what you've done on cap-and-trade, it's going to undermine my ability to do that.

The message is loud and clear. It's not coming from anyone putting together talking points, Mr. Speaker. It's coming from the American people to Democrats and Republicans alike in this Congress. Where are the jobs?

GOVERNMENT MUST RUN USING PAYGO PRINCIPLES

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

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Speaker, today Congress will consider a law requiring us to do what every other American taxpayer must do with its family finances, something very simple and very basic, pay for what we spend.

Ten years ago, thinking somehow it didn't need outside fiscal discipline, Congress abandoned this commonsense approach, wasted our budget surpluses, and went on a spending frenzy, doubling our national debt. Now we face the largest budget deficit in our Nation's history.

Our government cannot continue to borrow and spend, create ever-higher levels of debt, and pass along the costs of paying for it to our children and grandchildren. We are now relying on trillions of dollars of money borrowed from China and Middle Eastern oil states to pay our bills. This can't continue.

It's time we grow up, act like responsible adults and return to fiscal sanity. With this measure, any new spending we pass must be deficit-neutral. This is the long overdue essential first step towards a return to fiscal responsibility that will assure our creditors and demonstrate to the American public that we deserve to govern.

I salute my Blue Dog colleagues for their persistence on bringing this critical issue to a vote. I urge my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense bill.

**WE MUST WORK TOGETHER TO
STOP THE UNEMPLOYMENT**

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning I opened up my hometown paper, The Bakersfield Californian. On the front page of the local section there is an article, Kern County's unemployment rate for the month of June increased to 14.7 percent. If that's a talking point, it's coming directly from the paper. One year ago the unemployment rate was 9 percent.

The American people know that if Americans are not working, America is not working. My constituents ask me, Is this Obama economy going to improve? They continue to ask me, If you take more from what people earn, for the energy tax every time you turn on a light, when you go to health care, taxing, are you taking away the choice?

But I tell them there is a chance for a better way. There is a better way to work together to focus on small business. Small business creates 70 percent of every job in America. We can do better by working together and stopping the unemployment.

**CONGRATULATING THE FRIENDSHIP
MISSIONARY BAPTIST
CHURCH IN ROSWELL, NEW MEXICO**

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in Roswell, New Mexico. This year the church will be celebrating 47 years of service to the Roswell community. The Friendship Missionary Baptist Church has been dedicated to the faith and well-being of the people of Roswell for nearly a half a century.

I would like to especially honor the current serving pastor, Rev. Michael K. Shelton, and the church's former pastor, the Rev. O.C. King, and his wife for 28 years of faithful leadership to the church and the Roswell community.

Churches like Friendship Baptist achieve such great distinction because of the hard work, dedication, and compassion of their congregation. The leaders of the church and their staff are also to be commended for their guidance.

Friendship Missionary Baptist Church has been and will remain a place for fellowship and a source of hope for the people of southern New Mexico. I am honored to have churches like Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in my district, and I commend them on their years of service.

**FEDERAL ELECTED OFFICIALS
SHOULD ENROLL IN THE PUBLIC
HEALTH CARE SYSTEM**

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, would a government takeover of health care create jobs? The answer is clearly no. We should be focused on job one right now, which is find the jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Energy and Commerce Committee had continued to work today, I would have introduced an amendment to require all Federal elected officials, including the President and Vice President, to set aside our health care benefits and enroll in their new idea of a government-run health care system.

If the majority is really so confident that their plan will provide the very best health care to the people we represent, we ought to demonstrate that confidence by enrolling ourselves. I, for one, don't believe the government-run health care plan will be the best for the people we represent, but a government competitor will soon be the only one left.

A government competitor, Mr. Speaker, would be like an elephant in a room full of mice. The fast mice can get out of the room as quick as they can. The slow mice get crushed, and only the elephant is left. It is time we put our health care where we want the American health care to be, Mr. Speaker, but it's also time we find the jobs.

**THE BENEFITS OF HEALTH CARE
REFORM FOR ALL AMERICANS**

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

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we really are on the verge of finalizing groundbreaking health care reform legislation that will benefit healthier generations to come and the 250 million of us who have health care but who are tired of skyrocketing premiums and deductibles.

Did your salary go up 114 percent this last decade? It sure didn't, but that's what happened with premiums and deductibles. This is about real reform, not for insurance companies and their bean counters, but for the American people.

I want to emphasize today the importance of including a robust public plan option, relying on the Medicare provider network in the final reform bill. Providing Americans with a real choice in doctors and insurance plans puts Americans back in charge of their health care, not insurance companies, but real people and patients.

I would say that for those who believe in the free market, why are you afraid of a public plan? Why are you afraid of something that competes?

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for us to do health care reform to lower costs, to make it affordable, and to benefit those of us who have health care to lower our deductibles and our premiums.

WHERE ARE THE PROMISED JOBS?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate is in double digits around this country. Some States have the highest unemployment rate in history. The economy is bleeding jobs because the trillion-dollar stimulus bill was a jobs disaster bill.

Jobs, jobs, jobs, that's all we heard from the taxacrats as they jammed that bill through Congress. They didn't give anybody a chance to read it. They sure didn't want Members of Congress to read it. The American people didn't get to read it, and they have to suffer the consequences.

But the stimulus bill did help one city, however. Washington, D.C., has the lowest unemployment rate in the country. Now, how can that be? Well, the stimulus bill stimulated government programs funded at taxpayer expense. These aren't real jobs. Government doesn't create anything. All they do is suck money out of a private economy that could create real jobs.

The bureaucrats created more jobs for red tape regulating bureaucrats and forced citizens to subsidize it. All the trillion-dollar stimulus bill did was spend taxpayer money to create more government regulations, more government control, and more government bureaucrats. That's too bad.

And that's just the way it is.

**THE COST OF HEALTH CARE
INACTION IS TOO GREAT**

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to dispel the myth that health care reform will suddenly move the burden of paying for the uninsured onto the rest of us. All Americans are already paying the high costs of a broken health care system with 47 million Americans uninsured.

The cost of caring for the uninsured gets passed on to all of us. The average American family is currently paying more than \$1,000 every year to support the uninsured. This \$1,000 fee is buried deep in every premium and pays for the broken health care system.

Health care costs are soaring out of control. Premiums have doubled in 9 years, growing three times faster than wages. These staggering prices are too high for American families. Members of Congress must come together to address the problem for the health of middle class Americans and the health of their wallets. The cost of inaction is just too great to sit back and do nothing.

GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE WILL COST MORE JOBS

(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 painted a target on the backs of America's small businesses. As unemployment rises, 2.6 million jobs have been lost since January. Democrats continue to propose policies that will kill jobs.

First there was cap-and-tax, which will skyrocket electric bills, gas prices and food prices, and make American businesses less competitive. Now they have a government-run health care full of tax hikes and mandates on small businesses, which the NFIB estimates will cost 1.6 million more jobs lost.

Small businesses create the majority of jobs in this country. They are doing the best they can in this tough economy, but all they hear from Democrats is pay higher taxes. Democrats should stop feeding Big Government and start providing relief to small businesses.

Where are the jobs? We need health care reforms that help more Americans regardless of their preexisting conditions, help small businesses provide insurance for their employees, and keep in place an innovative side of our health care system.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1230

DO YOU FEEL LUCKY?

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. You've heard the commercial: Don't support government health care.

So the question that you need to ask yourself then is, Do I feel lucky? Do I feel lucky that I won't be one of the 14,000 people a day who lose their jobs and can't afford health insurance, that I won't have such a high deductible that I avoid preventive care and end up with end-stage cancer because I didn't go to the doctor. Well, am I lucky?

Do I feel lucky that Junior won't break a bone and I end up in the emergency room with a \$5,000 bill? Do I feel lucky that I won't go bankrupt from my health care problems? Do I feel lucky that I won't have some pre-existing condition that prevents me from getting a new job? Do I feel lucky that my health care premium won't grow three times faster than my salary?

The American economy is in the intensive care unit. The disease is the high cost of health care, and the medicine is health care reform.

RISING UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week my home State of Minnesota saw the unemployment rate rise once again, while seeing its exports drop by almost 20 percent from just 1 year ago.

The number one priority of this Congress and this administration should be job creation. But it's clear that the economic stimulus policies being pursued in Washington are failing. Congress has missed important opportunities to pursue real policies that will put Minnesotans and Americans back to work.

Instead, we've seen reckless spending and reckless borrowing at unprecedented rates, so much so that the fact now is that every man, woman and child in our country owes over \$37,000 as their share of the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, we should be reforming health care without throwing even more new taxes on the backs of families and small businesses, and we should be giving priority to helping small businesses, our number one job creators, to put Minnesotans and Americans back to work.

APOLLO MOON LANDING IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF ST. LOUIS PRIDE

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I rise today to remember the 40th anniversary of the Apollo Moon landing and the deep sense of pride it gave our Nation.

I, like all Americans, watched with amazement as Neil Armstrong declared: "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind." That moment demonstrates the magnitude of American know-how, ingenuity, innovation and our ability to rise to a great challenge.

My home city of St. Louis, Missouri, was instrumental in the success of that Moon mission, serving as home to then-McDonnell Douglas, which manufactured components for the third-stage booster rocket for Saturn V. That third-stage booster rocket launched those brave astronauts into lunar orbit, making the historic journey possible.

Now it's time to lead the world once again in innovation and science technology, especially as we transition to a new clean energy economy. Americans are ready to be called to action for a great challenge again.

HEALTH CARE REFORM A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the economic stimulus plan was passed earlier this year, the

American people were told that we had to act immediately because of our economic crisis. We were also told that that plan would create or save 3 million jobs and that the unemployment rate would not rise above 8 percent, and that we had to act so fast that actually not one Member of this House or the American people had a chance to read the bill.

And what has actually happened since that time?

Well, the economy hasn't gained 3 million jobs. It's actually lost 3 million jobs. Where are the jobs?

Unemployment is almost 10 percent. In my home State of Michigan, it is 15.2 percent today, and \$787 billion has been added to our national debt and we have an annual deficit approaching \$2 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, now we're being told that we need to pass health care reform immediately because we're in a crisis. We're told that it will be deficit neutral because it includes massive new taxes on individuals and small businesses. But CBO says that it will actually increase the deficit, Mr. Speaker, while others say that it will force millions of Americans out of their private health insurance.

We do need to reform our health care system, but doing it in such a panic mode is a recipe for disaster.

EMPLOYER MANDATE HARDSHIP

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, our economy is struggling, and unemployment is near 10 percent. Yet the health care proposal being considered in Congress asks our job creators, the small businesses of America across this country, to pay a new 8 percent tax.

Last week, in the Ways and Means Committee, I proposed to exempt small businesses from this penalty tax if it would result in businesses having to lay off workers, cut wages, or reduce jobs.

America's businesses are hurting, and we're asking them to pay more taxes? Yet, my amendment was rejected. Requiring small businesses to pay a penalty tax is no way to help them stay in business and create jobs. American workers will be harmed. Workers will bear the new cost through lost jobs and smaller wages.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. Americans need the confidence that their jobs are not in jeopardy, that we are working to protect and strengthen their health care, while supporting the small businesses that create jobs.

And these aren't speaking points. That's just some straight shooting from the sheriff.

STABILIZING OUR ECONOMY

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, President Barack Obama's chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, reflected on the administration's lack of focus on the economy earlier this year when he said that our Nation's financial crisis presented an opportunity to accomplish agendas unrelated to the economy.

A good example of that was the so-called stimulus bill that had nothing to do with helping to save or create jobs in the private sector, but everything to do with expanding government programs and pushing our Nation \$787 billion deeper into debt.

The Obama administration and the Congress should be focused on one issue and only one issue, and that is stabilizing our Nation's economy so that Americans can keep the jobs they have and get back the jobs they lost. Only when the economy is stabilized should we be debating other issues such as energy policy and health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting, and it's time that our President and the Democrats in Congress stop ignoring their pain and get to work on fixing this economy.

WASHINGTON IS OUT OF TOUCH

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. It amazes me how out of touch we are in Washington. For months now, my constituents in western New York have been asking, where are the jobs, any jobs?

Well, according to this chart of job postings, we found out where they are: right here in Washington, D.C., as we continue to hire thousands of Federal bureaucrats. It's one of the only cities that's growing, and all for the wrong reasons.

It's appalling that we're continuing to grow the Federal Government while we're running a deficit of \$1.18 trillion.

When I ran a business, you always had a budget, and you lived within it.

When you look around D.C., you see construction cranes all around the skyline. It's because we can't construct enough buildings to house all these Federal bureaucrats that we're now hiring when we have this deficit.

We have to stop this excessive spending and work together to create the right jobs in the right sectors.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the enemies of health reform have scoured all of Canada to find a story that fits with their message of "no change, no reform."

But I only have to look to my district, to Sharon Almeida from San

Bruno, who sent me this letter titled, "What's Wrong With This Picture?"

Each month Sharon and her husband, Frank, net \$3,811 from Social Security and pensions. But they pay out nearly \$2,800 for Sharon's cancer treatments. That leaves them just \$1,000 for food, utilities, gas, insurance, never mind a little something for the grandchildren. Thank God they own their own home and no longer have a mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, Sharon and Frank worked hard. They played by the rules and raised a beautiful and supportive family. They do not deserve this.

So, to the critics of reform, I say, let the Canadians worry about the Canadians. It's time we come together to provide real health care reform for Sharon and other hardworking Americans.

TROUBLE IN CAPITAL CITY

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, trouble, oh, we got trouble right here in Capital City. With a capital T, and it rhymes with B and that stands for Broke. Right here in Capital City, right here, we've gotta figure out a way to help the Americans we're about to choke.

You've got trouble right here in Capital City. With a capital T, and that rhymes with D and that stands for debt. Right here in Capital City we've got trouble. Remember the millions, the billions, the trillions. And don't you forget, we've got trouble. We're in terrible, terrible trouble. The game of some 256 Members is a devil's bet. Oh, yes, we've got trouble, trouble. Trouble with a T. It rhymes with D, and it stands for Democrat.

HEALTH CARE

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it's time for commonsense health care reform that will strengthen free enterprise, lower cost and expand access to affordable quality care.

Unfortunately, at a cost of \$1.28 trillion, Democrats wish to create a new government program that will unwillingly force more than 100 million people out of their current coverage, increase taxes by \$818 billion, and cut 4.7 million jobs.

According to CBO, this legislation would also increase the Federal deficit by \$239 billion over 10 years and, as a result, would ration care, force doctors out of the profession and hospitals out of business, and ultimately provide fewer options and longer waits for patients.

Locally, new health mandates in South Carolina, a State already in financial crisis, would create more unbudgeted costs and reduce funding for other important issues in the State.

Spending so much and accomplishing so little, a government takeover of health care is the wrong direction for all Americans. Republicans have a better plan that expands access to affordable health care and allows families to choose the plan that best fits their needs.

CUT TAXES AND CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, Continental Airlines, one of the largest employers in Houston, has just laid off 1,700 people. And my friend, Mr. CHRIS LEE of New York, has put together an inspired chart that shows clearly what this liberal leadership of this House and this Congress are doing with our hard-earned tax dollars. They're redistributing the wealth to Washington, D.C., they're creating jobs in the government and Washington and out in NANCY PELOSI land, out in San Francisco and in State capitals across the Nation.

But we fiscal conservatives understand, it's common sense: to create jobs, you cut taxes; you get lawyers and bureaucrats and regulators off the backs and out of the pockets of small business people. We need to cut taxes to create jobs. Do so immediately. We need to cut spending at the Federal level to reduce the level of debt that our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay.

The Inspector General for the Treasury has just reported that these irresponsible bailouts that this liberal majority has passed could cost taxpayers up to \$23.7 trillion on top of the \$60 trillion in unfunded liability that we have already passed on to our kids.

It's time to cut taxes and create jobs and get the government off our backs and out of our pockets.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SUPPORT FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM IS WANING

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the more details Americans learn about the government takeover of health care proposed by the President and the liberal leadership of Congress, the less support there is for this insane idea.

A Washington Post-ABC poll shows more than half of this country is opposed to this plan. Yes, support for this crazy deep dive into socialism is fading fast.

The nonpartisan CBO says this plan won't reduce the cost as the President suggested; it will accelerate it. And we know that will kill jobs.

This liberal Congress rammed the stimulus and cap-and-trade, which nobody could read before voting, down the throats of the American people.

But they are now fed up and on to their strategy.

We don't want DMV, Department of Motor Vehicles, style medicine with long waiting lines, delayed care and skyrocketing cancer death rates as in Canada and the UK. We don't want a system that will bankrupt this country and ignore the elderly, and we sure don't want our tax money paying for abortions.

Simply put, we want commonsense health care reform, not nonsense health care reform as now proposed.

□ 1245

A TAX ON HEALTH CARE IS A TAX ON PAYROLL

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, at the start of this year, the focus has been on economy and jobs, number one.

I was chairman of the Florida Chamber 4 years ago. We represented 137,000 businesses, and 99 percent of those businesses were small business. They create 75 percent of the jobs. Yet, today, we are going to tax health care. It's not a tax on profit. It's a tax on payroll. If you've got a \$1 million payroll making no money, and if you're paying another \$80,000 a year you don't have, you're going to put people out of business.

The other thing they want to put together is a surtax of 5.4 percent on businesses. They want to get to the millionaires. Do you know who those folks are? They're small business people. You wouldn't know that if you've never been in business. That's the majority of them. So you're going to tax the 8 percent. You're going to add another 5.4 percent. You're going to kill millions of businesses, and you're going to kill millions and millions of more jobs. We need to get focused back on the economy and on jobs in America today, right now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee and on the Health Subcommittee. We were in session last night until 12:30, working on this bill. It was beginning to be a bipartisan bill. We accepted Republican amendments; we accepted Democratic amendments, but we have a long way to go. Let me tell you what the facts are in our country.

Forty-three to fifty million people in our country are without health care. They get their health care through the emergency rooms. Do you know who pays for that? Those of us who have insurance, who are fortunate enough to have employer-based insurance, wheth-

er you're a Federal employee, a State employee, a city employee or whether you work for some of the large industries. We have insurance, but 43 to 50 million people don't. Our country's employers and employees spend more per capita than anywhere in the world for some of the worst results for the average illnesses.

We are going to debate a bill in a few minutes by my colleague from California, JOE BACA, on the increase in diabetes in the Hispanic community. Diabetes can be dealt with early on. Our health care system decides to deal with people after they're so ill that it's more expensive. We need health care reform in our country for cost containment but also to make sure that every American doesn't have to get their health care through the emergency rooms.

UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over this country are asking: Where are the jobs? We've been promised jobs over and over by the Obama administration and by the majority in this Congress, but unemployment numbers continue to rise.

When the President took office, 11.5 million people were unemployed. Six months later, that number now stands at 14.5 million Americans who are unemployed and who are looking for work. Where are the jobs?

In February, when the majority rammed through a \$1 trillion stimulus bill with zero input from my Republican colleagues, Americans were promised that unemployment would remain at 8 percent. Five months later, unemployment is at 9.6 percent and is climbing. In my home State of Florida, that number is 10.6 percent, the highest it has been in three decades. Where are the jobs?

The stimulus bill is not working, and despite what Vice President BIDEN says, we can't borrow and spend our way out of this recession. Instead of spending trillions of dollars on failed programs and on misled policies, we need to focus on lowering taxes on small businesses and on families. Again, where are the jobs?

AMERICAN INNOVATION, NOT REGULATION

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, the world is looking to us for innovation. That's the goose that lays the golden egg in our country—our free enterprise system, entrepreneurship. They are looking and are saying, American innovation can pull this economy back in a good direction, not regulation. Other

governments are moving away from regulation and high taxation. We're moving towards it. It's innovation, not regulation.

Look at the new cap-and-trade legislation for energy and the environment. It's a regulatory scheme. It's a taxation scheme, not an innovation scheme. Where is nuclear power? Where are the new energy technologies that can lead to a robust, manufacturing-driven, job-creating U.S. economy?

Look at the new health care scheme. It's a regulatory scheme, a taxation scheme and, frankly, a litigation scheme. It's protecting the status quo in litigation. The greatest medical centers in America are saying this government insurance scheme is the wrong approach. We need less litigation. We need to unleash the entrepreneurship and the innovation of the United States again so that we can lead.

Where are the jobs? They're in innovation and in entrepreneurship. They're in our free enterprise system. The government chokes it with regulation, taxation and litigation.

A SO-CALLED "STIMULUS"

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, 5 months after this House passed the so-called "stimulus" that shattered spending records, the economy struggles, and unemployment is approaching 10 percent. It's important to remember that Republicans had a different plan for economic recovery. While we didn't have enough votes to pass it, our solution relied on American ingenuity and small business, not on stimulating bigger government by creating government jobs. Our plan would have produced immediate results by putting tax dollars right back in the pockets of American taxpayers and of job creators.

Recently, it was reported that someone in the White House sees the need for another stimulus. Instead of doing the same thing over again and expecting a different result, perhaps it's time to give Republican alternatives a serious look. It's not too late to pass a real stimulus plan.

THIS CREDIT CARD CONGRESS

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep concern about the families of the United States of America. The economics of this credit card Congress are not working. Where are the jobs?

We cannot tax and spend our way out of our challenges. I firmly believe that President Obama, Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats in Congress are taxing, spending and borrowing too much money. This credit card Congress has now put us nearly \$12 trillion in debt.

We are spending nearly \$600 million per day just in interest on that debt. Bailouts and stimulus money by the billions of dollars are not helping the average person at home, and now we have a proposal to slam through a government-run, Chinese-financed health care system that puts a Washington, D.C., politician between our doctor and my wife.

The tax-and-spend, credit-card-driven, Chinese-financed economics driven by the Democrats doesn't work. We need fiscal discipline, limited government, accountability, and a strong national defense. We need to restore liberty for the American people and for small businessmen and -women. That's where you'll find the jobs.

Stand up, America. Let your voice be heard. Put a stop to this credit card Congress.

DEMOCRATIC HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the American people's biggest fears about the Democratic health care reform plan is the prospect of having some government bureaucrat stand between them and the doctors they trust. I've heard this message time and time again in townhall meetings, in letters and in phone calls from patients throughout this country.

The House Democratic leadership has promised the American people that their fears about the bureaucrat-rationed care they will receive are unfounded, even while drafting a 1,000-page bill that creates this Comparative Effectiveness Council to decide which treatments will be covered.

Late yesterday evening, I gave my colleagues a chance on the Energy and Commerce Committee to put their money where their mouths were by offering an amendment in the Energy and Commerce Committee that would simply bar Federal political appointees and bureaucrats from intervening in patient treatment decisions.

An easy vote, Mr. Speaker. Who do you want making your health care decisions—your doctor or a government bureaucrat? However, every Democrat on the committee, save one, voted against this amendment.

It's time for Congress to focus on strengthening the doctor-patient relationship and not the bureaucratic-patient relationship.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the people in South Alabama and, really, all across our country want to know: Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs that were promised by the administra-

tion and by the Democratic leadership of this Congress back in February?

Without a single Republican vote, a \$787 billion stimulus bill was forced on the backs of the taxpayers of our country with one simple promise: that it would keep unemployment below 8 percent and that it would create some 3.5 million jobs over the next 2 years. Where are those jobs? Instead of creating new jobs, almost 2.5 million jobs have been lost just since the stimulus bill has been passed.

Nationally, the unemployment rate is 9.5 percent, inching up closer and closer to double digits. In five of the six counties that I represent in South Alabama, that unemployment rate is already at double-digit unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious lack of credibility in our Nation's capital. Don't take my word for it. Just listen to the American people. They want to know: Where are the jobs?

SUMMERS RELYING ON GOOGLE SEARCHES TO GAUGE RECESSION

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, when this administration took over on January 20, the unemployment was at about 7.2 percent, and they made a promise that this new stimulus of \$787 billion would create or would save 600,000 jobs. Since that point, we've lost 2 million jobs. Where are the jobs?

The President's top economic adviser pictured here, Mr. Larry Summers, has made us all feel better in this country by telling us:

Of all the statistics pouring into the White House every day, top economic adviser Larry Summers highlighted one Friday to make his case that the economic free-fall has ended. The number of people searching for the term "economic depression" on Google is down to normal levels, Summers said. Searches for the term were up fourfold when the recession deepened in the earlier part of the year, and the recent shift goes to show consumer confidence is higher, Summers told Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? I'm telling you that somebody in this administration is asleep at the wheel.

JOBS

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

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. Millions of Americans are out of work, and hundreds of thousands continue to lose their jobs each month. In my home State of Ohio, the unemployment rate reached 11.1 percent in June, the highest it has been in decades.

According to the Columbus Dispatch, this adds up to an additional 33,000 jobs

in Ohio that have been lost during the month of June, which is up from 8.8 percent in January 2009. The Dispatch article goes on to state that, over the course of the past year, 279,000 Ohioans have lost their jobs, including small businesses, farmers, as well as 134,000 manufacturing jobs.

At the end of the day, I trust the American people and our small businesses, the taxpayers, to spend and to invest their own money as they see fit. That is what will get America back to work.

Unfortunately, the other side of the aisle's economic policies have this backwards. The government continues to take Americans' tax dollars and to spend those dollars as they see fit. Not only is that inefficient and wasteful; it's just flat out wrong. Where are the jobs? It's time to get Ohio and Americans back to work now.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question: Where are the jobs? My constituents, along with those across Ohio and our Nation are asking: Where are those jobs?

In my home State of Ohio, the unemployment rate has risen to 11.1 percent. We have the seventh-highest rate in the Nation. Every single county in my district is equal to or is higher than the national average, and Pike and Scioto Counties are actually above 15 percent, but that number is rather deceiving. Another large percentage of our population has either given up looking for work right now or has taken part-time or temporary work.

People in Ohio and in my district are hurting. We need jobs and we need them now. Only \$6 million of the Department of Transportation Recovery Act dollars have been spent so far in Ohio. The Recovery and Reinvestment Act was supposed to provide immediate stimulus to create new jobs. Where are those jobs? People are hurting. Five months later, there are no jobs.

I'm asking: Where are the jobs?

□ 1300

LOSS OF JOBS HAS GONE OFF A CLIFF

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with the national unemployment rate nearing 10 percent and Tennessee's own unemployment rate at over 11 percent, people are outraged that not more is happening in Washington to help them find work. So far, this Congress has provided those who find themselves out of work extended benefits, but it insisted on taxing those benefits. Worse, the majority has not done enough to

stimulate the economy and to produce jobs, the best benefit of all, which is a job.

Despite all of the promises of a green job revolution and the millions of jobs that would be saved or created because of the economic stimulus package, the number of jobs since President Obama took office has gone off a cliff.

Republicans have called for an immediate end to the tax on unemployment benefits, which would surely help those who have been hurt by this recession. We have also called for tax relief for small businesses who can use that money to create jobs. These measures can improve our economy immediately.

American small businesses are the most innovative in the world and will pull us out of this recession if we allow them, but Democrats seem determined to prevent any recovery from occurring. In the past month, they moved to bludgeon our economy with a national energy tax and tax on small business to finance massive new health care entitlements.

Enough is enough. Create jobs.

JOBS, THE ECONOMY, AND THE FUTURE OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, over 6 months ago, my Democrat colleagues and the Obama administration told the American people that if we passed the \$1.2 trillion stimulus package, it would create jobs, halt the growing unemployment rate, and turn our economy around; yet here we are today with a 9.5 percent unemployment rate—the highest in 26 years—and a record \$1.1 trillion deficit that is growing and expected to be \$2 trillion by year's end.

And yet this administration and Democrats want to push through another \$1.2 trillion health care package, a health care package that, according to the President's own economic adviser, will result in 4.7 million people losing their jobs.

Just a few weeks ago when talking about the stimulus package, Vice President BIDEN said for the Obama administration, Well, we just guessed wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the American people can really afford for this Congress or this administration to guess wrong again. We need to make sure that we find the jobs in this country, not tax and spend.

DEAD WRONG ON HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, listen. Listen with me and see if we can hear the sounds of jobs. Shhh, shhh, shhh, shhh. You gotta listen real close. Quiet. Well, I'm not hearing anything.

The administration told us in this House months ago that if the American people stood in favor of the stimulus package that unemployment would peak at 8 percent, and yet here in Illinois, the State that I represent, we've now eclipsed 10 percent.

We were told that the cost curve would be broken if only we would follow the administration's health care plan and it would be the salvation of small business, and yet the Congressional Budget Office came into the Ways and Means Committee last week, Mr. Speaker, and said that was dead wrong.

The question that has to be asked and has to be answered is one that we've heard no answer today from the other side: Where are the jobs?

There are no jobs. This is an administration that has pumped sunshine for months and has failed to follow through, and we ought not follow these brake lights right over the cliff.

We know what we need to do, and that is stand for small business and vote against this plan.

BRING HEALTH CARE COSTS DOWN

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, rising health care costs are a serious problem, but the Democrat bill being advanced in the House proposes \$1.2 trillion in additional spending on health care coupled with massive tax increases that would hurt small business and middle class families.

The Democrat new 8 percent payroll tax will force employers to cut millions more jobs in the middle of the worst recession in decades while their surtax would push my State of California's top income tax rate to over 56 percent, higher than even that of France's. And those tax hikes won't even cover the full costs of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we need real reform that brings down health care costs instead of pouring more money into a broken system.

HEALTH CARE PLAN SHOULD BE GOOD ENOUGH FOR EVERYBODY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee that failed because every Democrat voted against it. The amendment simply stated that Members of Congress and the administration should live by the laws they impose on the American people.

Specifically, if you vote for a government-run health insurance plan, you should get a government-run health insurance plan. If it's good enough to impose health care rationing on the American people, it's certainly good

enough for you. Because it's hypocritical to vote for a government-run rationed health care plan that will be forced on everyone else while retaining a private insurance plan for yourself.

If Members don't believe they should have to live under the rationed health care plan that they're pushing, they should explain why. Kansans are upset by the possibility that they're forced on a rationed public health care plan by this Congress. They believe if it's not good enough for the people who vote for it, it's not good enough for them.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for us to reform health care by addressing defensive medicine costs, by offering market-based principles for health care, and by keeping patients and doctors in control, not Washington bureaucrats.

HEALTH CARE AND ITS FAULTY PREMISES

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Well, they certainly aren't in the Democrats' job-killing health care plan. At a time when America is suffering the worst recession in a generation, it's utterly irresponsible to propose a government takeover of our health care system and destroy millions of private sector jobs in the process.

Since the Democrats passed their stimulus package, more than 2 million American jobs have been lost, and the chair of the White House Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Christina Romer, has suggested that the tax hikes on businesses that will be required to pay for the Democratic health care plan will result in the loss of an additional 4.7 million jobs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic proposal will force drastic cuts in Medicare Advantage, causing millions of seniors to lose their coverage for prescription medicine, the cost of private health care will skyrocket, and the Lewin Group has estimated that nearly 114 million Americans will be forced out of their current private health care coverage and into government-run health care plans.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' job-killing health care proposal is the wrong prescription. It will cost millions of jobs. Americans need a second opinion.

AMERICANS WANT TO SEE WHAT WE'RE DOING FOR THEM, NOT AGAINST THEM

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Ohio of the United States all want a job. Last year at this time, the Fifth Congressional District, according to the National Manufacturers Association, had the ninth largest

number of manufacturing jobs in the country. When the new numbers just came out, we're down to 15.

When you look at this map of the State of Ohio, looking at Williams, Fulton, Defiance, Paulding, Crawford, and Huron—those are some of my counties—when I've got counties over 15 percent, folks back home want to know what this Congress is doing.

What this Congress passed before we went on the Fourth of July recess was the national energy tax, the largest tax that we're going to see that puts businesses out, that puts people out of work, and that's what we're doing.

People want to know what we're going to do for them, not what we're doing to them. And I'm telling you that folks back home, when I go home every weekend, want to know what are we doing. When you look at the State of Indiana right here, right next to us, they're in as big trouble as we are.

When the Heritage Foundation came out with their report, of the top 20 congressional districts in the country that had problems under cap-and-tax, Ohio and Indiana ranked right in the top, 16 out of 20.

We've got to do something. We've got to act right now.

SIMILAR RESULTS AS STIMULUS PLAN

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? They are not in Michigan, my home State, where we have a 15.2 percent unemployment rate. And what could we expect, especially when this was one of the driving forces behind the trillion dollar stimulus package. One could expect similar results, and, sadly, that's true.

We then saw a national cap-and-tax energy tax did not create jobs, did not help, and now we're on the verge of a radical socialization of America's health care network. And what do we hear from the other side? Statistics but no references to the bill.

And do you know why? Because while our health care system needs reform, it is not broken. The one thing that's broken is this Congress. And if this Congress keeps spending people's money and engaging in radical change to our cherished way of life, every single family budget in America will be broken by their hand.

GOVERNMENTAL TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great debate here in Congress about how we go about reforming health care in the United States. I've tried to work in a bipartisan capacity with the majority, but the Democratic leadership's health care reform plan is a govern-

mental takeover of health care that will lead to fewer jobs, higher taxes, and, ultimately, less health care coverage for New Jerseyans.

Most disappointing to me is the fact that the Democratic health plan would increase, not reduce, our Nation's burgeoning long-term health costs, a step in the wrong direction. And according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, instead of saving the Federal Government from fiscal catastrophe, the Democratic health care proposal would already worsen the situation that is out of control, an \$11 trillion debt that is rising rapidly.

Democrats should put aside their \$1.5 trillion health care plan and take a hard look at the affordable and effective Medical Rights and Reform Act put forth by the Republican Tuesday Group. Together, we can find real solutions to make health care affordable.

HEALTH CARE REFORM AT WHAT COST

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have come to this mike today and said, Where are the jobs? Well, if we pass this government-run health plan with compulsory insurance, it's going to create some jobs. It's going to take a government police force that you won't believe. We're going to have Barney Fifes running all over this Nation forcing people to do things they don't want to do.

And how do we pay for it? Well, that's simple. We just go to the small businesses that can't afford to buy insurance for their employees as it is and we increase by 8 percent their payroll taxes. We are going to break the backs of small businesses that are the backbone of this Nation.

Let's put a stop to this nonsense.

NO JOBS

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs?

As a Senator, President Obama supported the \$700 billion bailout Nation strategy that today we're learning will cost the American people potentially \$24 trillion. But where are the jobs?

President Obama pushed the trillion dollar stimulus that cost our economy 2 million in job losses. No jobs.

President Obama took over GM and Chrysler, and he gave pink slips to 3,400 car dealerships that cost 150,000 jobs. No jobs.

President Obama's national energy tax will double our electricity bills in Minnesota and will cost 2.5 million job losses every year.

Now President Obama's economic adviser tells us that the government takeover of our private health care in-

surance will cost us 5 million jobs. No jobs.

This may be called the China-India stimulus plan, but the President isn't doing so well for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let's have real change so the American people can have real jobs.

□ 1315

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. AKIN. Americans love records. How fast can you go? How high can you go? How deep can you go? We love to set records. Why, the Democrats just set a fantastic record of the biggest tax increase in the history of our country. And was it clever? It was really clever. All you have to do is flip a light switch to pay a tax. And spending. Oh, we've done a great job of spending it. As a result of taxing and spending, more records. Why, in the last 6 months, we have lost more jobs than any 6-month period since World War II. There's a record for you.

Here's another record. We have, in the last 6 months, used up more jobs and lost jobs than we created over the Bush years over the previous 9 years. That's the only time that's happened since the Great Depression.

And here's another record, too: That is, the jobs that we've lost have been longer than any time since we've been measuring unemployment in 1948.

I wish we didn't set quite so many records. We don't need the Democrats' help for this kind of record.

Where are the jobs?

HEALTH CARE BILL COSTS AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Americans have lost millions of jobs in the last 6 months. The unemployment rate today is approaching 10 percent nationwide. And amid all of this, Democrats are proposing a government takeover of health care that would increase taxes, eliminate choices, cut Medicare, force Americans out of their current plans and place billion-dollar job-killing fines and mandates on small businesses, the job creators.

Studies estimate that nearly 5 million jobs will be lost as a result of taxes on small business under this Democrat plan.

There is a better solution, Mr. Speaker. Rather than penalizing struggling small businesses, Congress must make it easier for them to afford health benefits. We must increase choices, make health costs deductible, expand health savings accounts, end waste, fraud and abuse and control unnecessary lawsuits that drive up costs for everyone.

I support reform, Mr. Speaker, that lets Americans keep their doctors, lowers costs and keeps medical decisions between the patient and their doctor.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this year, the administration and Speaker PELOSI had this House pass a 1,500-page stimulus bill which no one in either body was able to read before they passed it that spent \$800 billion which we did not have, all because they promised that it would create new jobs. In fact, they said it would actually either create or save 2 to 3 million new jobs.

Their economic policy adviser at the White House said it would mean an immediate start of creating new jobs and eliminating losing jobs. Even Majority Leader STENY HOYER was on the floor saying this would be an immediate jolt to the economy, the immediate creation of jobs.

Well, it is 5 or 6 months later, and where are we? I just heard from Chairman Bernanke. He says he can't assess where we are right now. But if you look at the numbers, if you look at the chart that I have here, the Democrat projection with stimulus had we done something was here. What actually happened, we have seen as far as jobs, more job losses, more job losses, more job losses, February, March, April, May and June, more job losses. We have lost several million jobs since the stimulus was passed.

The administration misread the American economy. The administration misread the American public. The American public knows that we need to go in the right direction.

We spend too much, we borrow too much and we tax too much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must enlist the cooperation of Members in heeding the gavel at the expiration of their time.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I finished a lunch with a gentleman who is a business owner in Virginia. And we had a discussion about what are the things that we need to be doing to help with this economy.

As I travel across the First District, the thing I hear time and time again is where are the jobs? What are we doing to help this economy? What are we doing to help small businesses? Folks,

that is where this economy is going to be picked up, from the efforts to make sure we help our small businesses. That is what this Congress needs to be focusing on each and every day. When we come here, our focus ought to be what are we doing to help small business? What we doing to create jobs?

Obviously, what is happening right now isn't working. People out there are anxious. They are concerned. They are frustrated. They are telling me, as well as the rest of the Congress, get to work, start creating jobs and start turning this economy around.

Let's get the job done.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT JOBS

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, Americans all across the country are asking, where are the jobs? When President Obama brought the stimulus plan before the American people, he said it needed to be rammed down their throats quickly. He didn't allow people even the opportunity to read it. Not one Member who voted for the bill even had the opportunity to read it. But he said, don't worry. Just trust me. It will create millions of jobs.

Well, now 6 months later, 2 million more Americans have lost their jobs since President Obama took the oath of office. And what's their answer? They're talking about another stimulus bill. In fact, just last week, Vice President JOE BIDEN said, We have to go spend money to keep from going bankrupt.

The American people are starting to understand what's going on here with this Congress, the liberals that are running this place. They realize all they're doing is taxing and spending, and they're not creating jobs. They're running jobs off. The cap-and-trade energy tax would lose 3 million jobs to countries like China. And then they come back with this plan to have a government takeover of our health care system, a plan that would add another \$800 billion of new taxes on the backs of American people and run off even more jobs.

The American people know what's going on here. They want jobs, not these crazy liberal policies.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, for West Virginia's families, it's jobs, health care and the economy that matters the most to them. They've seen trillions of dollars spent, and they see Washington proposing to spend trillions more. They want to know where are the jobs with the stimulus? They want to know why the only apparent answer here in Wash-

ington is more spending and more borrowing.

My constituents want their voices heard. Recently, I sent a survey out and received 3,500 responses on what do people want on health care. They want to keep the coverage that they have. More than two-thirds are troubled by the idea of a government-run health care. Three-fourths are shocked by the thought of yet another trillion-dollar program. And the vast majority think that this is not the time to be raising taxes.

Unfortunately, the plan moving through the House right now fails to address all of these. It fails to control costs. It taxes small businesses. It threatens to force families into government-run health care. Simply put, this is not the health care reform my constituents and I are looking for. What they're looking for are jobs.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we were told a \$1 trillion stimulus package would create jobs immediately. But since then, nearly 2 million Americans have lost their jobs, and unemployment is at 9.5 percent, the highest in 26 years. Then the House passed cap-and-trade legislation which will cost our country 2.5 million jobs each year. Now we're rushing to take up the Democrats' health care bill, which research shows will cost 4.7 million more jobs.

As House Republicans offer plans and ideas to get our economy moving again, all we get in return is more of the same, spending and taxing, and it keeps yielding the very same results: Longer unemployment lines and a longer list of promises.

Mr. Speaker, we need new ideas and new approaches to deliver different results.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE IS NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. TERRY. The House health care bill is a government takeover of your health care and destructive to the economy. It provides perverse incentives to employers to dump their health care plan, forcing their employees into the government health exchange where they will choose the government-subsidized government plan. Oops, there goes the promise that you can keep your own plan.

This costs you \$1 trillion placed on the back of small businesses. Oops, there goes those jobs.

After 10 years, the cost of this plan explodes, needing multi-trillions of dollars to continue to fund. More taxes,

more debt. Oops, there goes our economy—to China and India.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, around the country, more and more Americans are out of work, struggling to pay their bills. Yesterday, the Web site recovery.gov revealed that your government spent \$1.2 million to purchase pork at twice what struggling families would pay at a local grocery store. It would be funny if it weren't so painful.

The \$787 billion stimulus was sold to the American people as a bill that would put people back to work. But now we see it for what it really is, a massive expansion of social welfare which is doing nothing to create jobs.

Where are the jobs? Almost 6 months have passed since the stimulus was signed into law, and unemployment continues to tick upward. It is over 13 percent in my congressional district. The so-called "stimulus" was a missed opportunity to provide true tax relief to the American people and for shovel-ready infrastructure projects that would have provided jobs. As more information on this stimulus package is revealed, I'm sure more terrifying news will be before us.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce you to Mr. Pitchford. He is a young and exciting teacher who gets 12-, 13- and 14-year-olds to enjoy geography and history. But this September, he is not going to be back in the classroom because his district relies upon resource jobs and royalties and development to fund schools. And this administration, through the arbitrary and unilateral decisions of the Secretary of the Interior, has cut this funding. This is the administration that stopped new uranium development for 2 years, has postponed offshore drilling decisions, and has postponed oil shale development projects. And for Mr. Pitchford, has taken 77 oil and gas leases and suspended them because they don't think 7 years of study was enough time.

If we do not develop the resources on our public lands, jobs are lost. If we don't have cheap forms of affordable energy, jobs are lost. And those jobs aren't simply a number. They are a face of a real person like Mr. Pitchford, who is no longer a teacher not because of his choice, but because of government decisions. And the collateral damage of these government decisions are the 13- and 14-year-olds in his classroom. Where are the jobs? They're not in Mr. Pitchford's classroom.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question. I don't know if it has been asked yet today. The American people want to know, where are the jobs? We have a Congress that has gone off the tracks. A trillion-dollar stimulus package, that's thousand-dollar bills stacked 63 miles high. Did we get any jobs? No. We have a budget with a \$1.2 trillion deficit built into it. Are we going to get jobs? No. We are going to get inflation and higher interest rates.

We have a cap-and-tax bill that is going to kill American jobs by raising the cost of our traditional sources of energy, coal, nuclear and oil. We have a health care bill on the agenda before the Congress today that is going to kill jobs and raise the cost of health care to the American people rather than contain the cost and create more choice and more competition for the American people.

This Congress is out of control, and the American people want to know, Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs?

MENTAL HEALTH PARITY

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in favor of the health care bill this Congress is considering. It would cap out-of-pocket expenses. It would eliminate preexisting condition discrimination. It would give patients a choice between our own physician and a government plan. It would eliminate lifetime caps for health care. It would eliminate the ability for people to no longer have the choice of having to choose a job and not be able to leave that job because of health care discrimination, no more denial because of a preexisting condition, and mental health parity for all insurance plans, irrespective of mental health preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have mental health screening annually covered, and that is what this bill does so that we treat it as a preventive item. For the 130 million Americans with mental health conditions, this will act as a preventive measure, saving us millions and millions of lives and dollars from suicide and the like.

BIPARTISAN SAFE COMMISSION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I offered a bipartisan commission amendment to the stimulus bill when it came before the Appropriations Committee and it failed. Had that amendment passed, we

could have helped create jobs, deal with the debt and deal with the deficit.

Now 6 months later, we have unemployment rates at a 26-year high, and some say it will go to 11 percent, and some even say 12 and 13 percent.

We have piled another \$787 billion on top of our children and our grandchildren. Social Security is in trouble. Medicare is in trouble. Medicaid is in trouble. Let's pass this bipartisan amendment so we can get control of the debt, get control of the deficit, create a renaissance in this country and create new jobs.

GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE WILL COST JOBS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the health care proposals that are before us have been tried before. Public option was tried in my home State of Tennessee under a plan called TennCare. For more than 10 years, the legislature and three Governors tried to make it work. It has been less than successful. But what has happened is that a program that was supposed to have saved millions, tens of millions of dollars, has never saved one nickel. It also has restricted access. It has driven up the cost of private health insurance, and it has nearly bankrupted the State.

Tennesseans know that rushing to reform health care and doing that wrong is a very expensive process. We all know that costs and access of health care needs to be addressed. No one seriously believes that any of these plans before this House right now is going to do that.

Tennesseans know the cost of rushing and getting it wrong, and the American people are figuring it out because they have seen the majority rush a stimulus, an omnibus, a housingus and a porkulus that has left the American people saying, where are the jobs? And they do not want that to happen in health care.

□ 1330

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must enlist the cooperation of Members in heeding the gavel at the expiration of their time.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS HAVE A PLAN FOR REFORM

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the worst recession in a generation, so what did President Obama and Speaker PELOSI do? Well, they propose a government takeover of health care that will lead to fewer jobs, higher taxes, and less health coverage.

As a physician, I know that government-run health care will end quality care. In addition, since the recession began, 6 million jobs have been lost; yet the Democrats' health care plan includes hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes on small businesses, the job engine creation in this Nation, \$800 billion in new taxes.

According to the economic modeling by the President's own Chief Economic Advisers, the business tax hikes alone would destroy up to 4.7 million jobs, and amazingly, an independent analysis by the nonpartisan Lewin Group found that 114 million Americans would lose their personal, private health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want real solutions to get our economy back on track, not another excuse to raise taxes on small businesses and working families. House Republicans have a plan for reform that expands access to affordable health care and saves jobs.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the facts show that the stimulus has been a dismal failure.

Fact: the administration promised that it would create 3.5 million jobs. Instead, we have lost an additional 2 millions jobs. But not only is the administration and this Congress not succeeding in creating jobs; they're actually rushing to pass legislation that would even create more job losses.

Look, the Pelosi cap-and-trade bill would cost Americans anywhere between 2 million and 3 million jobs a year in additional job losses. The health care proposal would cost Americans 4.7 million jobs lost and lead to \$1.3 trillion in new spending and huge tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to give relief to the job creators like the small businesses; and very respectfully I say, Mr. President, it's time to stop talking. Stop wasting taxpayers' money. Stop irresponsibly borrowing. Stop raising taxes. It's time to focus, focus on creating jobs. That would be a welcome change.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS HIDING OMINOUS NUMBERS FROM THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. In case you missed it, there was an ominous report in yesterday's Washington Post that said the administration is delaying for several weeks the congressionally mandated report on economic growth, job creation, and budget deficits, a report that's due right now.

The administration said yesterday, We're not going to tell you what's in that report for several more weeks. Why? I will tell you why. They don't want to downplay the politically damaging deficit numbers, the unemployment numbers, and the economic growth, or lack of growth, numbers that are in that report.

Why? Because it's an attempt to hide this record-breaking deficit as the Democrat leaders break arms to rush through this government takeover, the experiment in health care. That's why the administration is hiding ominous numbers from the American public.

DEVASTATING JOB LOSSES IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the devastating job losses in my district in California. This Congress, with the help of the Obama administration, has taken away 40,000 jobs and almost \$1 billion of income from the great San Joaquin Valley in California in a foolish attempt to protect a 3-inch fish.

The valley's unemployment now is at 20 percent, with some towns as high as 40 percent. Yet, the mere flick of a switch on the pumps in the delta will restore 40,000 jobs at no cost to the government.

In addition to this careless disregard for the farmers in my district, the Democrat leadership is now ramming through a \$1.2 trillion health care reform measure that will eliminate 4.7 million jobs, small business jobs, and subject farmers to \$500 billion in new taxes. And let's not forget the \$846 billion national energy tax that will result in a 2.3 million job loss and cause the price of everything on the family farm to dramatically increase.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The Democrats are giving them to the little fishies in the San Francisco Bay delta. Go figure.

STIMULUS SPENDING

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the administration argued that an \$800 billion taxpayer-funded spending spree was necessary to create jobs. It was rushed through with no time to review the policies that would implement this massive spending plan.

The administration sold this spending spree as a jobs creation measure. Yet, it turns out that jobs weren't a priority at all.

A \$3.9 billion stimulus funding announcement was made for smart grid investment grants by Vice President BIDEN in which he stated, "This is jobs—jobs."

Well, the Department of Energy didn't seem to get the memo. Application forms for grants asked: "Will DOE use the number of jobs estimated to be created and/or retained as a criterion for rating a proposal for funding?" The grant guidance says: "No."

Where are the jobs? Job creation was supposed to be the primary requisite for receiving recovery funds, and yet it was simply a reporting requirement. It was never about jobs.

WE SHOULD NOT ALLOW A RUSHED GOVERNMENT TAKE-OVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the House leadership prepares to rush to judgment on legislation that will lead to a government takeover of health care, 17 percent of our Nation's economy, it's instructive to look back a few weeks to the cap-and-trade energy debate.

Just before the Fourth of July break, leadership set another deadline to pass what will amount to the largest tax hike in U.S. history.

With unemployment soaring, policies that impose a national energy tax will only make things worse by increasing energy costs for all Americans, crippling small businesses, and putting more people out of their jobs.

Frankly, the legislation we passed is a gift that keeps on giving to our economic rivals like China and India whose economies are already sucking away U.S. manufacturing jobs at an alarming rate. Needless to say, as we saw from Secretary Clinton's recent visit to India, these nations do not plan to impose restrictions on their emissions.

Mr. Speaker, American families are struggling; there's no doubt about it. They're working to make ends meet and they are worrying about their jobs. We should not burden them with a new national energy tax, and we certainly should not allow a rushed government takeover of health care.

CREATING JOBS, NOT DESTROYING THEM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, our economy is in the midst of a historic recession, and millions of Americans have lost their jobs over the past several months despite promises from Speaker PELOSI and President Obama that their extravagant spending would create jobs.

But Americans are a hardworking and resilient people. So I was excited when I heard from a laid off entrepreneurial constituent of mine from Allegheny County, North Carolina, who's working on starting his own business.

He plans to hire around 20 people over the next 2 years.

However, he recently wrote to tell me that if the Democrats' health care bill becomes law, the new taxes and burdensome rules will take a devastating bite out of his ability to grow jobs. In fact, he said he would hire only half the workers if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty. This Congress should be implementing policies that create jobs, instead of burdening entrepreneurs with job-killing taxes and new government mandates and red tape.

THE POLICIES OF THIS ADMINISTRATION ARE LENGTHENING AND DEEPENING THIS RECESSION

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the chilling similarity between the broad-based taxes under the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade tax we passed several weeks ago and the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 that economists blame as one of the major factors in producing the Great Depression.

Another of Hoover's blunders was the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932. Its centerpiece was a radical increase in income tax rates from 25 percent to well over 50 percent.

If that sounds familiar, it should. That's one of the financing proposals in the health care bill that would push State and Federal income tax rates to more than 50 percent in most States.

Mr. Speaker, when I see the same policies from this administration that turned the recession of 1929 into the Depression of the 1930s, I'm reminded of Ben Franklin's observation that "experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other."

Mr. Speaker, these policies are lengthening and deepening this recession because this administration did not even learn from experience.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS THE DEMOCRATS SPENT \$1 TRILLION TO CREATE?

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, I think pushing government-controlled health care is a way for the Democrats to divert attention away from the economy.

The White House said we had to pass a stimulus because it didn't want unemployment over 8 percent. Unemployment is at 9.5 percent and slated to reach higher.

The White House said it didn't want to own General Motors. The government owns General Motors.

The White House said it didn't want any pork in the stimulus. Now, we're

paying money to clear away obstacles for fish and to monitor earthquakes and volcanos.

The White House said it didn't want to increase the deficit. The U.S. deficit broke past \$1 trillion in June, a grim testament to the recession and financial crisis.

I have one question, Where are the jobs the Democrats spent \$1 trillion to create?

HEALTH CARE REFORM MUST TARGET ACCESS TO QUALITY AFFORDABLE CARE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must reform health care. Too many Americans do not have access to quality, affordable health care. Instead of resolving these problems, however, the President prescribes an overhaul that will deny Americans treatments they need and make them wait to get treatments that a new health care commissioner allows.

This is not the way to reform our health care system, and my constituents agree. I've received many calls and letters from Arkansans, like Michael who recently told me he owes his life to the fact that we don't have a system like the British-run government health structure that is being hastily proposed.

In 2007, Michael was diagnosed with renal cell carcinoma, something he's sure his doctor would not have caught had he had his hands tied in red tape health procedures. He owes his life to the care we were able to give through a free-market system.

We cannot rush through legislation that will have serious implications on care Americans like Michael receive. We need to take a reasonable amount of time to listen to the concerns of Americans like Michael and craft a commonsense bill that addresses the real problems.

WE SHOULD NOT BE DECIMATING THE CARE OF OUR SENIOR POPULATION

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week the Democrats released a health care bill which essentially said to America's seniors "drop dead." Despite their promise to care for our seniors, Democrats have decided that it's too expensive to care for my senior constituents and everyone else's constituents.

This bill would cut an additional \$156 billion from the Medicare Advantage program in order to pay for the government expansion of health care for the young, the healthy, and the wealthy.

This, by the way, is the second attack on our seniors this year. The first

came in March when the administration announced that Social Security recipients would not receive a cost-of-living increase.

Listen up, America. Seniors have special needs. This bill ignores the needs of Florida's health care system. We should be fixing what is broke, not decimating the care of our senior population. This is change our Nation cannot afford.

□ 1345

FOCUS ON CREATING JOBS

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting and they're asking, Where are the jobs? The Obama administration and congressional Democrats promised that the stimulus—the trillion-dollar stimulus—would create jobs immediately. Last month alone, we lost almost half a million jobs and unemployment now stands at 9.5 percent.

It's clear the Democrats' trillion-dollar stimulus package isn't working, and their response is to increase spending in the appropriations process by 12 percent, pass a national energy tax that's going to result in increased energy costs, less competitiveness for American jobs, and drive jobs from American shores.

Now they're trying to ram down a health care plan that's going to raise taxes on American business, cost jobs, and force people into a government-run health care plan.

We need to focus on creating jobs—and you do that by holding the line on taxes, controlling spending, and reforming health care. Let's focus on creating jobs and answering the American people's cry for, Where are the jobs?

CONSTRUCTIVE HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It's been fascinating watching some of my friends parade to the floor making some pretty outrageous claims. The most recent one was, my good friend from Florida suggesting that by having the administration follow the law, that if the cost-of-living has not increased sufficiently, so that there isn't a cost-of-living increase for Social Security, somehow this is an administration assault on senior citizens. This is a rather bizarre notion when we think about their record when they were in charge, seeking to undercut formulas like the one in question to move them back in the other direction.

When it comes to health care, when our friends on the other side of the aisle, strong-armed their prescription Medicare drug coverage program into

law; did not seek concessions from the pharmaceutical industry; created the “doughnut hole” that has created a massive gap in coverage and no mechanism to pay for it.

What we’re doing at this point is trying to move forward in a constructive fashion to give the American people choices, follow the law, save money, and improve the quality of care.

BUREAUCRATS IN CHARGE OF HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned about keeping their jobs and the huge deficit that we have incurred here and in the Senate, and passing that debt on down to future generations of our children.

With over a thousand pages, the Democrat health care bill costs too much, spends too much, and will destroy jobs in America. Health care reform should be about lowering costs, providing quality, affordable care for all Americans. And this health care debate must consider that every individual has different health care needs and that Americans are struggling to pay their bills.

The Democrat leadership has failed to address these needs by supporting the same old, tired proposals of massive Federal new spending and increased Federal regulation, which will cost the United States more jobs.

This time, cutting a bigger Federal check won’t do it. Their plan amounts to \$818 billion in new taxes on individuals, on businesses, and a Federal takeover of our health care system. These taxes will crush our small business owners and destroy thousands of jobs.

This plan will put bureaucrats in charge of our health care—and the American people don’t want that.

LET’S PUT OUR HEADS TOGETHER ON HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ENGEL. The majority Democrats in this Congress are trying very hard to pass a health care bill that will be a good bill for the American people. Our friends on the other side of the aisle don’t seem to want to cooperate.

It’s a national disgrace that there are 47 million Americans that have no health care coverage whatsoever. It’s a national disgrace that our emergency rooms are being used to help people that have no coverage whatsoever. It’s a national disgrace that so many of our health care dollars are going into administrative costs.

We are trying to craft a plan that will put America back on the road so that every American will have health care; so that health care as we know it

will be improved; so that people that like their health care can keep their health care, but people that don’t have health care, can get health care.

We know that the system is broken. I don’t want to hear people on the other side of the aisle talk about deficits because when they were in the majority for 12 years, they gave us the biggest deficits in American history and left us with red ink as far as the eye can see.

So I would urge my friends on both sides of the aisle, let’s put our heads together and come up with a real, good health plan that America can be proud of.

URGING CONGRESS TO DO THE RIGHT THING

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Unemployment in my district has hit 14 percent—14 percent. Failed stimulus aside, Washington is doing nothing but making matters worse.

Put yourself in the shoes of the only people that can lift us out of this economic recession—small business owners. Let’s see what they’re facing.

They’re facing higher energy costs because of this Democrat cap-and-trade tax on energy. They’re facing higher health care costs because of a government takeover of health care. They’re looking at higher energy taxes, higher health care costs, and the kicker is, higher personal income taxes. The liberals are already proposing it.

The folks that are running Washington are out of touch with small business owners and are doing the wrong thing on our economy. And I urge the leadership of this Congress to do the right thing. Don’t kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Don’t kill small business owners. And don’t hurt this economy any more.

WASHINGTON PROPOSALS IMPEDING JOB CREATION

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

Mr. DENT. The issue is: Jobs, jobs, jobs. A friend of mine who employs many people in my district said this to me the other day, The policy proposals coming out of Washington are impeding job creation and scaring people. He’s right. And there are five reasons that are driving his concern.

One, a stimulus that spends too much, borrows too much, and delivers too few jobs. Two, a budget that doubles the national debt in 5 years and triples it in 10 years. Three, a card check bill that is undemocratic and imposes binding arbitration. Four, a national energy tax, cap-and-trade, that will cost 66,000 jobs in Pennsylvania and jack up electric bills for con-

sumers. And, five, a House health care bill with enormous tax increases and mandates on small businesses and businesses of all size.

Enough is enough. Time for Washington to get out of the way and let job creators do what they know how to do—create jobs.

DOING NOTHING HAS A PROFOUND COST

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some interesting rhetoric today about the impacts on small businesses and health care reform. Here’s a statistic. If we do nothing, the cost of health care on our small businesses in the United States over the next 10 years will increase to \$2.4 trillion. That’s going to have a crushing burden on the ability of small businesses to do what they do best, which is to create jobs.

Only 48 percent of our small businesses currently provide health care. If we allowed those cost increases to occur by doing nothing in terms of health care reform, we’re guaranteeing fewer Americans will have health care, we’re guaranteeing fewer successes among small businesses that are the job generator in this economy.

Doing nothing has a profound cost. That’s why we need health care reform. We need it now. We’ve waited 6 years. The time has arrived.

DOES ANYBODY SEE WHAT’S HAPPENING?

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, does anybody see what’s happening? Does anybody even care? The \$700 billion TARP program was to buy troubled assets. Did we do that? No. We bought car companies and banks. And we own them. And then we took the money away from the bond holders of the car companies and gave it to the unions.

The \$787 billion stimulus package only stimulated more welfare. It hasn’t created jobs. Not one. And now we have put upon us a government takeover of health care that’s going to lose, according to Christina Romer’s formula, 4.7 million more jobs.

This has never been about jobs for the Democrats. It’s never even been about health care. It’s about power.

Who’s going to make the decisions over your life, the personal decisions? The Democrats think they can. We think you should.

Does anybody see what’s happening? Does anyone even care?

WE CAN DO BETTER

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, \$700 million for wild horses last Friday; \$50 million for rare cranes and rare dogs and cats that don't even live in this country. We've got habitat problems in this country. The \$800 billion stimulus hasn't stimulated anything except unemployment.

I just left a crime hearing and we found out that out of 207,000 people in Federal prison, 53,000 of them are not citizens. They're non-U.S. citizens. They're here—most of them, they said, were probably illegal. So there's 53,000 jobs Americans didn't want, committing crimes in America. We had to outsource that.

But this is too serious. I know as a former judge, if somebody had come in and said, Here's a mom who has all these kids and grandchildren and she's gone to a bank and said, Give me money, loan me money, I can't control my spending, you would take those beautiful children away and give them to somebody that would be responsible. We can do better.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it's time to admit the failure of Obamanomics. Where are the jobs? Since we enacted the President's economic program, 2 million more are unemployed in this land—9.6 percent unemployment, the highest in a quarter of a century.

So what do we have to show for Obamanomics? \$143 billion more dollars of taxpayer bailout money. The first trillion-dollar deficit in our Nation's history. We had the national debt to be increased, tripled—triple—in the next 10 years.

We have found the historic debt, we have found the historic deficits, we have found the historic bailouts, Mr. Speaker. But where are the jobs?

You cannot bail out, borrow, and spend your way into prosperity. It does not work. It is time to put America back to work with tax relief for small businesses and American families. That's the Republican plan.

WHERE THE JOBS WENT

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. A number of my colleagues today have asked, Where are the jobs? Well, I don't know exactly where the jobs are because they haven't appeared. But I can tell you where the jobs went, at least in one company, and that's Chrysler.

When the Democrats opened this Congress, 4,000 people at Chrysler out of work. We honored a United States Senator. That's a nice piece of legislation.

But then things began to get serious. Almost 10,000 people out of work. The most important thing they could put on the floor is Supporting the Goals and Ideals of National Teen Dating.

Eleven thousand people out of work, we had to pass the Monkey Safety Act. Everybody likes safe monkeys. Thirteen thousand people out of work; Great Cats and Rare Canids Act. Sixteen thousand people out of work; Honoring Arnold Palmer. And 18,000 Chrysler workers out of work, the most important thing the majority could put on the floor is National Train Day.

But now they're getting serious because later today we are going to vote on Supporting the Goals of National Dairy Month.

That's the jobs.

MORE CREATIVE SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as Congress takes on the essential task of strengthening America's health care system, we have a choice here to either rush legislation costing more than \$1 trillion or to have a serious analysis on the fundamental question as to how we actually improve health care outcomes, reduce costs, and protect vulnerable persons.

One major consideration should be how any health care proposal will affect small businesses. Small businesses generate 60 to 80 percent of all new jobs each year in this country. In my hometown of Lincoln, Nebraska, 80 percent of those in the private sector are employed in businesses with 25 or fewer employees.

This current plan would place an 8 percent payroll tax on certain small businesses who do not or cannot provide government-mandated coverage.

Mr. Speaker, one study suggests that as many as 4.7 million jobs could be lost as a direct result of this overall health care proposal. This does not help anyone.

There are more creative solutions to get people the care they need, help families manage ever-increasing costs, and help small business entrepreneurs provide the benefits for their employees.

□ 1400

THE RECORD ON JOB CREATION

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

Mr. HOYER. I have been listening to this litany of "Where are the jobs?" I have been here long enough. Mr. PENCE, you opposed the program in 1993. You said it would destroy this economy. You said it would blow deficits sky high. It created 216,000 jobs per month on average.

You then supported an economic program in 2001. You said it would be a

haven for jobs and small business and all that. You created not 216,000 jobs per month but 4,240. Those are the figures. I'm sure that you will all want to come here and say, "No, Hoyer was wrong on those figures."

Under the economic program we propose, 216,000 new jobs every month on average. Under your program for the last 8 years under the Bush administration, 4,240 per month. That is a very substantial difference between 20.8 million new jobs under the economic program that you did not support in 1993 that we proposed, passed, and President Clinton signed.

So when you talk about jobs, you ought to talk about the experience that you've had under our program and your program. You failed. We succeeded. As a matter of fact, in the last year of the Bush administration, we lost 3 million-plus jobs. During the last year of the Clinton administration, we gained 1.9 million jobs. That's a 5 million job turnaround by your economic program.

So keep talking. America knew the difference. America made a decision. They said what you had been doing was not what they wanted so they changed. In 2006, they changed the Congress, and in 2008 they changed the Presidency.

And let me tell you something. We have lost 200,000 less jobs per month than Bush lost in his last 3 months in office, over the last 3 months. Now, is that where we want to be? It is not. But it is 200,000 better than the last 3 months in your administration. Those are the facts. Refute them if you can. Keep talking.

THIS ADMINISTRATION IS ASLEEP AT THE WHEEL

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Leader and Mr. Speaker, where are those jobs? We have the highest unemployment rate since the 1930s. They say a picture speaks a thousand words.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCAUL. Well, look at this picture.

Mr. HOYER. I thought it was since 1982 when Ronald Reagan was President.

Mr. MCCAUL. Reclaiming my time, they say a picture speaks a thousand words. Well, look at this picture right here because it says it all.

This is a picture of Larry Summers, the President's top economic adviser. Look at him. He's not creating jobs. He is asleep. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, this administration is asleep at the wheel.

The Vice President recently said that we can spend our way out of bankruptcy. What? Really? Spend our way out of bankruptcy? What happened to Economics 101? I think the American people are smarter than that.

Instead of cutting taxes and spending, which has historically worked, instead, we are enacting policies that

will devastate our economy; a national energy tax that will kill 2.5 million jobs and, according to the President, skyrocket energy prices. A health care bill that, according to the CBO, will spend over \$1 trillion and kill 4.7 million jobs.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the American people to wake up.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PENCE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR of Arizona). The gentleman from Indiana will state his inquiry.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask, as both I and my record were directly challenged by the distinguished majority leader on the floor, and given the fact that I've already utilized my 1 minute extended during the debate at the opening of this session, when a Member's record is challenged on the floor of the Congress, does a Member, under the Rules of the House, have the opportunity to obtain time when the distinguished majority leader refuses to yield time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only if someone yields to the gentleman.

Mr. PENCE. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, is it proper for a Member to direct an entire address to another Member of the body as opposed to the Chair or the Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must direct their remarks to the Chair, not to others in the second person.

Mr. PENCE. Further parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be heard.

Mr. PENCE. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, would it have been in order for the distinguished majority leader to raise questions about my record and the positions that I've taken here in the Congress during the course of my career in the context of floor debate under these rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot issue an advisory opinion on a question of order not timely presented.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to address the statement that was made by the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has the gentleman from Indiana previously been recognized for a 1-minute?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Is there a rule that prohibits this body from agreeing to a unanimous consent request to allow a Member to be recognized?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman seeking recognition to speak for 1 minute?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am recognized for a parliamentary inquiry, as I understand it. My parliamentary inquiry is: Does there exist a rule that prohibits a Member from being recognized to speak under a unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a matter of recognition. As the Chair stated before, if the gentleman has already had a 1-minute, he is not allowed a second.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair could recognize for a unanimous consent request that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to speak out of order.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would entertain that request from the gentleman from Indiana.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader came to the floor moments ago, and he asked the question that Republicans have been asking since midday today. It's a question that millions of Americans are asking, "Where are the jobs?"

Now the leader—I know it was unintentional—misstated my record, saying that when I was here in 1993 that I opposed health care reform. In fact, I was elected to Congress in the year 2000. But it was an honest mistake and a misstatement of fact, and I acknowledge it.

But can I just suggest, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the millions of Americans that may be looking in, let's stop looking to the errors of the past by Democrats or Republicans and let's come together today to create jobs for the American people.

Republicans are here to say that a government takeover of health care, financed by \$1 trillion in tax increases is a disaster for this economy. It is unconscionable for this majority and this administration to insist on the adoption of a government takeover of health care financed by \$1 trillion of tax increases during the worst recession in 25 years.

As the distinguished majority leader just said, Republicans say with one voice, "Where are the jobs?"

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Well, Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? That's what the American people want to know. What they know is the plan that the Democrats have isn't working, spending money we do not have. Not just a little bit of money but trillions of dollars that we don't have.

Chairman Bernanke spoke to the House Financial Services Committee today, and he said: Maintaining the confidence of the public and the financial markets requires that policy measures begin planning now for restoration of fiscal balance. Unless we demonstrate a strong commitment to fiscal sustainability, we will have neither fiscal financial stability nor doable economic growth.

I'll interpret that for you. If we keep spending money we do not have, we are not going to create jobs. We are going to lose more jobs.

Last week, the Federal deficit in this country reached \$1 trillion. If you started counting to \$1 trillion, it would take you 17,000 years.

We're talking about real money. We cannot continue on this spending spree that Congress is in, spending money that we do not have.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The American people want their jobs back.

THE FAILED POLICIES OF THE PAST 6 MONTHS SHOULD NOT BE REPEATED

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The President and Speaker PELOSI came to this House early this year and said, if you'll borrow and spend \$1.1 trillion, which is the largest spending bill in American history, it's going to save existing jobs and create another 3 million jobs. Well, where are those jobs?

They say, Well, you know, we had to spend that money because we couldn't go to the failed policies of the past and repeat those. Well, they would like to rewrite history. But the fact is, in 2003, this Congress passed one of the largest tax cuts on small businesses in America in our history, and it was followed by over 50 months of consecutive job growth, the largest consecutive period of time of expansion of jobs in American history.

I would suggest to you, the only failed policies of the past that we shouldn't repeat are the failed policies of the past 6 months.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the leader, where are the jobs? I listened attentively. I pricked my ears up. I thought I was going to find out where the jobs are. I didn't hear that answer.

I looked back at what happened for the 108th and 109th Congress. Members of the Democrats came down on the floor and they said, Just put us in charge and we'll solve the problem. They won the majority, and we saw a hockey stick graph going downward of industrial investment. That's what happened to our economy; it reacted to the Democrat majority.

You elected President Obama. Now you don't have any excuses, and you are angry because we are asking, "Where are the jobs?"

There are 14.5 to 14.7 million unemployed, another 6.8 million that are simply looking for a job that don't fit into that category, 21.3 million people looking for jobs in the United States, all of this under Democrat leadership.

We had historically low unemployment and a growing economy because we lowered taxes, and we kept the pressure off of regulation. You are turning this into the nationalization of the private sector and the health insurance industry, and the American people don't want to live in the kind of countries that exist on the east side of the Atlantic Ocean or north of the 49th parallel.

Where are the jobs?

IMPORTANCE OF JOBS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hear a recurring theme about jobs: Where are they? Who has them? Who doesn't have one?

In a different life, I participate at a needs assessment in a community that I lived in that went through a process of looking at what needs were in families, in neighborhoods, and in the community. Once we distilled that list down to the top 10 needs for this particular community in Midland, Texas, if you looked at them, out of all 10 of those, nine of those needs would have been positively impacted by a job.

You cannot overstate the importance of jobs in the private sector, because when you have jobs in the private sector, individuals are better, families are better, communities are better, and this Nation, as a whole, is better.

I can tell you where the jobs aren't. Here is a list of 53 new boards, commissions, and bureaucracies that are created under the health care plan that is percolating its way through this system. That plan will cost 4.7 million private sector jobs, but it will do a good job of creating additional bureaucrat jobs that don't create wealth and don't

improve the overall economy of this country.

Mr. Speaker, where are those private sector jobs?

ALABAMA IS SUFFERING FROM A HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, in February, the administration assured us that if Congress would pass the stimulus bill, then we would see immediate relief and halt unemployment at 8 percent; yet it is now 9.5 percent on average, and it's rising. But the jobs have yet to appear. So where are the jobs?

This problem hits home for me because Alabama is suffering from a greater unemployment rate than the national trend. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama unemployment rate topped 10 percent in June. It is the highest level since July of 1984. The June rate of 10.1 percent is up from 9.8 percent in the previous month of May.

At this time last year, Alabama's jobless rate was half that at only 4.6 percent. The current unemployment rate is 10.1 percent. That represents over 215,000 unemployed Alabamians. The congressional district that I represent is suffering even more with an unemployment rate of about 12 percent, and that's on the average.

At a time when families are struggling to make ends meet, the unemployment rate is rising, further evidence that we cannot borrow and spend our way back to a growing economy.

□ 1415

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. KING of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, 6 months after the Democratic administration came in with such promise, tens and tens of millions of Americans are asking, Where are the jobs?

Instead, during the past 6 months we've seen the systematic mismanaging and dismantling of the American economy. We've seen a stimulus bill which cost over \$1 trillion in new spending with almost no tax relief for small business, with almost no needed infrastructure, but again, money on top of money. The President said jobs would come almost immediately. Instead, the situation gets worse by the week.

We saw a cap-and-tax so-called energy bill which is going to result in millions of jobs going to China and India.

And now we see a health care bill which will ration medical care, at the same time, according to the CBO, increase medical costs, the worst of all worlds.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the American people to tell this administration and this Democratic-controlled Congress to work together in a bipartisan way so we can say, here come the jobs, not seeing the jobs leave our country, not seeing millions of millions of people being unemployed because of failed liberal Democrat policies.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, America is facing an unemployment and mortgage crisis unlike anything we have seen since the Great Depression.

Only months ago, President Obama pledged that he would create 3½ million jobs by the end of 2010 and told us that the unemployment rate would stay below 8 percent if we passed the allegedly urgent trillion-dollar "economic stimulus" bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, since the President has assumed office, employment has dropped by over 2½ million jobs. We've lost 8 million jobs since the beginning of the Democrat-led 110th Congress, and half a million of those were in June alone.

The jobless rate stands at 9.5 percent, and the President himself admits that it's likely to climb over 10 percent.

This Congress and this administration must be reminded by the American people that what comprises true economic growth are jobs and economic productivity by the people. Higher taxes, increased regulation, reckless spending, bureaucratic selection of economic winners and losers and out-of-control deficit spending, these are the Democrat policies of the last five months, and they diminish productivity instead of encouraging it. They will kill jobs. And unless we change course, Mr. Speaker, this country faces an unprecedented economic failure.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today troubled about the Democrats' proposed government takeover of our health care system. The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that this legislation will not reduce costs but, rather, drive health costs up higher for American families.

In addition to rising costs, according to the White House's chief economic adviser, Christina Romer, business tax hikes alone could destroy up to 4.7 million jobs.

Congress should consider free-market and Tax Code reforms to make our health care system better.

The President and his majority in Congress failed to produce jobs with the so-called stimulus. Where are the jobs?

Why should we trust them with revising the one-sixth of our economy based on health care, when their own advisers say it will mean millions of more jobs lost?

EMPOWERING PATIENTS

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I actually applaud the goal of our Democratic colleagues in terms of the health bill they are putting out. Access, quality, and controlling costs are things that we should all aspire for. Absolutely.

And I agree with parts of the legislation. Guaranteed access, for example, is just wonderful. But, of course our concern is that CBO comment that it's not going to control cost, not achieve one of these goals, but rather, reset it to increase it. And we know as the cost of health care increases, that will be one more thing that inhibits growth and jobs.

So what can we do? One, we do need fundamental reform, which, as the CBO has pointed out, this bill does provide. We need to put the patient in charge of health care decisions and dollars. We need to empower patients to make value-conscious decisions, empower them with the information they need for reasonable decisions by increasing transparency on the pricing of health care.

Let's empower them by incentivizing wellness programs at lower costs and improved lives. Let's empower them with things such as HSAs, which have been shown to decrease costs by 30 percent and, indeed, give insurance to those previously uninsured. Empowering patients is the only way to lower cost and increase access.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BACHUS. I just came from a hearing with Chairman Bernanke. There were some questions he could answer, but others he couldn't answer. We asked him, Where are the jobs? He couldn't answer that question. He said unemployment would remain high through 2011. He said he's not sure that the stimulus created any jobs. It might, but he couldn't answer that.

He did answer one important question, though; and he was very certain. He said, if we continue spending like we're spending today, we're on a rendezvous with financial disaster. He said, and he left no doubt, that we had to reduce our spending, that the deficit was going to threaten the prosperity of our Nation, not only our children and our grandchildren, but today, tomorrow. He said, we have to reduce spending. He said, spending is out of control. He said, the baby boomers in the next

year or two would overwhelm the Federal budget. He said, bring down the spending.

LET'S DO IT RIGHT

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation is facing record unemployment, we may well worsen the job situation if the proposed health care bill passes in its current version; 4.7 million more jobs are estimated to be lost and a trillion dollars in more taxes. That's bad medicine.

We still have not addressed the hundreds of billions in health care waste, but are proposing spending hundreds of billions more. We should not be substituting the barriers, burdens and, bureaucracy of insurance companies with the barriers, burdens, and bureaucracy of Uncle Sam's health insurance company.

I want to get people back to work. I want to make sure they're covered by health care. I want our Committee on Energy and Commerce to reconvene to get to work on this bill. It is going to take time. We need to take the time to fix this. Let's do it right. But let's not work towards artificial deadlines, and let's get America back to work with good health care.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I believe in health care reform. I have been fighting for it since I got here in 1995.

I came to the floor this morning to talk about this amendment. It's an amendment that was rejected by the Democrats last night. It says that no Federal employee should be able to dictate how a medical provider practices medicine. And it was rejected by the Democrats. Apparently Democrats in their health care bill want Federal employees, bureaucrats to dictate how your medical provider practices medicine. I think that's shocking. I don't want a Federal bureaucrat between me and my doctor or between you and your doctor.

But I got here and discovered that we are not supposed to ask, Where are the jobs? I don't get it. What's embarrassing about that question? It's a fair question. Where are the jobs?

When the Obama administration was sworn in, unemployment was 7.6 percent. When the stimulus passed, it was 8.1 percent. And today, it's 9.5 percent. And we're not supposed to ask where are the jobs? I think it's a legitimate question. I guess it's an embarrassing question. I'd like to know where the jobs are.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO PUT PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office, and I heard a lot of folks asking where the jobs were.

I downloaded an article from the Evansville Courier Press, which happens to be in Indiana. It says: "Stimulus has Hoosiers working."

I'll make a few quotes out of this article: "More than 2,400 people are now at work on Federal stimulus-funded roadway projects in Indiana, according to a state report being released today."

"'Things were slowing down, and the stimulus filled in the gap,' said Tim Mahoney, an economics professor at the University of Southern Indiana. 'It's kept the people employed that would be laid off,'" says that same article.

"What's clear is that the stimulus projects have boosted an industry otherwise floundering in Indiana."

"'In general, it definitely puts our people to work,' said Pete Bjorkman, the chief estimator for Evansville-based J.H. Rudolph" construction company.

"Our crews are going to be working more hours and more days because of this . . .," he said. 'It is creating more crews, more hours for our people that wouldn't have been there before.'

Mr. Speaker, I listened in the office to the stuff being said back and forth. To the folks in the audience and the people that are walking out there, Mr. Speaker, they're tired of this crap that's going on back and forth. We need to work together to put people back to work.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, the present unemployment rate in the United States is 9.5 percent and climbing, and the American people are hurting. Our economic downturn is a challenge that will require prompt bipartisan action.

As Congress moves forward with the national debate on the economy, it is imperative that we detract from illogical partisan bickering and avoid the empty political posturing that got us into this mess in the first place.

The American people have real problems, and they want real solutions that require less talk and more action.

I represent a district that is over 60 percent African American, and I have seen firsthand how this economic slump has disproportionately hurt minorities more than any other group in the United States. Among African Americans, the rate of unemployment and uninsured workers is highest.

While there are a number of options for getting our economy back on track, it is important to remember that our

Nation's proudest achievements have developed with a bipartisan, solutions-oriented consensus.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, my friends are asking, Where are the jobs? It's a good question because we were told in February, when the stimulus package was passed, that four or five million jobs would be created. Since then we've lost 1,963,000 jobs.

It's not bad enough that we're not doing anything to create jobs from the administration's side. But we're actually doing things to kill more jobs.

I just left a markup for the Education Committee where the majority is killing a program that has been very successful since 1965, has helped millions of students go to college and provided an education for them, and now they're eliminating that program, along with it, 40,000 jobs.

I have constituents at home that are really suffering. They're asking, Where are the jobs? It's about time you started doing something to produce them.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, people are asking, Where are the jobs? And I think it's an appropriate question to ask.

I myself get a little leery when any administration, any administration, says that they're going to create jobs. They do so for a while, but government jobs don't last very long, or they shouldn't last very long.

What the administration should do, and this Congress, is create an environment in which private sector jobs can be created. And that's what we're not doing with this health care bill. This health care bill will kill jobs, not create them. It doesn't create an environment where jobs can be created.

Now, the administration and this Congress say we've got to get to work. But last week, last Friday we spent an entire day on a welfare-for-wild-horses bill. There's an old Garth Brooks song that says, wild horses keep dragging me away. And, apparently, wild horses keep dragging this Congress away from actually creating an environment where jobs can be created. And this health care bill goes the wrong direction.

□ 1430

GOVERNMENT IN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FARR. I hear from the other side that government takes over health care. I'm just wondering which one of you Members is going to give up your Navy doctors downstairs to take care of you. Which one of you is going to give up your Federal health care plan which insures all the members of your family? Which one of you is going to give up Medicare for all of your constituents? Which one of you is going to give up the veterans' care in the veterans' clinics that are in your districts? Which one of you who loves the military that is doing such a great job of defending our country in Iraq and in Afghanistan is going to take away the military TRICARE program?

Yes, government is involved in health care. It sure is. That's what our country is surviving and living on. Let's make this work and stop attacking each other.

A LOT OF TALK ON THE SECOND STIMULUS

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk recently about the potential of a second stimulus package. Why would we need such a second stimulus? Because the first one didn't work. It's not rocket science, and the American people know it.

What the American people don't want to hear is that prior Congresses or that prior administrations used to do this, or that prior Congressmen were engaged in this, that or the other. What Americans want now is leadership and solutions moving forward, not how things used to be.

I'm new here. I came here because the American people were sick and tired of the way things used to work. Unemployment will soon reach double digits, and it already has in my district, the 16th District of Florida.

The first stimulus didn't work because the Federal Government is not capable of taking taxpayer money and properly redistributing it. So let's have a second stimulus package. Let's give tax breaks to small businesses and to small business owners. Let them hire and keep the people that they want to work for them. That's the American way. America works when people make it work, not when the government takes over.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members—and this is not directed at the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), who just spoke—that Members should address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, California unemployment is at 11.6 percent, and State Democrats in California destroyed the job market and the manufacturing base there through bureaucratic overregulation, unrealistic mandates and punitive fees and taxes. Congressional Democrats here in Washington are following California's lead with the national energy tax that's going to cost every American family \$3,000 a year and with the job-killing health care plan projected to cost over 4 million jobs.

I've simply come to the easy conclusion that Democrats don't like small business. I've come to the conclusion that Democrats don't like jobs. Those of us in California have seen this movie before, and it ends like "Thelma and Louise"—with the economy driving off a cliff in the Grand Canyon. And it's being driven by congressional Democrats.

GOVERNMENT DOES NOT KNOW BEST WITH REGARD TO HEALTH CARE

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, only in Washington, D.C., does government know best. My friends on the other side of the aisle think they know how to create jobs: stimulus I and possibly II, cap-and-trade, health care reform, higher taxes, more regulation, more government intervention. The Democrats think this is going to create wealth and jobs in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be about the business of overhauling taxes, of bringing commonsense regulation reform to the people, of giving people real choice to make decisions for their health care between them and their doctors. It is about empowering people, not government. What I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker, is not socialism. It's freedom. With all that our colleagues on the other side have done, and with all that they propose to spend, I ask a simple question, Mr. Speaker: Where are the jobs?

THE DEMOCRAT SPAGHETTI DINNER OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this chart is not a spaghetti dinner. It may look like it, but it's the Democrats' health care plan. If you were a person out in the hinterlands, looking at this, you would think, How in the world am I going to get health care coverage for me and for my family if I have to go through all of that? It's going to cost trillions of dollars—trillions.

In addition to that, there are going to be jobs created, 4.7 million jobs in China and in India, and their energy bill, cap-and-trade, is going to create 2.5 million new jobs in India and in China because it's going to drive jobs offshore because the small businesspeople will not be able to afford to pay all of these bills and taxes that the government is creating right now.

The Democrats need to do something. They need to cut taxes and help the small businessman make a profit and create new jobs. If they do that, we will have jobs, but right now, we don't know where the jobs are. Unemployment was supposed to cap at 8 percent. In Indiana, it's close to 10 percent. It's going to go to 12, 14, 15 percent if they don't change and change now.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, if we're all real quiet and if we turn down the rhetoric and if we listen very attentively, I think we can hear the voices of our constituents back home—the people who pay the taxes of this country. What are they saying? What question are they asking? Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs, Mr. President? Well, we're not hearing them, are we?

They've seen the \$800 billion stimulus package that was passed through this House, that was rammed down our throats and that had no effect. In fact, we've gone the other direction. Instead of increasing employment, we've gone the other way. We're now at 9.5 percent, headed towards double digits. What is the solution? A second stimulus is being talked about. Is that really what we need to do? In this last stimulus, there was a little bitty piece for small businesses. They're the ones that generate the jobs. They're the ones that can turn this economy around. They're the ones that can hire the people. Yet we ignore them. We turn our backs on them.

Oh, there are those voices again. I think I can hear them. Yes, they're louder this time. They say, Where are the jobs, Mr. President? Where are the jobs?

OBAMA MISERY INDEX

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the chart next to me shows the Obama Misery Index, OMI, which reveals a stunning rise in debt and in unemployment. "Oh, my," I think, is the right title for the index of current and future burdens that Americans face.

Despite campaign pledges of fiscal responsibility and of job creation, since Inauguration Day, we've seen an \$800

billion stimulus bill, massive energy taxes and a legislative agenda that has resulted in a rapidly growing debt alongside rising unemployment. Taken together, these figures define the effect of the President's policies to date, not only revealing their failure to deliver jobs for today's workers but an even larger government tab for our children and grandchildren to pay. Already the unemployment and debt on President Obama's watch is a stunning 40.6 percent—the current Obama Misery Index actually felt by the American people.

After the Vice President's recent claim that the government needs to spend more money to keep from going bankrupt and after the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, Director suggests that the \$1 trillion Democrat health care bill will add to the country's budget problems, this measure may only worsen in months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs?

FUTURE JOB LOSSES AT RURAL HOSPITALS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of job loss at rural hospitals if the current health proposal were to become law. The Democrats' public plan assumes reimbursement rates based on Medicare.

In the July letter from the Blue Dog Coalition to Speaker PELOSI, the coalition reported that Medicare reimbursement pays, on average, 20-30 percent lower than private plans. Actual costs are made up through private insurance reimbursement, which will be gone if the Democratic plan plays out. This will have a severe negative impact on rural hospitals, and it will leave us asking: Where are the jobs?

Many providers suffer financial losses as a result of treating Medicare patients. The lower rates make it more difficult for rural providers, who serve higher percentages of elderly and low-income patients. A new public plan with rates similar to Medicare's will create a financial result that will be unsustainable for even the Nation's most efficient, high-quality providers. The result is a loss of good jobs in rural America.

During this time of economic downturn, we need to be focused on the retention of existing jobs and on encouraging and not discouraging our rural hospitals.

FREEDOM OF AMERICANS TO CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President visited Michigan. With an unemployment rate of 15.2 percent, we were hoping that the Presi-

dent would answer the question: Mr. President, where are the jobs? When will the jobs come back to Michigan?

We had hoped that the President would have come to Michigan and would have recognized that raising taxes, that excessive spending and that more regulation wouldn't work, because that is what we've done in Michigan. We now have the highest unemployment rate in the country.

Mr. President, take a look at Michigan. Recognize that we need to reduce taxes, that we need to control spending and that we need to reduce regulation to get this economy moving.

America and Michigan will begin moving forward again when we empower its people, not when we empower the bureaucracy and the governments in Washington or in Lansing. It's about freedom. Give our constituents the freedom to spend their money to create their jobs.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue this question of: Where are the jobs?

The gentleman who spoke just before me is from Michigan, where their unemployment is upwards of 14 percent. Oregon's unemployment rate is now over 12.2 percent and is second only to Michigan.

Our basic industries have been shut down. My part of the State, by Federal policy, prevents us from even harvesting burned dead trees in a timely manner from our Federal forest lands and accessing our resources. Now along comes legislation that says if you take woody biomass off Federal land and use it to make new, clean, efficient energy, if it comes up as certain types of stands, it doesn't count. It's not renewable. So the jobs that would go with the creation of that were really diminished or were taken away fully by the cap-and-tax legislation, which we know is going to cost 1 million or 2 million jobs in this great State of ours.

I was out in John Day and Nyssa and Burns this weekend and Baker City. Everywhere I went at town meetings, the rooms were full, and people were asking, What are they doing to us in Washington? Where are the jobs?

CUT TAXES, CONTROL SPENDING, CREATE A COMMONSENSE ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the reason our economy is not creating jobs is that small business owners are asking themselves, What's coming next out of this place? Always remember this, Mr. Speaker: The American people are smart. Small business owners

are smart, but they're apprehensive; they're anxious about what's coming next from this Congress.

Is, in fact, this Congress going to pass cap-and-trade that's going to raise the cost of energy? Is, in fact, this cost of energy going to raise taxes? Is this Congress going to federally take over health care and make health care decisions for every single family and for every single small business owner out there?

That's why we're not creating jobs. We need to do what we know always works: cut taxes, get spending under control and enact a commonsense energy policy.

CUT TAXES, CREATE JOBS, REBUILD THE ECONOMY

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address how this Congress and this administration are handling the number one concern on the minds of Americans today—jobs. Despite promises of quick action and of immediate returns, hard-working parents in my district and around the country are still staying up nights, worrying about whether they will have jobs in the next month, in the next day or in the next week to provide for their children.

In response, House and Senate leaders' only answer seems to be higher taxes and massive new government spending. Already our children and grandchildren are on the hook for the \$1 trillion so-called "stimulus bill" that has resulted in almost 10 percent unemployment nationwide, even higher in my home State of Illinois.

Now the House leadership seems intent on pushing through another \$1 trillion-plus health care takeover that only promises more taxes on small businesses and working families. The result: fewer jobs except for Washington bureaucrats who will be rationing out health care procedures for patients.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. Let's work together on real solutions to cut taxes, to create the jobs and to rebuild this economy, not just more Washington spending with no end in sight.

□ 1445

JOBS ARE BEING SHREDDED

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, a hundred of my colleagues have come and asked, Mr. Speaker, "Where are the jobs?" We passed a stimulus bill months ago, and in Ohio, we had 33,000 jobs lost just last month. The jobs I see created, Mr. Speaker, are here in Washington—czars, commissars—not real people back in Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? We passed a bill on this floor creating a national energy tax which is going to cost Ohioans hundreds of thousands of jobs. We're debating a health care bill where small business owners are concerned that they're going to shed additional jobs at a time when we need small business owners to create more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Ohioans, as this chart points out, are shredding jobs in this administration, are shredding jobs this year. We're creating a record amount of deficits, record debt, higher taxes. All Americans want, all Ohioans want, Mr. Speaker, are jobs.

Where are the jobs?

JOBS ARE HEADED TO INDIA AND CHINA

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of the day is "Where are the jobs?" I will tell you where they're not. They're not in Michigan. Our unemployment is 15.2 percent. And sadly, in this House, we passed an awful energy bill a couple of weeks ago called cap-and-trade. That bill will add nearly a trillion dollars to the cost of businesses and homes across this country. Does that help with jobs? Absolutely not.

In fact, one of my constituents in Michigan said their utility increases, their electricity costs will go up by nearly 40 percent by the year 2024. Is that going to help with jobs? Absolutely not.

Did the Rules Committee allow us to add jobs with an amendment that would build perhaps as many as 100 new nuclear reactors in this country, tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of jobs? No. The Rules Committee said, You cannot offer that amendment.

Now, where are the jobs going? They're going to India and China. Did you happen to see on July 16 The New York Times where Secretary Chu said that if China's emissions of global warming gasses keep growing at the pace of the last 30 years, the country will emit more gasses in the next three decades than the United States.

Where are the jobs?

TWO AGENDAS

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my State of Georgia now has an unemployment rate in excess of 10 percent. As you've heard, other States are in worse condition. We are asking today the question of where are the jobs. We spent millions and billions, and perhaps even now trillions, of dollars throwing money at the problem, and yet the job losses continue.

The legislative agenda that's been adopted by this administration and by this House has primarily two pieces of

legislation. First is the cap-and-trade, a bill that is setting us on a path that has already been followed by some of our European countries, Spain in particular. They set out on this path of green jobs over a decade ago. The result is 17.5 percent unemployment. The green bubble burst, and for every job they created, they lost 2.2 jobs.

The second major approach of this House has been the new health care reform bill, a bill that will tax employers 8 percent of their payroll amounts if they do not provide health insurance for their employees. What does that mean? New jobs? No. It means losing jobs that we already have.

Mr. Speaker, it's appropriate to ask, where are the jobs?

THE MORE CONGRESS SPENDS, THE WORSE THINGS ALWAYS SEEM TO TURN OUT

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, the stimulus bill was advertised as a way to reduce unemployment and help put this economy back on track. The blue line on this chart represents the projected path of the unemployment rate. That was below 8 percent prior to the stimulus being passed. The red line shows, in fact, what actually happened since the stimulus bill was passed. It was well-intended, but surely it was misguided.

Now, the more Congress spends, the worse things always seem to turn out. So let's get out of the bailout business. Let's get out of the stimulus business. Let's get out of the national energy tax business, and let's not get into the health care business. Let's let the free enterprise system and the small businesses that made this economy great stay strong and create jobs.

WE SHOULD BE SPURRING JOB CREATION

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, accompanying the spike in the private sector job losses throughout our economy, we have seen a massive government intrusion into the private market. This Chamber recently passed cap-and-tax legislation which gives Washington 17 percent over the economy. If we move towards nationalized health care—the next priority for the administration—it could shift another 16 percent of our economy towards Washington, D.C.

The Federal Government already runs General Motors and Chrysler. It now has a huge equity stake in dozens of our financial institutions. We've witnessed a massive \$800 billion stimulus package that has failed to deliver the promise of an increase in job growth. And this flawed approach has failed to deliver because government spending does not increase the size of the economic pie. What it simply does is take

money out of the private sector and shift it to the government.

Real economic growth has always and will always come from the private sector. And instead of continuing this trend, shifting our economy to one centered on bureaucrats, which is exponentially increasing our deficit and killing off the private sector, we should be spurring job creation.

JOB-KILLING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose efforts by the majority to rush through a misguided health care experiment that will greatly increase the already sky-high unemployment in my State. At a time when Floridians are facing double-digit unemployment, Congress should not be pushing through a government takeover of health care that will be paid for by a tax hike on small businesses.

And a recession nearing double-digit unemployment nationally will discourage job growth and creation leading to even higher unemployment and people with employer-based health insurance being forced onto the government plan. This job-killing tax, combined with the crushing debt some in Congress have been piling on our children and grandchildren to pay for Big Government programs, will make it much more difficult for future generations to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to reject this small business tax.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS AND TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say three things: Where are the jobs? Where is the transparency that was promised? And where will the savings come from in a health care proposal that, in fact, starts off by talking about savings while, in fact, increasing spending?

You don't need a new tax if everything is already taxed and you are going to save. You only need a new tax if, in fact, you are going to spend more money, create more waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, the President said we would not go above 8 percent, that the stimulus would in fact drive down the tendency towards unemployment and, in fact, create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? They were not created.

Mr. Speaker, the President said that this administration would have unparalleled access and transparency, and yet the special IG for the Troubled Asset Relief Program has said just the opposite, that he's being blocked at

every step, that, in fact, he's not getting the transparency that he was promised.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Where is the transparency?

AMERICA'S RIGHT TO KNOW MONTH

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I propose that we make August America Right to Know month. That means Americans have a right to know what this Congress is doing in proposals that change their lives, and what I'm talking about is the health care legislation.

Just a couple of days ago, we marked up this legislation in the Ways and Means Committee, about a thousand pages, and it came to us 3 minutes before midnight the day prior to us marking it up.

We had an amendment in the committee that said, If we're going to impose this new health care system on the American people, Members of Congress, themselves, should be put into this system. What happened to that amendment? It went down by a party-line vote. Republicans said "yes"; Democrats, except for Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, said "no."

We also said let's recognize the fact that we're taxing people, a lot of taxes on people earning less than \$250,000. That violates the pledge people believed they had in the last election. What was the vote? The Republicans said, no, let's not tax people earning less than \$250,000; the Democrats said, yes, we will continue to tax those people, violating this pledge, this promise the American people thought that they had on Election Day.

August ought to be the month where America gets to know what's going on.

EXCESSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, my district extends from Orlando to Daytona Beach. The State of Florida now has in excess of 10 percent unemployment. Nationally, 9.5 percent unemployment. Where are the jobs?

Congress passed a \$787 billion so-called stimulus package. I took to the floor and spoke from the Democrats' side of the aisle and pleaded with folks that we needed jobs and we needed to invest in America's infrastructure; instead, we put less than 7 percent. So to date, out of \$787 billion and \$48 billion for transportation highway money, we have \$523 million expended.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, where are the jobs? People want to work. They don't want government handouts. They don't want government welfare or food stamps. They want jobs in my district and throughout the Nation.

Where are the jobs, I come back to ask, that this country needs and our people need?

AGENCIES, PROGRAMS, AND COMMISSIONS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR DOCTOR

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people in Texas who are worried what kinds of jobs they will have when this new government-run health care plan goes through Congress, 1,018 pages delivered to us a few minutes before midnight. We had until 9 o'clock to read it and start voting on it.

Here's the plan: Thirty-one new Federal agencies, programs, and commissions in between you and your doctor taking away control of your health care.

At the committee, we asked, What does all this cost? They said, We don't know the price tag. We offered amendments. We said, Can you certify that Members of Congress read this bill and let the public read it? They said they thought that was a bad idea. We asked about rationing.

We were worried about wait times for family physicians and second-class cancer treatment. They said that would be too inconvenient to provide information, and they defeated it.

Then finally we said, Let's strike the taxes on small businesses, and they refused to, saying small businesses have it so easy, they need to raise taxes on them.

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't want the government telling us what doctors we can see, what treatments we can receive, and what medicines we can receive.

WASHINGTON-KNOWS-BEST MENTALITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, last October, President Bush and Hank Paulson said to the Congress we need to bail out the financial services industry. We have to do it bold and we have to do it quick or the financial markets will tumble. Well, we passed the \$700 billion TARP program, and still stock portfolios, savings of Americans all through the country dropped by 30 or 40 percent.

In January, NANCY PELOSI and President Obama told us that we had to act bold and fast to pass the stimulus program because the unemployment rate was 8 percent, and now 2.5 million jobs have been lost since that and unemployment is up to 10 percent.

And now the same Washington-knows-best mentality is telling us to rush through a government takeover of health care by August 1. This will result in a bureaucrat taking the place of

your doctor telling you what procedures you will have. It will result in a \$1 trillion Federal program. It will result in rationing and a huge tax increase on farmers and small businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have to slow down. Let's learn from the stimulus program. Let's learn from TARP. Let's slow down the process.

BLUE DOGS NEED TO ENFORCE BILL

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the pending health care legislation does one thing: It does bend the cost curve, but it bends it up. That's not according to me or my colleagues. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office that says private insurance rates will go up and the public option insurance will go up. What does that result in? 4.7 million jobs could be lost as a result of increased taxes, particularly hard-hit small businesses.

Where are the jobs?

My Blue Dog colleagues are down at the House negotiating some face-saving measure in this bill, and I'm going to include this list of their proposals, but I want to make sure that they comply with their July 9 letter which says it must be deficit neutral, it must protect rural health care, it must ensure bipartisanship, and finally, any health care reform legislation that comes to the floor must be available to all Members and the public for a sufficient amount of time before we are asked to vote on it.

This is government. This is transparency. The Blue Dogs need to enforce it.

□ 1500

THE JOBS WERE IN WYOMING

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, "where are the jobs?" could be answered in one word, in my State of Wyoming. We were hiring people when our energy industry was robust from other States that were losing jobs, like Michigan. But the cap-and-trade bill that passed this House last week changed coal bonus payments from being paid over 5 years to now being paid in one lump-sum payment.

We are going to destroy jobs in Wyoming. So the people who moved from Michigan to Wyoming to find good-paying jobs are now going to have to return to Michigan or stay in Wyoming and be unemployed.

It is because of the activities of this Congress. This Congress has not been happy to watch States like Michigan suffer. They have decided to make States like Wyoming, that were pro-

ducing energy for this country, suffer right alongside States like Michigan. Our State, which had a healthy economy before cap-and-trade, before the Obama presidency, is now suffering just like the rest of the Nation. Our unemployment has doubled in Wyoming, Mr. Speaker.

UNSUSTAINABLE DEBT

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was Albert Einstein who said that "the most powerful force in the universe is compound interest."

That's great, Mr. Speaker, when compound interest is working for you—in building a nest egg for your children's college costs or for retirement. But when compound interest is working against you, it's catastrophic.

It is absolutely devastating, especially for a Nation on the intermediate and long term, when that Nation recklessly spends taxpayers' money and causes huge, unsustainable deficits.

As of June 30, the national debt was \$11.5 trillion—over \$37,000 per person. In June alone, the deficit rose by over \$220 billion, a year's worth of deficits in 1 month! Now CBO says that the number, the total debt to the United States, will double in the next 10 years. It took 180 years for us to get to that \$11.5 trillion. Under President Obama's massive spending it will double in just 10 years. Nothing puts our economy at greater risk of implosion and job loss than unsustainable debt.

COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS ARE THE CURE TO OUR ECONOMIC WOES

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last November, Americans sent a clear message. They wanted change in Washington. But they also asked for accountability, transparency, and for politicians to respect their tax dollars.

Unfortunately, from the \$787 billion so-called "stimulus," trillions in bailouts, and the \$3.55 trillion budget, Washington has gone on a reckless spending spree with taxpayer dollars.

And now the majority in Congress is trying to pass a government takeover of health care that will add \$239 billion to the debt our kids will have to pay back.

Prime time press conferences don't hide the fact that since January, our Nation's debt has skyrocketed by more than \$1 trillion, that our debt to China increases each day, and that our Nation is facing double-digit unemployment levels.

Kansans know you can't spend money that you don't have. Congress must learn this lesson. As a CPA, a former

State treasurer and a mother of two teenagers, I'm convinced that we need commonsense solutions to rein in spending, keep taxes low and get Americans back to work.

JOBS WILL BE LOST AS A RESULT OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty clear that we've lost a lot of jobs in this country, and I think it's pretty clear that we are going to lose a whole lot more jobs if we pass this health care plan.

I thought Members might want to just hear a firsthand personal example. I've got a longtime friend that lives in Florida. He has a small business. By the way, he voted for Obama this year. He said, I'm going to vote for Barack Obama, even though I'm a Republican, because we need some change in this country.

I saw him this weekend. He said, hey, have you seen that Obama health care plan? I said, yeah, as a matter of fact, I have. A lot of people have seen it. He said, man, that's not the change that I was voting for. He said, that's going to kill my business. He said, I'm going to see my taxes go up. He said, we're already laying off people, but if they put that penalty on us that I read about, then I'm going to have to lay some more people off. He said, this is killing me.

And I'll tell you, that's happening all over the country, not just in Orlando, Florida, but all around the country. So we need some reform, but we need the right kind of reform, and this is not it.

\$746,000 OF TAXPAYER MONEY FOR ONE JOB

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the last 6 months, a lot has changed. We have a new President of the United States, we have a new Congress, the 111th Congress, and we have 3.1 million fewer jobs, and an increase of 28 percent in unemployment just in the last 6 months.

What was the reaction? What was the response from the new administration and of this Congress? Well, we need to pass a stimulus bill, and we need to pass it now. No time for debate. No time for amendments. No time for input from the minority. We need to pass it now.

This bill had less than 24 hours of debate on this floor before it was passed out of the floor, and yet the President took 4 days to sign it. What did it do? It spent \$787 billion, the largest spending bill in our country's history.

And what have we gotten? The administration says we created 150,000 new jobs after spending \$112 billion.

Well, get out your calculators. That is \$746,000 of taxpayer money for one job. Where are the jobs?

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN LOSING SUPPORT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a new ABC News/Washington Post poll has found that for the first time, less than half of Americans support President Obama's health care plan. Since April, approval of the President's handling of health care has dropped 8 points, while disapproval has risen 15 points.

In an example of fair reporting, the Post put the poll results on its front page yesterday. Other news media have not been as candid in their coverage of health care.

When the Congressional Budget Office director revealed that the health care bill "significantly expands the Federal responsibility for health care costs," the evening news programs on both CBS and NBC failed to report the CBO's key finding, nor have they reported how many jobs will be lost under the President's health care plan.

Mr. Speaker, with so much at stake, Americans need the media to report all the facts on health care.

HEALTH REFORM IS SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, President Obama told us that all this reckless spending he was doing was going to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Instead of jobs, we get a so-called "health reform" bill. And this provision of that bill tells Americans that they will be prohibited from having their own insurance. They will be forced into a government health plan run by something like the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, this health plan is socialized medicine, pure and simple. And in addition to that, it will cost more. It will increase taxes on the wealthy and a whole lot of other people. It will increase the deficit. It will lower quality. It doesn't cover everyone. And it is projected to lose another 5 million jobs of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not reform. This is just nuts.

1934 CHICAGO TRIBUNE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I received a communication from a constituent at home who

brought to my attention a political cartoon that ran in the Chicago Tribune 75 years ago in 1934. It is often said that history doesn't repeat itself, but if you listen closely enough, it will rhyme. Or said another way, those who do not recall their history are doomed to repeat it.

The constituent who sent this to me is a retired FBI agent. He wrote in his e-mail, "change the names and the situation looks very familiar." Saul Alinsky, the leader of community organizers in Chicago, would be pleased with the current situation. When you look at the caption, spend, spend, spend under the guise of recovery, bust the budget, blame the capitalists for failure, junk the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this was apropos 75 years ago. It may well be apropos again today.

RADAR IN SOUTH FLORIDA

(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. I would ask my colleagues on the other side if they would tell me, what is their health care plan? Is it just that we shouldn't do health care? What part of it would you not do? is the question that I ask.

But I really rise, Mr. Speaker, to take cognizance of a very fine day yesterday of bipartisanship. A former colleague of ours, the now-Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, came to south Florida along with FAA Director Randy Babbitt to meet with several of us regarding radar in south Florida. On the flight from USAir here, Administrator Babbitt and I had an opportunity to hear a flight attendant do something very nice. She recognized and complimented 30 members of the Booker T. Washington High School class of 1949 in Miami who were en route here to Washington. It was a wonderful gesture, and it made for a wonderful day.

My colleagues here who continue to rant about us not having health care, I wonder what they would say if we do nothing? Will health care stay the same? Or will it rot?

CREATE WEALTH AND CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to ask the President to make good on his promise about those jobs, because I don't believe that government creates jobs. Government doesn't create wealth. All it does is move wealth around. We need jobs.

But I am here to ask the President to make good on the idea of producing the right policies that would create jobs by creating wealth in the private sector. And I would suggest to my colleagues

that the way to do that is to have a low-tax situation, a lighter touch on regulation and less litigation. It's really those three things. If you have low taxes, light-touch regulation, and less litigation, we will expand the American economy, we will create wealth, and we will create jobs.

That is something that we can be doing here in this Congress. It is something that we can cooperate on getting done, and we can serve the American people. We can deliver American solutions.

DON'T WRECK MEDICARE

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I for one believe that the health care system must be reformed. I've said that and have worked in that regard during my time in Congress. But I'm greatly concerned about the plans that I see coming forth for us to consider in this Congress.

The single-payer plan raises concerns with me on behalf of senior citizens across the country, especially those I represent in Kansas. The plan that we are currently operating under, Medicare, provides wonderful services for many Americans, for senior citizens. But the reality is, that plan is bankrupt. We will spend \$38 trillion more than we have over the next 75 years.

The plan is expected to be bankrupt by 2017. So the idea that we would expand the plan when it already is in financial difficulty baffles my mind. The plan is to raise \$820 billion in taxes, and we still leave the national debt increasing by \$239 billion. This plan needs attention, and we need to make certain that what we do does not wreck the health care delivery plan we have in place for seniors today, especially in places like Kansas, where senior citizens are dominant. That plan does that.

□ 1515

THERE IS SERIOUS TROUBLE IN PARADISE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? I rise today to discuss the rising unemployment in my congressional district of south Florida. Last week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released data indicating that unemployment in Miami-Dade County was at nearly 11 percent. This represents a notable increase from 9.9 unemployment just last month.

Mr. Speaker, south Floridians are hurting. In Miami, workers in the food service and hotel industries have had their hours cut in half because of a reduction in tourism. These workers are working two, three jobs in order to pay the bills.

In the Florida Keys, recreational fishermen are docking their boats permanently as the industry grapples with one of its slowest seasons in history.

There is serious trouble in paradise as hardworking small businesses and middle-class families remain uncertain about their economic future. That is why it's imperative that this Congress gets serious about providing real solutions for our constituents. They cannot afford to wait because they are looking for jobs.

WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT SPENDING IS HAVING DEVASTATING CONSEQUENCES ON THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President and the Democrat majority, where in the heck are the jobs? With this stimulus bill and more than \$1 trillion spent and zero job growth, where are the jobs?

With the national energy tax passed by this House, it levies billions of new energy taxes on the American people, costing the average American family \$3,100 more a year to heat and cool their home and put gas in the tank of their car. Where are the jobs?

On health care, our Democrat majority's \$1.2 trillion government takeover of our health care system mandates a one-size-fits-all, government-run health care plan on most Americans. Their plan is to nationalize our health care system and create new mandates, government bureaucracy and inefficiency that will only serve to drive up costs of our health care system even more.

Wasteful government spending is having devastating consequences on this country. It also could cost 4.7 million more jobs and hurt small business.

WE NEED TO FOCUS ON SAVING THE COUNTRY'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young boy, a radio station went on the air in Louisville, Kentucky, and for the first week of its existence played one song over and over. It was called "Purple People Eater."

I am reminded of that event today as we've heard speaker after speaker from the other side repeat the same tired Republican talking points. What we haven't heard is one idea about how to fix our dysfunctional health care system which is threatening every business in this country, threatening our competitiveness and our long-term economic prospects.

It is time that this Congress and our colleagues from the other side focus on saving this country's health care system. We heard one gentleman from the other side saying we're facing \$38 tril-

lion in additional debt in Medicare. We're trying to make sure that that doesn't happen.

I wish our colleagues on the other side would help us in that task.

GOOD ENERGY POLICY IS GOOD JOBS POLICY

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, in southern Missouri, rural families are struggling with job losses. We are a vibrant district with a time-honored work ethic, but job losses have hit us especially hard during a time of unprecedented economic challenges.

Constituents call my office every day, and they're asking what is Congress doing for them, how are we helping the manufacturing worker who doesn't want to go to the unemployment office because he really just wants to go back to work. And I hear a lot of justifiable anger from the same callers about Congress' policies that are going to make it tougher for them to get back to work. Cap-and-trade is the focus of their frustration and mine.

Today, unemployment is still severe in southern Missouri with the potential to go much higher, much higher, if the cap-and-trade bill becomes law. More than 3,000 jobs could be lost in the Eighth District in a single year, and the few new green jobs this bill would create won't be in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will leave with us a legacy of energy cost increases that will kill generations of jobs in rural America and in southern Missouri. Like my constituents, I am ready and willing to get to work if you will only give us the opportunity.

Good energy policy is good jobs policy. I hope we can reverse course on cap-and-trade so it doesn't destroy our rural economy.

THE HEALTH CARE BILL WILL CREATE ADDITIONAL TAXPAYER EXPENDITURES

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Last night, as the Energy and Commerce Committee met to debate the new health care reform bill offered by the Democratic Party, as I looked through the analysis by CBO, I discovered that there was a reduction in Medicare benefits over the next 10 years in excess of \$450 billion.

In addition to that, there was a reduction in reimbursements to hospitals of \$155 billion over the next 10 years.

The part of it that bothered me most is that in so many rural areas, programs like Medicare Advantage, home health care, skilled nursing care were particularly hit by these reductions.

In addition to that, this bill provides for an additional tax on employers, a tax on individuals that do not go out and buy health insurance once the

mandate goes into effect; and, still, the bill is not paid for. And as the CBO director indicated, this bill will not save taxpayer money. This bill will create additional taxpayer expenditures.

WE DON'T NEED A GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE AND WE DON'T NEED ADDITIONAL JOB LOSSES

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

Mr. SOUDER. Where are the jobs? Last week, the health care bill was passed through the Education and Labor Committee, jammed through in an all-night session; and, supposedly, it offered a public-private option.

Just a few minutes ago, we finished an Education and Labor markup. Where we once had a public-private option in direct lending, 80 percent chose the nonpublic option. So what did we just do? We eliminated the private option, and the Federal Government is going to be a giant bank, one of the biggest banks in the world, taking over all student lending.

When we talk about the needs in health care, we need to address the problems that we're facing, the gaps in the health care system, how to make it more efficient. What we don't need is a government takeover of health care with no private options. We don't need higher taxes on the small businesses and the people in my district who are struggling with a mean of 15 percent unemployment in my eight counties. We don't need additional job losses.

And this bill unbelievably had a clause added that will add more jobs for ACORN. When people in my district said they wanted more jobs, they didn't mean more jobs for ACORN.

AMERICA DEMANDS REAL REFORM

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it's an outrage the way health care is being approached in this country. Voters did vote for change; but, apparently, that's all they're going to have left in their pocket.

I sat through a 17-hour markup on the Ways and Means Committee last week, and I didn't see one constructive process. I didn't see the voices of Democrats and Republicans heard on addressing the delivery system for Medicare to re-engineer it to reduce billions of dollars in cost.

Instead of reforming the private insurance industry that many of us want to do on both sides, Speaker PELOSI's response to that and the Democratic response to that is we'll legislate them out of business by undercutting them with a Medicare-like system which will punish rural America.

And finally, egregiously, there's been no addressing of liability reform that

punishes our doctors and health care providers with junk lawsuits.

America demands real reform. We want real reform. Slow this thing down and give account to America for the kind of health care people need and want and that's affordable and accessible and not a government-run plan.

GREATEST THREAT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY FROM CAP-AND-TRADE BILL WAS SMOKE COMING OUT OF THE BACK-ROOM DEALS

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, the American people were promised a climate change bill that would address the emissions problems. The problem is that their greatest threat to the environment and the economy from the so-called cap-and-trade bill was the smoke coming out of the back-room deals that were cut to create this monster that's being called cap-and-trade.

Frankly, I will just tell you the whole concept that when we had a chance to get government out of the way and build new zero emission generating facilities to be able to provide clean energy for the economy and for the environment, instead of that, this Congress decided to drop the cap and tax, tax, tax.

And anyone that's worked on emissions issues will look at this bill in the future and say how could somebody with a straight face go back to their district and say that this bill is going to clean up the environment and help the economy? It is going to continue the pattern of a massive emission while we get the economy driven down.

There is no cap in this bill, only taxes.

WE SHOULD HAVE DONE THE STIMULUS RIGHT THE FIRST TIME

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, people are asking where are the jobs.

As my friend from Indiana said moments ago, we just came out of amending a bill in the Education and Labor Committee where we wiped out the private sector in the student lending business, tens of thousands of jobs just erased.

As all my colleagues know, this House, this Congress, passed a stimulus bill which was supposed to create jobs. Instead, we've been losing millions of jobs.

I find it interesting that the Republicans offered an alternative to that stimulus bill which would have cut taxes and created twice as many jobs, and now Christina Romer, the President's economic adviser, when she's been pressed on news interviews on two

separate occasions in May and again in July about where are the jobs and why isn't the stimulus working, she said, well, the tax cuts in the stimulus bill are working.

How ironic. We should have done it right the first time.

WE NEED A PRESCRIPTION OF LOWER TAXES AND LOWERING SPENDING

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. I remember walking into my home one night when I was a senior in high school after school, 1982. My father and mother were talking with each other with a distressed look on their faces, and my dad was telling my mother that he was losing his job. The factory where he expected to work his entire life was shutting down. This was 1982, the recession, a recession like we find ourselves in today; and the prescription from Washington was to lower spending and to cut taxes.

In the late 1980s, my father decided to take advantage of the economy and create a plant that he used to work at; and he decided to start a new plant, created over 500 jobs because Washington's prescription was lowering taxes and lowering spending.

The prescription today coming out of Washington to try to get out of this recession is to raise regulation and to raise taxes; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that's why we're lingering in this recession, because people don't want to invest, because they're concerned about what's happening here in Washington, D.C.

FIRST, DO NO HARM

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives addresses the very important issue of health care reform, we need to adhere to the principles of all physicians: first, do no harm.

Unfortunately, the legislation that came out of the House Education and Labor Committee late last week does not adhere to this principle. CBO tells us it will drive up the costs of health care in the United States. In fact, when it's fully implemented, over \$200 billion a year this plan will cost, it will not protect the right to keep the insurance coverage that you currently have. If you like it—that was one of the underlying principles of the administration—this bill will not protect that right.

It will not adhere to that principle: do no harm. It will drive up costs. It will take away freedom of choice of the American citizens, and it is also going to have an impact on the ability for small businesses to provide insurance because of the taxes included in this bill. It's going to cost people insurance because small businesses will not be

able to continue to afford the 8 percent payroll tax as well as an increase on small businesses filing a subchapter S.

First, do no harm. We need to adhere to that principle. Unfortunately, this legislation does not do that.

REPUBLICANS HAVE BEEN CUT OUT OF THE PROCESS

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to come down here, Mr. Speaker, but then I heard the distinguished Democrat leader, Mr. HOYER, come down and chastise us for using 1-minutes. Mr. HOYER, you know why we're using these 1-minutes. It's because you've cut us out of the process.

For the first time in this Nation's history, appropriations bills aren't under open rules. So we have no opportunity to offer amendments under the appropriations bills.

So you can understand why, in my district, having almost 20 percent unemployment, some of the highest unemployment in the country because this government fails to act to get water to the people to provide for the general welfare of the people of my district, this is why we come down here, Mr. HOYER.

So I would suggest that we probably won't do this again because you will probably take away this advantage that we have of using these 1-minutes to make our case before the American people. I assume this will be the last day we have unlimited 1-minutes, but I can promise you that if you just go back to the open rules process on the appropriations bills, we will gladly not use these unlimited 1-minutes this way.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will kindly remind Members that remarks in debate should be directed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

NEVADA'S ECONOMY IS THE MOST DISTRESSED IN THE NATION

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

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent study Nevada's economy is now determined to be the most distressed in the Nation; and if you recall, 4 months ago we passed a stimulus package and we were promised by this administration, and by the majority, if we do this, if we pass this stimulus package, that we'd only have 8 percent unemployment. It would never exceed 8 percent unemployment. Yet we had to do it right now. We had to pass this piece of legislation.

Well, I'm here to tell you today that Nevada's unemployment is at 12 percent, and that this administration says

that the unemployment is even going to go higher.

So the question is, What did the stimulus do for Nevada? Well, in Las Vegas, Las Vegas has received to date \$4,833. So the question is, Where's the money? \$4,833 to Nevada and to Las Vegas.

Las Vegas Mayor Oscar Goodman said, "I bet more on a football game than what the city's received."

I ask the Speaker: Where's the money and where are the jobs?

1530

JOBS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I want someone to show me the jobs that we have been promised by the Democrats. Many counties in my district have unemployment rates of more than 13 percent.

Show me the jobs, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle promised that their trillion-dollar stimulus would immediately create jobs and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. Nothing could be further from the truth. In June alone, almost half a million jobs were lost, driving unemployment to its highest level in 26 years.

Now, after shoving a \$646 billion energy tax down the throats of the American people, liberal leadership is now shoving a multitrillion-dollar health experiment. According to the CBO, this will cost 750,000 more jobs and push 100 million Americans off of their private health care plans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to show me the jobs and show me why the American people should believe once again that a trillion-dollar experiment will work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings now will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 164, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2729, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1622, by the yeas and nays; and H. Res. 507, 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.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to

the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 164, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 164.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Clay	Guthrie
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gutierrez
Aderholt	Coble	Hall (NY)
Adler (NJ)	Coffman (CO)	Hall (TX)
Akin	Cohen	Halvorson
Alexander	Cole	Hare
Altmire	Conaway	Harman
Andrews	Connolly (VA)	Harper
Arcuri	Conyers	Hastings (FL)
Austria	Cooper	Hastings (WA)
Baca	Costa	Heinrich
Bachmann	Costello	Heller
Bachus	Courtney	Hensarling
Baird	Crenshaw	Herger
Baldwin	Crowley	Herseth Sandlin
Barrett (SC)	Cuellar	Higgins
Barrow	Culberson	Himes
Bartlett	Cummings	Hinchee
Barton (TX)	Dahlkemper	Hinojosa
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hirono
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hoekstra
Berman	Davis (KY)	Holden
Berry	Deal (GA)	Holt
Biggart	DeFazio	Honda
Bilbray	DeGette	Hoyer
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Inglis
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inslee
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Israel
Blackburn	Dicks	Issa
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Blunt	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Bocieri	Donnelly (IN)	(TX)
Boehner	Doyle	Jenkins
Bonner	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Bono Mack	Driehaus	Johnson (IL)
Boozman	Duncan	Johnson, E.B.
Boren	Edwards (MD)	Johnson, Sam
Boswell	Edwards (TX)	Jones
Boucher	Ehlers	Jordan (OH)
Boustany	Ellison	Kagen
Boyd	Ellsworth	Kanjorski
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Kaptur
Brady (TX)	Engel	Kennedy
Bralley (IA)	Eshoo	Kildee
Bright	Etheridge	Kilpatrick (MI)
Broun (GA)	Fallin	Kilroy
Brown (SC)	Farr	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	King (IA)
Brown-Waite,	Filner	King (NY)
Ginny	Flake	Kingston
Buchanan	Fleming	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Burgess	Forbes	Kissell
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Foster	Kline (MN)
Buyer	Fox	Kosmas
Calvert	Frank (MA)	Kratovich
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kucinich
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Cantor	Fudge	Lance
Cao	Gallegly	Langevin
Capito	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Giffords	Latham
Cardoza	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Carnahan	Gohmert	Latta
Carney	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Goodlatte	Lee (NY)
Carter	Gordon (TN)	Levin
Cassidy	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Graves	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Linder
Chaffetz	Green, Al	Lipinski
Chandler	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
Childers	Griffith	Loeb
Chu	Grijalva	Loeb
Clarke		Lofgren, Zoe
		Lowey

Lucas	Pascrell	Sherman
Luetkemeyer	Pastor (AZ)	Shimkus
Lujan	Paul	Shuler
Lummis	Paulsen	Shuster
Lungren, Daniel	Payne	Simpson
E.	Pence	Sires
Lynch	Perlmutter	Skelton
Mack	Perriello	Slaughter
Maffei	Peters	Smith (NE)
Maloney	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Manzullo	Petri	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Markey (CO)	Pitts	Snyder
Markey (MA)	Platts	Souder
Marshall	Poe (TX)	Space
Massa	Polis (CO)	Speier
Matheson	Pomeroy	Spratt
Matsui	Posey	Stark
McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Stearns
McCaul	Price (NC)	Stupak
McClintock	Putnam	Sullivan
McCollum	Quigley	Sutton
McCotter	Radanovich	Tanner
McDermott	Rahall	Taylor
McGovern	Rangel	Teague
McHenry	Rehberg	Terry
McIntyre	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
McKeon	Richardson	Thompson (MS)
McMorris	Rodriguez	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Meek (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Meeke (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Tierney
Melancon	Rohrabacher	Titus
Mica	Rooney	Tonko
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Tsongas
Miller (MI)	Ross	Turner
Miller (NC)	Rothman (NJ)	Upton
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Miller, George	Royce	Velázquez
Minnick	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Mitchell	Rush	Walden
Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Walz
Moore (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Moran (KS)	Salazar	Wasserman
Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Murphy (CT)	T.	Waters
Murphy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Murphy, Patrick	Sarbanes	Watt
Murphy, Tim	Scalise	Weiner
Murtha	Schakowsky	Welch
Myrick	Schauer	Westmoreland
Nadler (NY)	Schiff	Wexler
Napolitano	Schmidt	Whitfield
Neal (MA)	Schock	Wilson (OH)
Neugebauer	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Schwartz	Wittman
Nye	Scott (GA)	Wolf
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Olson	Serrano	Yarmuth
Olver	Sessions	Young (AK)
Ortiz	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Pallone	Shea-Porter	

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver	McCarthy (NY)	Reyes
Davis (TN)	McHugh	Sestak
Hill	McMahon	Waxman
Kirk	Moore (WI)	

1556

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent 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. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 596, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the

bill, H.R. 2729, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2729, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 96, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—330

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Kind
Ackerman	DeGette	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Aderholt	Delahunt	Kissell
Adler (NJ)	DeLauro	Klein (FL)
Alexander	Dent	Kosmas
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kratovil
Andrews	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kucinich
Arcuri	Dicks	Lance
Austria	Dingell	Langevin
Baca	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Bachmann	Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)
Baird	Doyle	Latham
Baldwin	Driehaus	LaTourette
Barrow	Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)
Bartlett	Edwards (TX)	Lee (NY)
Barton (TX)	Ehlers	Levin
Bean	Ellison	Lewis (CA)
Becerra	Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)
Berkley	Emerson	Lipinski
Berman	Engel	LoBiondo
Berry	Eshoo	Loebsack
Biggert	Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe
Bilbray	Farr	Lowe
Bilirakis	Fattah	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Filner	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (NY)	Fleming	Luján
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lynch
Blumenauer	Foster	Mack
Bocciari	Frank (MA)	Maffei
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Maloney
Bono Mack	Fudge	Markey (CO)
Boren	Gallegly	Markey (MA)
Boswell	Gerlach	Marshall
Boucher	Giffords	Massa
Boyd	Gonzalez	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Grayson	McCarthy (CA)
Bright	Green, Al	McCaul
Brown, Corrine	Green, Gene	McCollum
Buchanan	Griffith	McCotter
Burgess	Grijalva	McDermott
Butterfield	Guthrie	McGovern
Buyer	Gutierrez	McHugh
Calvert	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Camp	Halvorson	McMahon
Cao	Hare	McMorris
Capito	Harman	Rodgers
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Capuano	Heinrich	Meek (FL)
Cardoza	Heller	Meeks (NY)
Carnahan	Herseht Sandlin	Melancon
Carney	Higgins	Michaud
Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Himes	Miller (MI)
Castor (FL)	Hinchee	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Childers	Hirono	Miller, George
Chu	Hodes	Minnick
Clarke	Holden	Mitchell
Clay	Holt	Mollohan
Cleaver	Honda	Moore (KS)
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Cohen	Inglis	Moran (VA)
Cole	Insee	Murphy (NY)
Connolly (VA)	Israel	Murphy, Patrick
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim
Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Murtha
Costa	(TX)	Nadler (NY)
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Courtney	Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Crowley	Johnson, E.B.	Nunes
Cuellar	Jones	Nye
Cummings	Kagen	Oberstar
Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Obey
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Olver
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Pallone
Davis (KY)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascarell
Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)

Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Terry
Perlmutter	T.	Thompson (CA)
Perriello	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Peters	Sarbanes	Thompson (PA)
Peterson	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Pingree (ME)	Schauer	Tiberi
Pitts	Schiff	Titus
Polis (CO)	Schrader	Tonko
Pomeroy	Schwartz	Towns
Posey	Scott (GA)	Tsongas
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Turner
Putnam	Serrano	Van Hollen
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Velazquez
Radanovich	Sherman	Visclosky
Rahall	Shuler	Walz
Rangel	Simpson	Wamp
Rehberg	Sires	Wasserman
Reichert	Skelton	Schultz
Reyes	Slaughter	Waters
Richardson	Smith (NE)	Watson
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Rogers (MI)	Snyder	Welch
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Wexler
Ross	Space	Wilson (OH)
Rothman (NJ)	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Stark	Wolf
Ruppersberger	Stupak	Woolsey
Rush	Sutton	Wu
Ryan (OH)	Tanner	Yarmuth
Salazar	Taylor	Young (FL)
	Teague	

NAYS—96

Akin	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Bachus	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Paul
Blunt	Graves	Pence
Boehner	Hall (TX)	Petri
Boozman	Harper	Platts
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Herger	Roe (TN)
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Rooney
Ginny	Issa	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Royce
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Jordan (OH)	Scalise
Carter	King (IA)	Schmidt
Castle	King (NY)	Schock
Chaffetz	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Shadegg
Conaway	Latta	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Linder	Shuster
Culberson	Lummis	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	E.
Dreier	E.	Thornberry
Duncan	Manzullo	Tierney
Fallin	Marchant	Upton
Flake	McClintock	Walden
Forbes	McHenry	Westmoreland
Fox	McKeon	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Wittman
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Kirk	Paulsen	Sullivan
McCarthy (NY)	Sestan	Walt
Murphy (CT)	Speier	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1603

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR NATURAL GAS VEHICLE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1622, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1622, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 35, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie	Conaway	Hill
Ackerman	Connolly (VA)	Himes
Aderholt	Conyers	Hinchee
Adler (NJ)	Cooper	Hinojosa
Alexander	Costa	Hirono
Altmire	Costello	Hodes
Andrews	Courtney	Hoekstra
Arcuri	Crenshaw	Holden
Austria	Cuellar	Holt
Baca	Cummings	Honda
Bachmann	Dahlkemper	Hoyer
Bachus	Davis (AL)	Hunter
Baird	Davis (CA)	Inglis
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Insee
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Israel
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett	Deal (GA)	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	DeFazio	(TX)
Bean	DeGette	Jenkins
Becerra	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Berman	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones
Bilbray	Dicks	Jordan (OH)
Bilirakis	Dingell	Kagen
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Kaptur
Blackburn	Doyle	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Dreier	Kildee
Bocciari	Driehaus	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bonner	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Bono Mack	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Boozman	Ellison	King (NY)
Boren	Ellsworth	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boswell	Emerson	Kissell
Boucher	Engel	Klein (FL)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kline (MN)
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kosmas
Braley (IA)	Fallin	Kratovil
Bright	Farr	Kucinich
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Lance
Buchanan	Filner	Langevin
Burgess	Fleming	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Forbes	Larson (CT)
Buyer	Fortenberry	Latham
Calvert	Foster	LaTourette
Camp	Fox	Latta
Cao	Frank (MA)	Lee (CA)
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Lee (NY)
Capps	Fudge	Levin
Capuano	Gallegly	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Giffords	Lipinski
Carney	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Loebsack
Cassidy	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Castle	Goodlatte	Lowe
Castor (FL)	Gordon (TN)	Lucas
Chandler	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Childers	Cardoza	Luján
Chu	Grayson	Lungren, Daniel
Clarke	Green, Al	E.
Clay	Green, Gene	Lynch
Cleaver	Griffith	Maffei
Clyburn	Grijalva	Maloney
Cohen	Guthrie	Marchant
Cole	Castor (FL)	Markey (CO)
Connolly (VA)	Chandler	Markey (MA)
Conyers	Childers	Marshall
Cooper	Chu	Massa
Costa	Clarke	Matheson
Costello	Clay	Matsui
Courtney	Cleaver	McCarthy (CA)
Crowley	Clyburn	McCaul
Cuellar	Coffman (CO)	McCollum
Cummings	Cohen	McCotter
Dahlkemper	Cole	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
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
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)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shadegg
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton

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

the resolution, H. Res. 507, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 507, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 428, nays 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

YEAS—428

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
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
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
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
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hersth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchesy
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Insee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeke (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey

Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
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
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

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

NAYS—35

Akin
Bishop (UT)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Coble
Culberson
Duncan
Ehlers
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)

Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Issa
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Linder
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo

McClintock
Paul
Pence
Petri
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—5

Blackburn
Crowley

Kirk
McCarthy (NY)
Sestak

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1610

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to

NOT VOTING—5

Blackburn
Crowley

Kirk
McCarthy (NY)
Sestak

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1617

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 658, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo.

As soon as these preparations are complete, the House will immediately resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph.

About 5 minutes after that, the House will proceed with the business of the House.

For the information of the Members, when the Chair says the House will be in order, we are ready to take our picture. That will be in just a few minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 111th Congress.)

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair in 2 or 3 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, on May 25, 2007, U.S. District Court Judge Oliver W. Wanger issued a ruling that directed the Bureau of Reclamation to reduce water exports from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to protect a three-inch minnow called the Delta smelt;

Whereas, on December 15, 2008, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, based on the Wanger Ruling, issued a Biological Opinion on the Delta smelt that permanently reduced water export from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta which is traditionally delivered to cities and farms in the San Joaquin Valley and the Los Angeles and San Diego basins;

Whereas according to a University of California at Davis study, based on the water reductions outlined in the Delta smelt Biological Opinion, revenue losses in the San Joaquin Valley of California for 2009 will be \$2.2 billion and job losses at 80,000;

Whereas according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate in the San Joaquin Valley has reached the highest level in the Nation;

Whereas region wide unemployment in the San Joaquin Valley of California is nearly 20 percent and some cities have an unemployment rate of 40 percent;

Whereas thousands of people who once relied on employment in the agricultural sector are now unemployed and struggling to meet their most basic needs, such as providing food for their families;

Whereas, on March 1, 2009, the Sacramento Bee reported thousands of people have been turned away from local food banks as supplies are not ample enough to meet local needs;

Whereas, on April 14, 2009, the Fresno County, California, Board of Supervisors proclaimed that the man-made drought has created an economic crisis;

Whereas on June 4, 2009, despite the ongoing man-made drought in California, the National Marine Fisheries Service issued a new Biological Opinion on the spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, the southern population of North American green sturgeon, and Southern Resident killer whales which further reduces water supplies to Californians;

Whereas, on June 19, 2009, California's Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger declared a state of emergency for Fresno County, California, and petitioned President Barack Obama to declare the county a Federal disaster area;

Whereas on June 28, 2009, the Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar visited Fresno, California, and held a town hall meeting in which nearly 1,000 people attended to express their dissatisfaction with the lack of action by the Obama Administration;

Whereas, on July 6, 2009, the Los Angeles Times reported that during Interior Secretary Ken Salazar's town hall meeting on June 28, 2009, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mike Connor, pledged to provide financial aid to starving families and an audience member replied "we don't want welfare, we want water";

Whereas, on June 29, 2009, CBS 5 Eyewitness News reported that hundreds of San Joaquin Valley farmers protested outside the Federal Building Plaza in San Francisco which houses Speaker Nancy Pelosi's district office;

Whereas, on June 29, 2009, CBS 5 Eyewitness News reported the protestors blamed Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Congressman George Miller for the water shortage in the San Joaquin Valley;

Whereas, on June 29, 2009, CBS 5 Eyewitness News reported that protestors were holding signs that said "ESA Puts Fish Ahead of People", "Congress Created Drought", and "New Endangered Species: The California Farmer";

Whereas, on July 1, 2009, the Fresno Bee reported that a crowd of 4,000 marched through the streets of Fresno, California, to demand that the Federal Government end the man-made drought;

Whereas, on June 18, 2009, the Democrat leadership held open Roll Call Vote 366 for the purpose of changing the outcome of the vote;

Whereas during this vote, House Democrat leadership was seen on the House floor pressuring Members of Congress to change their Aye vote to a Nay vote in order to defeat the

Nunes Amendment which would have helped to relieve the water crisis in California;

Whereas, on July 8, 2009, during the mark-up on the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, a debate was held on the Calvert Amendment which would have restored water deliveries to Californians;

Whereas during the mark-up, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, David Obey, said "Recognize there are certain actions, that if you take, this bill won't pass, your earmarks in the bill won't become law";

Whereas Chairman Obey violated Clause 16 of House Rule 23 by linking passage of the Calvert Amendment to loss of earmarks;

Whereas, on July 14, 2009, despite historical tradition of open rules during the appropriations process, the Rules Committee blocked an amendment to the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 that would have restored water deliveries to Californians;

Whereas, for two years, the House of Representatives has known about the man-made drought in California without taking legislative action to resolve the crisis;

Whereas the lack of action by the House of Representatives has demonstrated that fish are more important than families;

Whereas article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution enumerates that the Congress shall have the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States;

Whereas the House of Representatives has willfully and knowingly failed to provide for the general welfare of the San Joaquin Valley of California; and

Whereas the failure of the House of Representatives to carry out its duties has subjected the House to public ridicule and damaged the dignity and integrity of the House of Representatives; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Natural Resources is instructed to discharge H.R. 3105, the Turn on the Pumps Act of 2009, for immediate consideration by the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1630

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PRICE DAM HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2938

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12187, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the period required for commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of the date of its expiration and the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of such expiration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2938 would allow the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend the construction deadline for a hydroelectric power plant at the Melvin Price Locks and Dam in Alton, Illinois. Over the past 20 years, there has been great interest in building a hydroelectric plant at this site on the Mississippi River; however, construction of the hydroelectric plant has not happened on this site as of this date.

Last October, Brookfield Power acquired the license to proceed with the construction of the site. When Brookfield applied for an extension of the construction deadline, the company was informed that because of the administrative extensions granted to the previous licensee, congressional action is needed to grant an extension.

Brookfield will lose this license at the end of this month, July 2009. For

that reason, Brookfield and the City of Alton, Illinois, requested legislation to extend the deadline for 6 years.

Passing this legislation is necessary to ensure that Brookfield can bring renewable energy to Illinois and create green jobs. The hydroelectric project will create 404,000 megawatt hours of electricity, the equivalent of 283 barrels of oil. Further, Brookfield will hire 125 workers over a 3-year period and invest over \$400 million to construct the plan.

This bill is cosponsored by my friend and colleague from Illinois, Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS. Both the majority and minority staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee have reviewed and accepted the legislation. FERC has also reviewed the legislation and does not oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2938.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2938, a bill that extends the timeline to bring this hydroelectric power plant project in Illinois on line. It gives them another up to 6 years, and ultimately, this would be the decision of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. But as they're going through the process right now of permitting and approval, this provides them an additional 6 years to make sure that the project has enough time to get approved and completed and bring this new power source on line.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of this legislation. I think it's a good bill because I think hydroelectric power is a good thing for our country, and when we're concerned about getting renewable energy online, there's probably nothing better than hydropower for that.

Unfortunately, in the cap-and-tax bill that was passed by this House over my objection and over the objection of the gentleman from Illinois, there is a provision on page 19, line 12, sub 3, that says, The hydroelectric project installed on the dam is operated so that the water surface elevation at any given location and time that would have occurred in the absence of the hydroelectric project is maintained.

Now, I share this language with you because the gentleman from Illinois, my friend, talked about the 404,000 watts or megawatts, whatever it is—I didn't jot down the exact amount—would be produced as hydroelectric power and, therefore, renewable energy and create new jobs. My concern is this: that hydropower is being added after this legislation is moving forward.

Should the cap-and-tax bill become law, that hydropower, according to this language, would not be considered as renewable energy for purposes of Illinois meeting the new Federal standard on renewable energy. Because in con-

sultation with two civil engineers I've spoken with who operate hydro projects—many of them and large-scale hydro projects—when I shared this language with them about maintaining the surface elevation at any location in time, they laughed. They said you can't operate a hydro system and not affect the water behind the dam in some way at some point.

And so to disqualify the new hydro—like the gentleman from Illinois is trying to get here—makes no sense to me. Either hydropower is renewable or it's not.

Now, there is another provision in this bill, the cap-and-tax bill, that said hydro that came online after 1988 is renewable but hydro before 1988 is not. Now, you have got water flowing down a river. You've got multiple dams along the way with hydro generation facilities. It's the same water. It just depends on what year the dam was built whether or not that hydropower is considered renewable or not. That doesn't make a lot of sense.

Nor do the provisions in the cap-and-tax bill that said, if woody biomass off a Federal forest comes off of a late successional stand, you can't count the burning of that to produce green energy as renewable energy, but if it came off of a severely damaged tree, it is, although there is no definition for that. And if any woody biomass comes off private, county, State lands, it's all considered renewable energy when it produces electricity when it's burned, but yet there is this restriction on Federal land.

□ 1645

I share that with you because America's Federal forests are terrifically overstocked and subject to catastrophic fire.

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

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

Mr. WALDEN. We could create more real jobs cleaning up the forest in very depressed communities. I was just out in four counties in my district. I think two, maybe three, are now at over 20 percent unemployment. They have 70, 50 and 80 percent Federal land. This is the great forests of our country that are left to burn up. The woody biomass could be put into clean energy. There are firms willing to invest if they could get supply. Again, the cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax bill harms that effort.

So I share the gentleman's support of this legislation to create and move forward on the hydro project. It's unfortunate if the cap-and-tax bill that passed the House becomes law that hydro will not be considered renewal. That doesn't make sense. And I hope that the Senate can correct this problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for supporting this legislation. I share the same concern that you have with the section that you quoted in the energy bill, and we hope that our friends in the other body

will address that issue so that it is not a concern for the future.

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

Mr. SCALISE. I would like to yield 3 minutes to a cosponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Melvin Price Locks and Dam is named after an historic member of this Chamber, Mel Price, who gave me my nomination to West Point. So it is with great affinity that I just mentioned that. But now that district is ably represented by my friend and colleague, JERRY COSTELLO, and I thank him for including me on this reauthorization bill.

The Republicans have already talked about an all-of-the-above energy strategy which talks about nuclear, wind, solar and hydroelectric. And no one is really more knowledgeable on the hydroelectric issue than the colleague who preceded me, GREG WALDEN. There is a concern about if we want these programs, these licenses, to actually become real projects in the whole credit issue, then this has to qualify for renewable, and that will help bring some dollars to help effect this instead of just worrying about relicensing, then we can actually get it built. But if we don't do this process, then we have to go through the whole paperwork procedure.

I'm very happy to be here with my friend who, again, worked hard and diligently for southern Illinois. And this is all part of that all-of-the-above energy strategy that will help us decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. Thank you for letting me join you in this resolution.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise really in amazement today to hear our colleagues on the other side talk about hydroelectric power being a renewable energy source, because we have seen multiple venues here in the House where Democrats have denied that.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous need in this country for alternative sources of energy, renewable sources of energy. Nuclear energy is one of those renewable sources of energy, or a source of energy that is one that makes the most sense from an environmental perspective as well as a cost perspective.

We have many members of the opposition on the other side that want to deny us going into a nuclear age. France gets over 80 percent of its electric power from nuclear sources. The United States should do the same thing. In my home State of Georgia, the Georgia Power Company for a long

period of time now has been trying to get permitting for two new nuclear reactors at their plant in Vogel just south of my district, just south of Augusta, Georgia. They already have two. They want two more. But, Mr. Speaker, they have had a great deal of difficulty because the regulatory commission and various environmental groups have made it extremely difficult.

They are not alone. All over this country, there are electric power companies that want to put in electric power plants that are nuclear-fueled. Mr. Speaker, they have great difficulty doing so. We need to use our renewable resources, not only for hydroelectric power, but for nuclear power. We need to look to wind and solar. We need to look to biomass. We need to stop this idiocy of a corn-based ethanol source of energy. Mr. Speaker, I'm from Georgia, and I love my cornbread and grits. It makes no sense to me to drive down the road burning up my food. But we've done that. And it has driven up the cost of corn for the chicken producers that produce most of the chicken for the world, all over the world in my district, and in my friend NATHAN DEAL'S district from Gainesville in the Ninth and Tenth Congressional Districts of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, we have an energy policy that is broken. Republicans have presented bill after bill that would solve the energy crisis. The American Energy Act is one. It is an all-of-the-above energy plan that would stimulate hydroelectric power. It would stimulate nuclear power. It would look to alternative sources of power.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. But our plans are not being heard on the floor of this House. Why is that? Why are the American people's representatives not being heard?

It is because the leadership on the Democratic side wants to stifle debate, wants to shut off any alternative ideas. They call the Republican Party the "Party of No," but the Democratic Party has been the Party of No, whereas the Republican Party is the Party of k-n-o-w Know because we know how to solve the energy crisis. We know how to solve the health care financing crisis. We know how to solve the economic crisis. But those ideas are not being heard. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people to wake up and demand that the Republicans are heard.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Louisiana if he has other speakers?

Mr. SCALISE. I'm prepared to close.

Mr. COSTELLO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in support of the legislation dealing with hydroelectric power. I think it is important, as we are talking about energy, that we really talk about the

need to get a comprehensive national energy policy in our country. It is not just enough to promote hydroelectric power. It is not just enough to look at any one significant source of power. We need to look at all of the resources in our land. In fact, the inscription by Daniel Webster right above the Speaker's rostrum talks about the need to explore the resources of our land. Unfortunately, there are many Federal laws and barriers in place that prevent us from doing just that. This cap-and-trade national energy tax imposes even more barriers. In addition to imposing significant taxes on to the backs of American people in the form of higher utility rates and bureaucratic regulations, it will run millions of jobs out of this country.

That's not the right approach. What we need is a comprehensive energy policy. I'm proud to be a cosponsor, with many other of my colleagues, of the American Energy Act, a bill that we filed earlier this year to take that comprehensive approach to a national energy policy, one that looks at all of the alternatives. We explore more technologies for wind, for solar, for hydroelectric and for nuclear power. We use our natural resources, like oil and natural gas, to get to that bridge to fund those other alternatives. We use the things that we have here today to get us to those technologies that aren't yet readily available to power our homes or to run our cars. But hopefully one day, through the use of these technologies, we will advance the utilization of the natural resources we have in our country to create jobs.

Our bill would actually create jobs and generate billions of dollars to the Federal Government, not by raising taxes, but by actually creating more economic opportunities by creating jobs and getting people back to work so that they can contribute and pay into and pay down this debt as opposed to raising the debt and running off jobs.

So I would hope that we would support and get to a place where we can actually get agreement in a bipartisan way to pass a bipartisan bill like the American Energy Act that actually takes a comprehensive approach to solving our national energy needs and reducing our dependence on Middle Eastern oil—rather than this tax approach, this cap-and-trade energy tax that actually would make countries in Europe, the Middle East and China more powerful and put America further at risk—so we can get our strengthened energy policy and we can get energy independence. But we need to have a bipartisan approach, not this cap-and-trade energy tax that literally would run millions of jobs out of our country.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Louisiana and the minority for supporting this legislation. In particular I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois, Congressman SHIMKUS, not only for his

kind words, but for cosponsoring this legislation.

I urge passage of H.R. 2938, and with that I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2938.

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. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING LATINO DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 69) recognizing the need to continue research into the causes, treatment, education, and an eventual cure for diabetes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 69

Whereas diabetes mellitus is a chronic disease caused by the inability of the pancreas to produce insulin or to use the insulin produced in the proper way;

Whereas in the case of Type I diabetes or insulin-dependent diabetes, formerly called juvenile-onset diabetes because it tends to affect persons before the age of 20, the pancreas makes almost no insulin;

Whereas in the case of Type II diabetes or non-insulin-dependent diabetes, which comprises about 90 percent of all cases of diabetes, the pancreas produces a reduced amount of insulin or the cells do not respond to the insulin;

Whereas this year 23.6 million Americans suffer from one form or another of this disease, and 5.7 million people go undiagnosed, commonly known as pre-diabetes;

Whereas 2.0 million or 8.2 percent of all Latino Americans aged twenty years or older have diabetes, and Latino Americans are 1.5 times more likely to have diabetes than non-Latino whites of similar age;

Whereas Mexican-Americans, the largest Latino subgroup in the United States, are more than twice as likely to have diabetes as non-Latino whites of similar age;

Whereas residents of Puerto Rico are 1.8 times more likely to have diagnosed diabetes than United States non-Latino whites;

Whereas diabetes affects individuals in different ways, and as a result, treatment programs will vary;

Whereas diabetes in the Latino community can result in a high prevalence of complications, such as foot problems and amputations, kidney failure that may lead to chronic or end stage renal disease, blindness, numbness and loss of sensation in the legs, heart attacks and strokes, and eventually death;

Whereas individuals suffering from diabetes can reduce their risk for complications if

they are educated about their disease; learn and practice the skills necessary to better control their blood glucose, blood pressure, and cholesterol levels; exercise; and receive regular checkups;

Whereas targeted health communications to the public are vital in disseminating information about diabetes and the need to live a healthy lifestyle;

Whereas the Latino Diabetes Association, a nonprofit organization devoted to aggressive diabetes education, has worked tirelessly to raise funds for diabetes education and to find the causes of and cure for diabetes; and

Whereas the month of July of 2009 would be an appropriate month to recognize Latino Diabetes Awareness Month in order to educate Latino communities across the Nation about diabetes and the need for research funding, accurate diagnosis, and effective treatments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the need to continue research into the causes, treatment, education, and an eventual cure for diabetes;

(2) commends those hospitals, community clinics, educational institutes, and other organizations that are—

(A) working to increase awareness of diabetes; and

(B) conducting research for methods to help patients and families in the Latino community suffering from diabetes;

(3) congratulates the work of the Latino Diabetes Association for its great efforts to educate, support, and provide hope for individuals and their families who suffer from diabetes;

(4) supports the designation of an appropriate month to recognize "Latino Diabetes Awareness Month"; and

(5) calls upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

First, I would like to thank Majority Leader HOYER, Chairman WAXMAN, Ranking Member BARTON and Health Subcommittee Chair PALLONE and, of course, my colleague from Louisiana, a good baseball player, for their support of this resolution. I also want to take the time to thank all my colleagues in the House of Representatives for their bipartisan support of this resolution.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 69, the Latino Diabetes Awareness Resolution. The resolution recognizes the need to continue research into the causes, treatment, education and an eventual cure for diabetes and commends those organizations

that are working to increase awareness of diabetes and conducting research for methods to help patients and families in Latino communities suffering from diabetes.

It also congratulates the work of the Latino Diabetes Association for its great efforts to educate, support and provide hope for individuals and families who suffer from diabetes. The resolution also supports the designation of July 2009 as "Latino Diabetes Awareness Month." It calls upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

It is critical for the long-term sustainability of any health care reform plan to make sure that steps for the prevention of diseases, like diabetes, are encouraged by Congress. This prevention of disease would do a great deal in helping keep costs down for current patients, as well as favorably changing the attitudes and behavior of diabetes patients and their families, thereby improving their quality of life.

We can take a good first step in achieving these goals by passing this resolution here today. Diabetes is a chronic disease of the pancreas and adversely affects its ability to produce and use insulin in the proper way.

Diabetes has no cure, treatment varies from patient to patient, and it is quite often very painful. Some side effects of treatment include weight gain, skin rash or itching, various stomach problems, tiredness and dizziness, and swelling in the leg and ankle.

The impact of diabetes is not focused solely on the patient; family members and immediate care takers also suffer greatly from the effects of diabetes on their loved ones. I say this from personal experience.

In the Latino community, diabetes can result in high prevalence of foot problems, kidney failure, renal disease, blindness, heart attacks, strokes and eventually death.

□ 1700

What's scariest is that diabetes patients who need to take one or more insulin shots daily, and for whatever reason do not, greatly increase their risk of stroke and heart attack.

One of the reasons I believe diabetes disproportionately affects the Latino community is the lack of sound health communication that speaks to those Hispanics who are most at risk of coming down with diabetes, or who already suffer from it. This means targeting communications efforts to both English- and Spanish-speaking communities and specifically referencing these efforts towards the area of our culture that puts us at risk the most: our diets.

Over 23.6 million Americans suffer from diabetes, and of these, 2 million are Latinos or of Latino descent; 8.6 of all Latinos over the age of 20 live with this disease. However, Latinos are almost twice as likely to have diabetes as non-Latino whites of similar age.

Individuals suffering from diabetes can reduce their risk for complications if they are educated about their disease and take the proper steps to care for themselves. This means learning and practicing the skills necessary to better control their blood glucose, blood pressure and cholesterol levels. They must exercise and receive regular checkups, as well as maintain a healthy, balanced diet, as well as maintaining willingness to change these dangerous eating habits.

And that becomes very difficult for a lot of us because we like our frijoles, our tortillas, our tamales, our enchiladas, our menudo; but we have to put that aside. This could include eating meals prepared healthier, eating more moderate portions, or a combination of these.

Two people ought to be commended for their hard work in the attempts to educate the public about diabetes and treatments for patients, and that's actors Rita Torres and Edward Olmos. A few years ago, I worked with Rita Torres and Edward to help put together a short documentary highlighting the day-to-day lives of different diabetes patients, regardless of age or ethnicity, and they ought to be recognized for their tireless efforts to raise diabetes awareness.

I have been affected personally by diabetes through the loss of five members of my immediate family. My father was a proud, hardworking man, never missed a day of work for any reason until he was struck down by diabetes and ultimately needed to have a leg amputated. It originally started with a toe, half a leg, and then the leg itself.

My mother also was very strong, was never sick until she, too, came down with diabetes.

My two brothers, Abelio and Tanny, and my sister Annie fought with diabetes but ultimately lost their battle largely due to lack of education and awareness of how the disease would affect their lives and not willing to change their eating habits.

Tanny recently passed away due in part to the fact that he could no longer afford all the necessary treatment to keep his diabetes at bay. He is not only a victim of diabetes but of the high cost of health care as well.

My brother-in-law, Ted Dominguez, was also a victim of diabetes. Ted was a great athlete back in his day, always in great physical shape. His lesson to us is that anyone, regardless of age, weight or physical condition, can get diabetes. He eventually went through dialysis and ultimately ended up losing his life.

Also, a former staff member of mine who has been a close friend for many years, Daniel Hernandez, is a testament to us and to many other folks. He worked for me because he needed coverage for diabetes. He left my office after 2 years and became an independent consultant. He came back, however, and approached me one day and told me that the only reason he

was willing to come back to work was to qualify for health care benefits that he would not be able to receive otherwise.

It was their fight and their example that opened my eyes to the horrid realities and difficulties of this disease and the need for education and awareness about diabetes and ultimately to introduce this resolution.

However, a great diabetes success story and a perfect example to prove that diabetes can be beat is Supreme Court nominee, Judge Sonia Sotomayor. Judge Sotomayor was diagnosed and has lived with type 1 diabetes since the age of 8 years of age. Due to carefully monitoring her condition, she fought the disease head-on and continues to be a great example of someone who can live with diabetes. She will soon not only be the first Latina to become a Justice on the Supreme Court, but also the first Latina with type 1 diabetes.

Another example of a remarkable type 1 diabetes patient is Sara Rodriguez. Sara is a constituent of mine, a rising junior at Rancho Cucamonga High School, a straight A student, and letter winner in basketball, volleyball, and track. In order for Sara to lead as normal a teenage life as possible, she must test her blood sugar levels eight to 20 times per day, every day. She will never outgrow her disease and will require care and medication for the rest of her life. She is a very brave and courageous young woman whose fight and determination should not only be an example to diabetes patients everywhere, but to anyone facing adversity.

On behalf of all of the other young people like Sara Rodriguez, Congress recently reauthorized the special diabetes program. This is a wonderful example of the government's commitment to cure diabetes for people like Sara and the millions of others who live with the disease and its complications. This program funds \$150 million a year in type 1 diabetes research and is aligned with the goals of this resolution to keep us on the path towards a cure for diabetes.

Yet another great example of a person living a healthy life with diabetes is Roque Martin, the grandfather of Matt Gomez, one of my interns, who has been instrumental in assisting with this resolution. Roque was diagnosed with diabetes over 25 years ago and continues to live a healthy life even at the age of 78. He eats right and checks his blood sugar level three times a day and is a great example, along with Sara and Judge Sotomayor, for all diabetes patients that with proper care, diet and exercise, one can survive with diabetes.

That is why it's so important to pass this resolution, which I introduced in the hopes of bringing awareness to those lucky enough to not have to face the disease firsthand, or through the fight of a loved one.

It takes a small, but a critical, first step to help raise awareness about dia-

betes for not only the Latino community, but for all Americans and all individuals impacted with diabetes.

But, also, it's a giant step for those individuals that have suffered from diabetes for many years and lack the ability to tell their stories firsthand, along with families and immediate caretakers of diabetes patients, who oftentimes suffer the impacts of the disease more so than the patient themselves.

Diabetes is a disease that can, and does, affect anyone: Democrats, Republicans, black or white, Latinos, Asians, American Indians, all nationalities. The alarming statistics regarding diabetes are on the rise. With the greater scope of the health care debate, there is no better time to raise the awareness for a preventable disease than right now. And there is no better time than right now to stress that no diabetes patient should be denied health care coverage because of their preexisting condition.

For these reasons, I ask you to stand with me and fight against diabetes and pass this resolution.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 69.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California on his leadership on this bill, building a bipartisan coalition to bring it to the floor under suspension. I want to recognize the 23.6 million Americans that suffer from diabetes. Diabetes can lead to serious complications and premature death, but people with diabetes can take steps to control the disease and lower the risk of complications.

The Centers for Disease Control has stated that progression to diabetes among those with pre-diabetes is not inevitable and that studies have shown that people with pre-diabetes who lose weight and increase their physical activity can prevent or delay diabetes and return their blood glucose levels to normal. Through regular exercise and a steady diet, Americans can get to a healthier state of living and avoid diabetes, and that's what we're trying to raise awareness about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Houston, Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), also an outstanding basketball player.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 69, which recognizes the increased rates of diabetes in the Hispanic community and calls for increased research to combat and prevent the high rates of diabetes in Hispanics.

And I want to thank my good friend JOE BACA for sponsoring this resolution and also for the compliment. I think you're the first person in history who ever said I was a good basketball player. Thank you, JOE.

According to the Office of Minority Health, Mexican Americans are twice as likely as non-Hispanic whites to be

diagnosed with diabetes by a physician. They have higher rates of end-stage renal disease caused by diabetes, and they are 50 percent more likely to die from diabetes than non-Hispanic whites.

Mexican American adults are two times more likely than non-Hispanic white adults to have been diagnosed with diabetes by a physician. In 2002, Hispanics were 1.5 times as likely to start treatment for end-stage renal disease related to diabetes, compared to non-Hispanic white men. In 2005, Hispanics were 1.6 times as likely as non-Hispanic whites to die from diabetes.

In our district, it is predominantly Hispanic. We have a large number of individuals with type 2 diabetes, which is often referred to as late-onset diabetes. Because of this, many individuals in our district have diabetes-related complications, including illnesses such as foot problems and amputations, kidney failure that may lead to chronic or end-stage renal disease, blindness, numbness and loss of sensation in the legs, and heart attacks and strokes.

However, type 2 diabetes is preventable with a good diet and exercise. It is important we have targeted educational campaigns in the Hispanic community to help combat the diabetes epidemic.

I would like to commend the Latino Diabetes Association and other diabetes research groups for their work in educating the Hispanic community on diabetes-related issues. Groups like these are crucial to the reduction of diabetes in the Hispanic community.

I would also like to extend my support towards designating July 2009 as Latino Diabetes Awareness Month to help raise awareness of the high rate of diabetes in Hispanics.

Through education and prevention and wellness programs we can drastically reduce the number of Hispanic individuals with diabetes.

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

Mr. BACA. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. This is probably the most important part, Mr. Speaker.

That is why this Congress needs to pass comprehensive health care reform that covers everyone so we can deal with the diabetes epidemic in our Hispanic community, our African American community and also in our low-economic community, because we can deal with this if we push the envelope back to deal with it before it gets to be where people start losing their legs.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a medical doctor. I've treated diabetes for 3½ or more decades. I congratulate my good friend JOE BACA for bringing this issue to the forefront because it is extremely important for all Americans, not just

only the Latino community that he's focusing on here. I've seen many patients in my overall medical career that are Latino, as well as blacks and Caucasian and people from all ethnic groups. It affects everybody no matter who their forefathers, what their skin color is, and I congratulate Mr. BACA for bringing this forward.

God tells us in Hosea 4:6, My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. And as a medical doctor, I've tried to instill knowledge into my patients over the years, and this, of course, is what this resolution is all about, and I do congratulate the gentleman for bringing it forward because we do have a problem with people being knowledgeable about diabetes and the effect that it has upon them, their families, their longevity.

Diabetes is the leading cause of blindness in the adult population. It leads to many health problems. It leads to heart attacks and strokes. It leads to peripheral vascular disease.

As I sat here listening to Mr. BACA, I recalled an elderly black gentleman who came to see me as a patient that I diagnosed as having diabetes, and I started talking to him about diet and exercise and those types of things. Well, he didn't take care of himself, in spite of all my warnings and all of the consequences that he was headed towards. He wound up having a foot cut off, and he had that leg cut off. I kept talking to him. His blood sugar was continuing to be extremely high. Wound up having a second leg cut off, and eventually he had both arms and both legs removed, and he was sitting in a wheelchair when he finally got the message and started controlling his diet, taking his medications as prescribed, and we finally got his blood sugar in good control.

That's a sad story. I've seen many, many patients over the years that have developed renal failure, which is what diabetes leads to. It leads to the nerves in people's legs dying so that they have no feeling in their legs so they can get cuts or even the simplest little puncture or a cut on their foot may lead to gangrene that leads to amputation, maybe even lead to what we call in medicine septicemia, which is where you have bacteria in your bloodstream, and it can go to your heart and it can affect the valves in your heart. Septicemia itself can lead to death, by itself.

Diabetes afflicts many of our population, and it's sad that people don't have the knowledge of what that disease will lead to.

□ 1715

That's why I congratulate Mr. BACA for bringing this forward, and I do support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when I was practicing medicine in rural south Georgia, I had a small automated lab in my office down there, and Congress passed a bill called the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. My lab was totally

automated. I had quality control to make sure that the results were absolutely accurate so that when I checked a patient's blood sugar, I would know what it was to know if they had the potential for prediabetes or whether they had frank diabetes. I would do a fasting blood sugar that would help me diagnosis their condition.

Well, Congress passed CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, that closed my lab and every single doctor's lab in this country. Closed our labs. Eventually, I got my lab back up after I jumped through the hoops that were required by the legislation, by the regulatory burden placed on me and all doctors in this country.

Prior to CLIA, a patient would come in and I would take a history and physical and would suspect that they may have diabetes. Some patients would get a family history of diabetes, and so I would do a screening test of a fasting blood sugar.

I charged \$10 for that test, Mr. Speaker. After CLIA shut me down, I had to send patients over to the hospital. The hospital was charging \$35 for the same test. Once CLIA came along, it actually increased, and I got my lab opened back up, I had to charge \$35, but the hospital, I think, went to \$75 for the very same test.

The point I want to make here is this regulatory burden on the health care industry markedly raised the price for that one test. What we see across the health care industry when government gets involved in health care decisions, such as it did with CLIA, it drives up the cost for all of us.

As a physician who used to be a preferred provider for Medicare patients—I'm not now, for many reasons—but as a preferred provider, I could not see many patients, as I did previously, for free. Many, many patients, poor patients, people that had no insurance would come into my office, and I would see them for free. I have literally given away hundreds of thousands of dollars of free health care provision in my office; give free tests, free screening for diabetes, for many conditions. But under current Federal law, physicians who accept Medicare cannot do that. That makes no sense, Mr. Speaker.

It is so today because of Federal regulation. Congress passed HIPPA, the Health Insurance Portability and Privacy Act. That has cost the health care industry billions of dollars and has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches that it's created. And it was totally unneeded.

Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is the American people need to know that the more the Federal Government gets into the health care business, the more regulatory burden is placed on physicians and hospitals, the higher the cost goes.

In the non-stimulus bill we put a chunk of money, a huge chunk of money, for something called comparative effectiveness research. What I'd like my colleagues and the American

people to know, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a process put into place by the Democratic majority.

This could have prevented those 78-year-old people that my friend Mr. BACA talked about from getting the care that they need because it is going to be deemed, as some Federal bureaucrat says, it's not effective comparatively to provide the dialysis for that 78-year-old that Mr. BACA was talking about. It's not going to be effective to try to prevent the blindness. It's not going to be effective to provide care to people who now are getting care. And we're going to have a tremendous denial or delay of services.

I have said on this floor in Special Orders that this comprehensive health care bill that's being debated right now in committees and is going to be presented on this floor eventually—the Speaker wants to have it come up before we leave for the August recess—it's literally going to kill people.

Now I have been chastised in the liberal media for making that claim, but it's going to kill people for this simple reason, Mr. Speaker. And the American people need to understand this. People are going to be denied services. They're going to have a marked delay in their being able to get the screening tests that they need for colon cancer or for evaluation of their chest pain or they're going to have a marked delay, as we see in Canada and Great Britain today, of being able to get their bypass surgery.

So diabetic patients who have developed coronary artery disease and have angina pectoris and maybe even had a heart attack are going to have marked delay in being able to get the stints put in or their bypass surgery that they desperately need, and people are going to die.

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

Mr. SCALISE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I have seen patients over and over again with these consequences of diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I've given away hundreds of thousands of dollars of my services over my career. I want people to have access to health care—but they do today. EMTALA requires every emergency room in this country to evaluate and treat everybody who walks in. So the question of access is not a true question to debate today.

We hear about 47 million people. The numbers keep growing by the Democratic side. The American people need to understand that a lot of those people are illegal aliens who have come here illegally. I understand why. They come here for work, for their families. And I feel for them. But they have still broken the law.

American citizens are going to be denied treatment, denied x-rays, denied their coronary bypass surgery, denied their dialysis, and all these things because of this comprehensive health

care plan that's being shoved down the throat of the American people. This is not the proper way of doing it.

CBO just last week said it's not going to lower the cost of health care. CBO just last week said it's not going to put people in the insured category. CBO last week said it's going to cost at least 750,000 jobs in America.

The more government gets involved in the health care business, the higher the cost goes, the less efficient it is, and the Democratic plan is going to destroy the quality of health care.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, need to stand up and say “no,” and say “yes” to a health care plan that makes sense, that lowers the cost of care for all Americans.

Mr. BACA. First of all, I appreciate some of the comments that my colleague, the doctor from Georgia, ended up making. And it is about knowledge, education, and awareness, and it's about preventive, because preventive is really the key to saving money. Once you do the early detection, early prevention, then we could save a lot of lives on account of treatment, because in his statement he indicated many of the people that he treated—those are people that I recognize in terms of my own personal family that lack that kind of knowledge, that kind of awareness, and did not follow the doctor's orders in terms of what they should have been doing to preserve their life. That's why it's very important that we create this kind of legislation to recognize diabetes awareness for all America, because it impacts all of us.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. It's important that we continue working to find the causes and the treatments, education, and make sure that we are researching properly to find cures for diseases like diabetes.

The broader question of health care reform—I think my friend from Georgia did a really good job of talking about the challenges and the concerns that so many over on this side have of this proposal that's before us. Not here in this bill, but being debated here in this Congress in these coming weeks, this week, last week, this proposal to have a government takeover of our health care system.

I think it shows that while there are definitely ways to approach this in a bipartisan fashion, where there are many areas of health care reform that many of us agree need to be made to improve outcomes, to improve access, to focus on that narrow group of people who don't have access to care.

I think the real danger is going down the road of a government takeover where government literally is interfering in the relationship between a doctor and their patient, as this bill would do, the bill that's been filed by the administration, by some of the members of this Democratic leadership.

I think there's real problems, and we can only look at the neighbors that

have gone down the same road. Look at Canada. Canada has a government-run health care system. Many people with the means from Canada come to America to get good care. The same thing in England.

There was a tragic story in England, which has a government-run system. Just yesterday, there was a young man, a 22-year-old, who died because he was not allowed to get a liver transplant. “He did not qualify for a donor liver under strict NHS rules.” His own mother said, “These rules are really unfair.”

They have a government-run system that's very similar to the proposal that's being pushed by the President to have this government takeover of health care.

We actually had an amendment in committee last night in the Energy and Commerce Committee that would have prohibited a government-run system from having a bureaucrat interfere in the relationship between a patient and their doctor. Unfortunately, our amendment was defeated.

So clearly it shows that a government-run system would allow a doctor-patient relationship to be interfered with by a government bureaucrat here in Washington. That's not health care reform. That's rationing of health care.

So we need to, hopefully, go back to the table and have a true bipartisan debate because there are many proposals that are on the table, bills that have been filed—I'm cosponsor of a number of them that actually address some of the problems that exist in health care—to allow companies to pool together so they can get the same buying power as a small business, as a large business does; to allow individuals to buy insurance across State lines so they don't have to rely on their employer if they don't like their employer's plan; and then also open up and address those areas of waste, fraud, and abuse that exist. That's what we're concerned about.

I do think it's very important that we raise awareness and education for diseases like diabetes. And I do want again to thank the gentleman with the “good arm” from California for his leadership on this issue because he has, I think, taken this issue and approached it in a good bipartisan way. Hopefully, we can do the same with the broader area of health care reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank both sides for bipartisan support on this resolution. I look forward to the strong support.

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. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 69.

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. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

□ 1730

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 270, by the yeas and nays;

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 123, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1933, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2632, 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.

RECOGNIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF HUNTERS FOR THE HUNGRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 270, 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 Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 270.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

YEAS—418

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

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

Olver	Titus
Ortiz	Tonko
Pallone	Towns
Pascarella	Tsongas
Pastor (AZ)	Turner
Paul	Upton
Paulsen	Van Hollen
Payne	Velázquez
Pence	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Walden
Perriello	Walz
Peters	
Peterson	
Petri	
Pingree (ME)	
Pitts	
Platts	
Poe (TX)	
Pollis (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	
Sánchez, Linda T.	
Sanchez, Loretta	
Sarbanes	
Scalise	
Schakowsky	
Schauer	
Schiff	
Schmidt	
Schock	
Schrader	
Schwartz	
Scott (GA)	
Scott (VA)	
Sensenbrenner	
Serrano	
Sessions	
Shadegg	
Shea-Porter	
Sherman	
Shimkus	
Shuler	
Shuster	
Sires	
Skelton	
Slaughter	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Snyder	
Souder	
Space	
Speier	
Spratt	
Stark	
Stearns	
Stupak	
Sullivan	
Tanner	
Taylor	
Teague	
Terry	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiahrt	
Tiberi	
Tierney	

Wamp	Wilson (OH)
Wasserman	Wilson (SC)
Schultz	Wittman
Waters	Wolf
Watson	Woolsey
Watt	Wu
Waxman	Yarmuth
Weiner	Young (AK)
Welch	Young (FL)
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	

NAYS—1

Moran (VA)

NOT VOTING—14

Bean	Kirk	Simpson
Burton (IN)	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Sutton
Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)	Wexler
Johnson (GA)	Sestak	

□ 1757

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 30, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 30.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—421

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

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

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1803

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOHN WILLIAM HEISMAN TO FOOTBALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 123, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 123.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

YEAS—423

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

Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxo
Frank (MA)
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
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling

Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
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
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lofgren, Zane
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
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
Pascarell
Kind
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
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)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor

Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

McCarthy (NY)
Paul
Radanovich
Ryan (WI)
Sestak
Simpson
Sires
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1823

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 602, 603, and 604, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

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.

LIM POON LEE POST OFFICE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3119) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 867 Stockton Street in San Francisco, California, as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3119

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

SECTION 1. LIM POON LEE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 867 Stockton Street in San Francisco, California, shall be known and designated as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to present H.R. 3119 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States postal facility located at 867 Stockton Street in San Francisco, California, as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office."

Introduced by the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI of California, on July 7, 2009, and reported out of the Oversight Committee on July 10, 2009, by unanimous consent, H.R. 3119 enjoys the strong support of the entire California House delegation.

Born in Hong Kong in 1911, Lim Poon Lee and his family immigrated to San Francisco, California, when he was only 8 months old. Following his distinguished service as a United States Army counterintelligence specialist during World War II, Mr. Lee received his undergraduate education at the College of the Pacific and his Juris Doctor at the Lincoln University School of Law.

Mr. Lee would then go on to serve his beloved San Francisco community through his longtime service as a social worker, juvenile probation officer, and as a writer for the monthly Chinatown news magazine, *Chinese Digest*.

In 1966, Mr. Lee achieved further distinction when he was selected by President Lyndon Baines Johnson for appointment as the postmaster of San Francisco. Notably, Mr. Lee's appointment at the time was the highest Federal appointive post ever held by a Chinese American.

Mr. Lee's subsequent 14-year tenure as the postmaster of San Francisco was marked by his dedicated and successful effort to increase the hiring of minority and disabled persons, as well as the inauguration of an alcohol recovery program for post office employees.

During his later years, Mr. Lee continued his admirable commitment to public service through his service as a Methodist chaplain and his membership on the boards of several community organizations, including the Chinatown YMCA, the Chinese American Civil Council, and the Chinatown

Community Service Organization. Additionally, Mr. Lee was well known in San Francisco as the master of ceremonies for the city's annual Chinese New Year parade for several years.

Regrettably, Mr. Lee passed away in 2002 at the age of 91. Madam Speaker, let us honor this dedicated public servant and distinguished Chinese American and postal employee through the passage of this legislation to name the San Francisco Chinatown Post Office in his honor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3119.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3119 to designate the facility at the United States Postal Service located at 867 Stockton Street in San Francisco, California, as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office."

Born in 1911 in Hong Kong, Lim Poon Lee moved to San Francisco with his family when he was just 8 months old. The son of a laundry operator, Mr. Lee went on to college, graduate school, and law school after serving as a U.S. Army counterintelligence specialist during World War II.

He often told stories about serving in Japan and how he was the only U.S. Army representative there who spoke Japanese, Chinese, and English. His multilingual mediation skills helped to quell a riot between Chinese POWs and their Japanese captors when news of the Japanese surrender came through.

After serving in World War II, he continued mediating and became a social worker and juvenile probation officer.

□ 1830

Mr. Lee was also very much a community activist and worked with the Chinese community, World War II veterans and the Democratic Party. In addition to working as a campaign organizer for many local Democrats, Mr. Lee was also a founding member of the Chinese American Democratic Club, an organization that played a key role in securing rights for Chinese Americans.

For his tireless efforts in the San Francisco community, in 1966, Mr. Lee was appointed Postmaster of San Francisco. At the time, it was the highest Federal appointive post ever held by a Chinese American.

Though Mr. Lee once said his only experience with the U.S. Postal System was "walking up to the window and putting down a nickel for a 4-cent stamp," Mr. Lee mastered the nuances of his new position.

During his 14-year tenure, Mr. Lee greatly increased the hiring of minority and disabled persons and even started an alcoholic recovery program. Best said by retired California State senator John Burton, "By the time Lim finished with it, it looked like the face of San Francisco, with Asian, African American, Latino and female workers." Perhaps most notable was Mr. Lee's establishment of the post of-

fice at 867 Stockton Street in the heart of Chinatown in 1977. Recently, this post office celebrated its 30th anniversary, and fittingly, recognized Mr. Lee for his significant contributions.

Sadly, Mr. Lee did not live to see this celebration. He passed away at the age of 91 on June 7, 2002. Though his life ended, his legacy remained and is felt far beyond the post office at 867 Stockton Street. The executive director of the Chinese American Voter Education Committee reflected on Mr. Lee's life: "At a time when there were few role models, few political leaders, Lim Poon Lee was someone Chinese Americans could look up to."

In recognition of Mr. Lee's contributions to his community and the city of San Francisco, let us now recognize his many years of service by naming the post office he established in San Francisco, California, as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California, the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him and the ranking member for bringing this resolution to the floor about a great personality. It is such a cause of celebration for all of us in San Francisco to see Lim Poon Lee so recognized on the floor of the House of Representatives. Thank you both for your kind words about him.

Those of us who knew him and worked with him take great joy in the celebration we have here today. And I also rise in support of the legislation to commemorate the life and the achievements of Lim Poon Lee, the first Chinese American postmaster in the United States.

Today, the House has an opportunity to honor Postmaster Lee's lifetime of public service and proud patriotism by naming the post office in the heart of San Francisco's Chinatown as the "Lim Poon Lee Post Office."

As has been mentioned, Lim Poon Lee came to these shores from Hong Kong as an infant. Like many immigrants, he so loved this country that he spent his entire life in public service.

During World War II, he served in the U.S. Army as a counterintelligence specialist. He worked in the public welfare and juvenile court system in San Francisco. And Mr. Lee served one of my predecessors in Congress and a friend to many of us here, Congressman Philip Burton, as a field representative.

In 1966, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Lim Poon Lee the Postmaster of San Francisco. At the time, it was the highest Federal appointive post ever held by a Chinese American. In this position, Lee transformed the face of San Francisco's postal system by increasing the hiring of women, minorities and disabled postal workers.

In San Francisco, we know the beauty is in the mix, and Mr. Lee worked to

ensure while hiring that the post office look like the rest of the city in terms of its great diversity. In 1977, Lim Poon Lee established San Francisco's Chinatown Post Office, the post office located at 867 Stockton Street. Today we have the opportunity to name that post office for him.

As we honor Postmaster Lee, we also recognize his family, his wife Catherine, his children Rosalind, Dorinda, Lynnette and Chesley and his grandchildren. They helped make his success possible.

As was mentioned by my colleague, Mr. LYNCH, Postmaster Lee passed away in 2002 at the age of 91. His absence is felt throughout San Francisco. As was also mentioned, he was the master of ceremonies for the Chinese New Year Parade, a columnist for "Asian Week" and a leader on many distinguished boards and commissions. All who knew him knew him to be a larger-than-life personality. All who knew Philip Burton knew that it took such a larger-than-life personality to be his field representative.

I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the life of the first Chinese American postmaster, again at the time, the highest appointive office in the land when appointed by Lyndon Johnson, by supporting this legislation naming a post office in honor of Lim Poon Lee. And I thank you, Mr. LYNCH, again, for your leadership.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, given this was Speaker PELOSI's bill, please note that we did take a little harder, closer look. And I'm happy to report that this is an outstanding American. I appreciate the Speaker's bringing this bill that is a worthy designation. He is a great American and somebody I hope our communities across this country can look up to.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the committee for bringing H.R. 3119 forward.

I rise in strong support of this legislation honoring the first Chinese American Postmaster General in the United States, Lim Poon Lee, by naming a post office after him.

At the time of his appointment, he was the highest ranking federally appointed Chinese American official. He served the United States honorably in World War II as a counterintelligence specialist. He spoke three languages, Chinese, Japanese and English. During his tenure as Postmaster General, he worked to change the face of the post office by hiring women, racial and ethnic minorities and the disabled.

Postmaster Lee was a key activist in the fight against the Chinese Exclusion Act, and during his long career in public service, he served as a social worker, juvenile probation officer, and preacher, sitting on numerous community boards and councils. I think it is

fitting to also say that we do look into the background of folks to see if they should be honored in this way. I think that when we talk about him, it is obvious that he has contributed quite a bit to his country. But one more thing that I think we need to understand is that he also was a victim of anti-Asian legislation in this country. And when he was able to reach and attain a certain level of responsibility, I think he also understood this concept of not perpetuating these kinds of behaviors, but correcting it and making it easier for other folks to be able to participate in this country. And I think that is why he is recognized in being able to work with other folks. I guess we call that "acting affirmatively in positions of influence." I think that he is a great example of someone who understood how to implement things like affirmative action and looking at going beyond the arena of comfort in doing the right thing and extending the conduct and the principles of the Constitution of this country.

I and other members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus have worked to highlight the accomplishments of and contributions to American society made by Asian American and Pacific Islanders.

In this spirit, I thank the Speaker and the other leaders for bringing forth this resolution and urge my colleagues to rise in support to honor a pioneering Chinese American who contributed much to this country.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I simply want to thank Speaker PELOSI for bringing this bill forward. I thank Mr. HONDA for his remarks and the ranking member for his comments as well. And I ask that all Members join us in honoring Lim Poon Lee by naming the San Francisco Chinatown Post Office in his honor.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3119.

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. CHAFFETZ. 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.

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON BURMA

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 56) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 56

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

Section 9(b)(3) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking "six years" and inserting "nine years".

SEC. 102. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A(b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a "renewal resolution" for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 103. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3)(B)(i) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "January 31, 2018" and inserting "February 7, 2018".

SEC. 104. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2009, whichever occurs first.

TITLE II—TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Corporate Estimated Tax Shift Act of 2009".

SEC. 202. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

(a) REPEAL OF ADJUSTMENTS FOR 2010, 2011, AND 2013.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 401 of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (and any modification of such section contained in any other provision of law) shall not apply with respect to any installment of corporate estimated tax which (without regard to such section) would otherwise be due after December 31, 2009.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR 2014.—Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year), the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2014 shall be 100.25 percent of such amount, and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support this joint resolution which extends and renews the import ban on products of Burma under the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. The joint resolution is necessary because the troubling human rights conditions in Burma persist, and thus renewal of the import ban is warranted.

Burma's military junta continues to be one of the world's most repression and abusive regimes. And while some have voiced concerns about the effectiveness of unilateral sanctions, Burma remains a major violator of basic human rights, which is why it is so important to renew the import ban for another year.

For over 45 years, Burma has been under the rule of authoritarian military regimes, all dominated by the majority Burman ethnic group. Not only have these military rulers suppressed democracy, but they have continually denied basic human rights to their own citizens. The Burma regime continues to hold Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest. She has been detained for 14 of the last 20 years and is currently on trial because an uninvited American swam to her lakeside home in May of this year. Most expect that she will be found guilty of violating the terms of her house arrest, extending her detention, and giving the junta an excuse to hold her through next year's elections.

Burma's legal system is a mockery to justice and to democratic principles. In addition to the wrongful detention and the current sham trial of Suu Kyi, nearly 2,000 additional political prisoners are being held, most without ever being formally charged. The military regime continues the practice of arbitrarily arresting and detaining regular citizens and pro-democracy activists. This past weekend, at least 50 members of the opposition National League for Democracy party were participating in the official ceremony marking the death of General Aung San, the country's independence hero.

These political activists were released later in the day. Other activists are not so fortunate. They often disappear for days, weeks and months, and some may never return. In prison they are subjected to physical abuse, receive little food, lack clean water and are refused sufficient medical care. They suffer, and so do their families, who may never discover the fate of their loved ones. But Burma's disregard for basic human rights extends far beyond its prison's walls. Violence and ethnic discrimination against children, women and ethnic minorities continue unabated.

For instance, there have been a number of reports of Burmese soldiers raping and killing teenage girls of the

Karen minority. Those who commit these despicable acts are rarely, if ever, brought to justice by this repressive regime.

□ 1845

Additionally, workers' rights remain restricted; women and girls continue to be subjected to trafficking for purposes of prostitution; and children are often forced into military service.

Forced labor is frequently used to support military operations and infrastructure. Villagers are forced to build and repair military camps, often with materials they must buy or provide themselves.

It is Burma's suppression of democratic principles such as freedom of speech and assembly, and the regime's refusal to provide basic human rights, that leads me to urge my colleagues to extend the ban on the import of Burmese products for another year.

I commend Prime Minister Gordon Brown and Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon for their recent statements calling on the junta to end its oppression, and I hope that nations around the world, and in particular China and India and the ASEAN member countries, will work with the United States to pressure the Burmese military regime to embrace reform and address its troubling human rights record. Secretary Clinton's attendance at this week's ASEAN summit presents an important opportunity to renew this work.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 56. Our Burma sanctions are meant to promote democracy, develop respect for human rights, and improve living conditions for the Burmese people. Unfortunately, the ruling junta is still working against, not toward, these objectives. For that reason, I am in favor of reauthorizing our overall sanctions program against Burma for another 3 years and extending import sanctions against Burma for another year.

Burma's regime is one of the world's most oppressive and continues to oppress democratic movements and humanitarianism. Opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi is still being falsely detained by the regime, now on sham charges. As of April 2009, the regime held an estimated 2,100 political prisoners, more than 150 of whom were recently sentenced to prison terms of up to 104 years. Many of these prisoners were held for nearly a year without charge and were convicted of offenses relating to the participation in pro-democracy movements. The regime also jailed three lawyers representing opposition activists for contempt when the attorneys merely argued that the trials of their clients lacked due process. The regime also severely restricts freedom of assembly, expression, association, movement, and religion.

The Burmese regime does not limit its repugnant behavior to civic activists. Extrajudicial killings, rape, torture, recruitment of child soldiers, and forced labor are routine. Moreover, the regime has actually worked against the interests of its people following the May 2008 cyclone. Due to the regime's practice of applying unreasonable restrictions to humanitarian assistance to workers, the area the cyclone hit hardest continues to be in dire need of assistance.

The leaders of the regime will have greater incentive to cooperate with United Nations diplomatic efforts, their southeast Asian neighbors in ASEAN, and the Peoples Republic of China if its leaders and cronies come under targeted economic pressure that denies them access to personal wealth and sources of revenue. Some Burmese businesspeople with ties to the junta are now starting to feel the pinch, but there is a long way to go.

Another reason to reauthorize the sanctions program and extend the import ban for another year is that this Congress amplified the program last summer. The expansion eliminated trade in jewelry containing Burmese rubies and jadeite, even if the jewelry was made in, and exported from, a third country. It was designed to bring about multilateral pressure on the regime through the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, similar to successful legislation on conflict diamonds.

We are still in the process of assessing the effectiveness of the new law. The Government Accountability Office will be reporting to us this fall on the effectiveness of the expanded sanctions and will be making recommendations for improving administration of the program. It would be unwise for us to allow the lapse of this sanctions program without having the benefit of the GAO's research and report.

I view import sanctions with great skepticism and always have, but these Burma sanctions are crafted to maximize their ability to effect change. For one, they require the administration to issue annual reports on Burma that include whether U.S. national security, economic, and foreign policy interests are being served.

On this point, I note that the administration transmitted this year's statutorily required report late last night. We're still waiting for the administration to articulate its overall Burma policy. The State Department announced it would be conducting a high-profile review of U.S. policy some 6 months ago, but it's not out yet; and our Secretary of State will be showing up at ASEAN meetings tomorrow and Thursday with no new vision.

Perhaps the most critical aspect of the Burma sanctions program is that they require us to redirect our attention every summer to the question of whether these sanctions should be continued. They are not self-executing. We here in Congress must vote to continue them on an annual basis.

I continue to believe that our greatest hope for effecting real change in Burma is multilateralism. The whole world, particularly China and the ASEAN countries, must put real economic pressure on the regime. I support this resolution because it increases our chance to bring about this multilateral effort.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will control the remaining time on H.J. Res. 56 on behalf of the majority.

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise this evening in support of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, and let me thank both our friend from Texas for his comments, as well as my friend from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, for his comments as well with regard to this legislation.

This legislation was first enacted in 2003 under the leadership of former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and my good friend, Tom Lantos. Tom spent his life fighting for freedom and democracy for those who could not fully defend themselves. He is greatly missed here in the House of Representatives, but his legacy remains, and I have been proud to help carry on his efforts to secure democracy in Burma.

Former Chairman Lantos would be pleased that we are considering the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. This legislation will reauthorize the current sanctions on imports from Burma's military regime for an additional 3 years, as well as maintain the ban on the importation of jade and other gems from Burma.

I introduced the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act because we must show the military regime currently ruling with an iron fist in Burma that there are consequences for their actions. Burma's military regime has carried out a brutal campaign against its own people. It has destroyed 3,000 villages, forced over 1 million people to flee as refugees, and has used rape as a weapon of war, and has pressed millions of civilians into forced labor, modern day slave labor.

The junta has also rejected recent diplomatic outreach, which would have been well received in the global community. Specifically, the junta refused United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon's request to release political prisoners, including Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the nonviolent movement for democracy and human rights in Burma.

Not only did the junta refuse Aung San Suu Kyi's release, they even refused Ban Ki-Moon's request to meet with him.

The Burmese regime must be stopped. If passed, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act will supplement President Obama's actions on

May 15, when he renewed investment prohibitions against the Burmese military regime that began during President Clinton's term in office.

The United States is not alone in using sanctions as part of a diplomatic strategy to help promote change in Burma. The European Union renewed its Common Position on sanctions; and Canada, Australia, and New Zealand and others have unilaterally imposed their own restrictions.

Aung San Suu Kyi and the other legitimate leaders of Burma have also called on the world to impose sanctions on their own country, just as Desmond Tutu and the leaders of the struggle to end apartheid in South Africa called for sanctions on South Africa in the 1980s.

We must maintain our sanctions against the junta in Burma, and I call on all my colleagues to vote for the renewal of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers; and in support of this resolution, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Madam Speaker, at this point in time, we have no further speakers.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H. J. Res. 56, a resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, P.L. 108–61. I am proud to have once again introduced this legislation this year with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY.

In 2003 Congress passed the Burmese Freedom & Democracy Act, legislation that I co-authored with my friend, the late Tom Lantos. President Bush signed this bill into law and we have reauthorized these import restrictions every year since. The legislation bans imports from Burma and the issuance of visas to those officials affiliated with the State Peace and Development Council, SPDC, the military junta that rules Burma and brutally represses its people. This law also bans U.S. financial transactions that involve individuals or entities connected with the SPDC.

These sanctions are critically important to keeping the pressure on the Burmese junta. The government continues to have one of the worst human rights record in the world and routinely violates the rights of Burmese citizens, including the systematic use of rape as a weapon of war, extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture, as well as slave and child labor. The Burmese regime has destroyed more than 3,000 ethnic villages, displaced approximately 2,000,000 Burmese people, more than 500,000 of which are internally displaced, and arrested approximately 1,300 individuals for expressing critical opinions of the government. And it continues to detain Aung San Suu Kyi, the head of the National League for Democracy and the democratically elected leader of Burma, on bogus charges that she violated the terms of her house arrest. She is currently on trial and faces up to five additional years of confinement.

We must continue to stand with the Burmese people and expose the despicable and

reprehensible actions of the SPDC. Sanctions are critical to putting pressure on the junta. Last year Congress passed and President Bush signed into law Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act, P.L. 110–286, which bans the importation of Burmese gems into the United States and freezes the assets of Burmese political and military leaders. But we still need others to follow ours and the EU's lead. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, and the United Nations Security Council, UNSC, must impose multilateral sanctions against Burma's military regime including a complete arms embargo.

Finally, it is my hope that the new Administration promptly completes its policy review toward Burma, implements all the provisions of the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act, appoints a Special Coordinator for Burma, and supports the establishment of UNSC Commission of Inquiry on Burma.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution, H.J. Res. 56, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL CHILDREN AND FAMILIES DAY

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 534) supporting the goals and ideals of "National Children and Families Day."

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 534

Whereas research shows that a supportive and encouraging family is critical to raising strong and resilient children;

Whereas strong healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children;

Whereas spending time engaging in family activities supports the development of healthy and well-adjusted children;

Whereas families are of many compositions and sizes, it is the strength and support of the family that is essential to child rearing;

Whereas families play critical roles in the care of children, and in their children's health care, this is particularly true for children with special needs;

Whereas mental health plays a central role in child development, families should be encouraged to cultivate environments that are safe and secure, supportive, and that contribute to high-confidence and high self-esteem;

Whereas it is essential to celebrate and reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children and their positive effect for the Nation's future;

Whereas the fourth Saturday of June is "National Children and Families Day", a day set aside to recognize the importance of children and families; and

Whereas the country's greatest natural resource is its children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the goals and ideals of "National Children and Families Day".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 534, the resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day. The strength of our Nation relies heavily upon the future success of today's children. To ensure this success, families across the Nation work hard to instill resiliency, health and wisdom in their children.

This bill was introduced on June 11 and was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The committee reported the bill by unanimous consent on June 10, and it comes to the House floor today with bipartisan support from over 56 cosponsors.

Madam Speaker, American families together make tremendous sacrifice each day to ensure the quality of their child's development. Families play a critical role in the care of children, including their health and developmental needs. Families, including those with children of special needs, should be encouraged to create safe and secure and supportive environments to foster confidence and self-esteem.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 534 gives us the opportunity to celebrate and reflect upon the role that all these families play in developing well-rounded, well-educated children and the positive outcomes this creates for the Nation's future. We sincerely thank them for their contribution to our country.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 534, supporting the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day.

Families have long played a critical role in the development of America's youth and well being of our society as a whole. With this resolution, we celebrate those who create a positive family atmosphere and for the many families who commit to the challenging task of raising healthy, productive young men and women.

□ 1900

Over the years, we have learned that the families who provide ethical and moral guidance are the linchpins of our Nation. We depend on our families to encourage education, arouse curiosity, and cultivate safe, supportive environments that contribute to self-confidence.

At this time in history, our youth are increasingly exposed to undesirable influences and because of that it becomes all the more important for family units to pull together as a team, listen to one another, and to work through life's issues.

By spending time engaging in family activities such as volunteering for community service projects, children can learn that service to others benefits all those who participate, either those who need assistance or those who volunteer to serve them. Creating these strong family environments will ultimately result in a new generation of well-rounded leaders for our country.

By celebrating National Children and Families Day on the fourth Saturday in June, the country recognizes the importance of families as well as our country's greatest natural resource, the children of our Nation.

I find it interesting that today, July 21, was my mother's birthday. To be able to ask to speak on this is special to me. She passed away in 1995. I miss her dearly. I would encourage my colleagues to stand up and support this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. At this point I would take great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the lead sponsor of this resolution, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. LYNCH and Mr. CHAFFETZ. I'm really excited to be here today to rise in support of my resolution, House Resolution 534, Supporting the Goals and Ideals of National Children and Families Day.

On a note, I would just say to Mr. CHAFFETZ, part of what moved me in introducing this resolution with my colleague from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, was the relationship that I have had with my own family and parents and grandparents and extended family, recognizing the very special role that families play in the lives of children and growing them and nurturing them, and especially in sometimes a very troublesome world.

I'd like to thank Chairman TOWNS for the leadership in the Government Oversight and Reform Committee and for his support of this resolution. I'd also like to thank all the cosponsors of the resolution from both sides of the aisle—all of us who recognize the value of families and the importance to our children. Particularly, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) herself soon to be a new grandmother, who understands the role that she has

played in her own children's lives and soon to be in a grandchild's life.

House Resolution 534 brings together a really diverse group of Members to recognize and celebrate the role that families play in the development of our greatest natural resource and the future of our Nation—our children.

National Children and Families Day is an opportunity to recognize the importance of families in raising children. Families, however they're defined, improve the quality of life and social development of children. It's within the family unit that a child first learns how to interact with others and how to cope with challenges.

Children's early development depends largely on their parents, extended family, and other caregivers. As such, children thrive when they're raised in an environment of close, dependable relationships that provide love, nurturing, security, and encouragement.

All areas of a child's development—cognitive, social, and physical development—are interconnected. Physically, families play critical roles in the care of their children, meeting nutritional needs and keeping them out of harm. Socially and psychologically it's important to consider how we create an environment that will foster socially well-adjusted children—one who's in good mental health.

Cognitive development is linked intimately to psychological welfare, and this forms the foundation upon which future progress is constructed. These are the things that happen within families.

National Children and Families Day is also a day to celebrate families. It's a special day to highlight the importance of spending time engaging in family activities that support the development of healthy and well-adjusted children.

Families that spend time together help cultivate familial bonds that lay the foundation for a child's later development, well into adulthood. It teaches them how to become good parents themselves.

We have worked with the National Children's Museum, which I'm excited to say will be located in Maryland's Fourth Congressional District that I represent, just outside of Washington, D.C., and the Association of Children's Museums to encourage special events and activities that will highlight the value of spending time together and to celebrate this annual event.

The local children's museums provided my son and me easy access to venues where we could spend time together learning to care about and improve the world. As a single mother, the museums provided us with excellent exhibits and activities that assisted us in strengthening our relationship.

While the composition of families has changed over times, families remain the foundation of our national child-rearing structure and are critical to raising strong and resilient children.

Today, families range widely from single-parent families, to extended families, to even extended families that care for children of our deployed servicemen and women—some of those families where both parents in fact are deployed and the extended family becomes the nurturing grounds for those children. We have experiences all across this country in which family compositions are nurturing and enriching environments for their children.

We see families and their children every day here in the Nation's capitol visiting these historic sites in Washington and surrounding counties. In this context, allow me to share with my colleagues a "Top Ten" places for families and children in the Washington region. You can find that on Web sites across this country, including the National Children's Museum.

This resolution will serve to remind us how valuable family activities are in the lives of children. The joy of participating in family activities, however small or large, will remain with a person for his or her entire life.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. This resolution is designed to reinforce the value of this investment of familial time with an annual commemoration.

In conclusion, I urge you to support House Resolution 534. This resolution honors families of all compositions that are based in a foundation of love and care and in relationships that foster environments in which children can grow, learn, thrive, and mature.

National Children and Families Day recognizes dynamic families and their role in successfully raising our country's future.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers at the moment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I just ask all Members to support the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and her resolution, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I also urge the Members to support the passage of H. Res. 534, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 534.

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. BROUN of Georgia. 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.

CONRAD DEROUEN, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2972) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2972

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

SECTION 1. CONRAD DEROUEN, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 West Edward Street in Erath, Louisiana, shall be known and designated as the “Conrad DeRouen, Jr. Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Conrad DeRouen, Jr. Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I may consume. As chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I'm pleased to present H.R. 2972 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service Facility located at 115 West Edward Street in Erath, Louisiana, as the “Conrad DeRouen, Jr. Post Office.”

Introduced by my colleague, Representative CHARLES BOUSTANY of Louisiana, on June 19, 2009, and reported out of committee on July 10, 2009, by unanimous consent, H.R. 2972 enjoys the support of the entire Louisiana House delegation.

Born on February 12, 1921, Conrad “Snookie” DeRouen graduated from Erath High School in 1937, and subsequently attended Vanderbilt University, graduating with a master's degree in health and physical education.

At the age of 21, Conrad DeRouen volunteered for service in the United States Marine Corps and was commissioned as a second lieutenant at Quantico, Virginia. Following additional training at Camp Pendleton, Second Lieutenant DeRouen was deployed to the Asiatic theatre during World War II, serving with the 1st Battalion, 2nd Marine Division.

In July of 1944, after serving overseas for a few months, Second Lieutenant

DeRouen was involved in the Battle of Saipan in the Marianas Islands. Regrettably, Second Lieutenant DeRouen was gravely wounded in the neck by enemy forces and subsequently died from his wounds at the age of 23.

In recognition of his distinguished service, Second Lieutenant DeRouen posthumously received the Navy Cross, awarded for extreme gallantry and risk of life in actual combat with an armed enemy force and going beyond the call of duty.

As noted by the accompanying citation, Second Lieutenant DeRouen, despite his wounds, “gallantly refused to be evacuated and remained steadfast in his station until he collapsed from pain and blood loss.”

Additionally, the citation noted that, “By his initiative, courage, and devotion to duty throughout these hazardous operations, Second Lieutenant DeRouen upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.”

Madam Speaker, Second Lieutenant Conrad DeRouen's life stands as a testament to the bravery and dedication of the heroic men and women who have offered the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation.

Let us together honor this distinguished Marine through the passage of this legislation to designate the West Edward Street Postal Facility in his honor.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. BOUSTANY, the lead sponsor of this resolution, in supporting H.R. 2972.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend and colleague from Utah and my friend from Massachusetts for this courtesy.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 2972, 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. I'd like to thank the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

Today, it's really a distinct honor for me to celebrate the life of United States Marine Corps Reserve Second Lieutenant Conrad C. DeRouen, Jr., an extraordinary hero in World War II.

A native of Erath, Louisiana, a small coastal town in my district, DeRouen graduated from Erath High School, then went on to Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and subsequently received a master's degree from Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee.

He married Marguerite Domingues of Abbeville, Louisiana, and at the age of 21 he volunteered to serve in the United States Marine Corps.

□ 1915

While fighting against the Japanese forces in Saipan, Mariana Islands, on July 3, 1944, Lieutenant DeRouen endured continuous exposure to enemy

fire in order to guide tanks into areas of combat; and when the communications systems failed, DeRouen seated himself behind the turret in order to continue the resistance.

In another assault on Japanese forces later on July 8, 1944, Lieutenant DeRouen, despite being wounded in the neck by shrapnel from an enemy grenade, refused to leave his post with the 1st Battalion to seek medical assistance and, instead, continued to fight at his station. DeRouen eventually collapsed due to pain and loss of blood and was carried off the field of battle by his comrades. He finally succumbed to his wounds on his ship and was buried at sea.

Lieutenant DeRouen's actions were an inspiration to the marines he fought beside and were a contributing factor in the success of the campaign in the Mariana Islands. Because of his heroic death at the age of only 23 years of age, he was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross for his bravery in a combat zone, the second highest decorated Medal of Honor. Today I join the town of Erath in honoring this fallen hero with the dedication of their post office to the name of Second Lieutenant Conrad C. DeRouen, Jr. for being the highest decorated veteran in its history, a real hero and someone we should all honor.

As we honor Lieutenant DeRouen today, we also must recognize our present-day heroes in Iraq and Afghanistan, those who have fallen and those who continue to fight, and we thank them as well as their families and the families of all of our troops who put on a uniform.

I now ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, but I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. It's an honor to stand and rise in support of H.R. 2972 and the great American hero that we know as Conrad DeRouen. I appreciate bringing this to our attention, and we look forward to having this post office named after him. It's the least we could do from a country that's so grateful.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2972.

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. BROUN of Georgia. 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.

CONGRATULATING NBA CHAMPION
LOS ANGELES LAKERS

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 566) congratulating the 2008–2009 National Basketball Association Champions, the Los Angeles Lakers, on an outstanding and historic season.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 566

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers are one of the most successful and respected franchises in the history of the National Basketball Association (NBA);

Whereas prior to the 2008–2009 season, the Lakers won 14 NBA championships, with a cast of players that, over the years, have included NBA greats such as Wilt Chamberlain, Erving “Magic” Johnson, James Worthy, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Shaquille O’Neal, Michael Cooper, Elgin Baylor, A.C. Green, and other Lakers stars, whose accomplishments were captured courtside by legendary Lakers sportscaster Francis Dayle “Chick/Chicky Baby” Hearn;

Whereas in the off-season, the Lakers’ General Manager, Mitch Kupchak, with the support of the team’s owner, Jerry Buss, maintained the Lakers core of Kobe Bryant, Lamar Odom, Derek Fisher, Pau Gasol, and Trevor Ariza;

Whereas the combination of Bryant, Odom, Fisher, Gasol, and Ariza, led the 2008–2009 Lakers to a 65–17 regular season record and the number one spot in the Western Conference playoffs;

Whereas Ariza first came to fame as a member of the 2002 and 2003 California State Championship teams at Westchester High School in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas the Lakers entered the NBA playoffs with home court advantage as a result of the team’s regular season performance and defeated the Utah Jazz in 5 games;

Whereas the Lakers then faced the Houston Rockets in the Western Conference semifinals, winning in 7 games, with Pau Gasol scoring 21 points in an 89–70 victory in the deciding game;

Whereas the Lakers squared off against the high-octane Denver Nuggets, clinching the series in 6 games, thanks to the outstanding play of Pau Gasol and Kobe Bryant;

Whereas the Lakers’ matchup with the Orlando Magic in the NBA finals represented a battle between a veteran team, the Lakers, and a young Magic team, led by Dwight Howard;

Whereas the Lakers won the first 2 games of the finals in Los Angeles, including a hard-fought Game 2, during which Kobe Bryant and Pau Gasol combined for 53 points, propelling the Lakers to a 101–96 victory;

Whereas although the Lakers lost Game 3 in Orlando by a score of 108–104, NBA fans were treated to a 31-point performance by Lakers guard Kobe Bryant, who played all but 8 minutes of the game;

Whereas the Lakers were able to defeat the Magic in Game 4 despite a 25-point performance by Magic forward Hedo Turkoglu;

Whereas the Lakers won Game 5 against the Magic by a final score of 99–86, clinching a historic championship, Kobe Bryant’s first championship without Shaquille O’Neal, Head Coach Phil Jackson’s 10th title as a coach, and the Lakers organization’s 15th championship;

Whereas the Lakers recovered from a devastating loss in the 2008 NBA finals against the Boston Celtics to win the 2009 NBA

championship and achieve historic championships for Head Coach Phil Jackson, and Kobe Bryant;

Whereas the Lakers’ Kobe Bryant was presented with the Bill Russell NBA Finals Most Valuable Player Award;

Whereas in addition to the contributions of superstars Bryant, Gasol, and Odom, strong contributions by Ariza, Brown, Farmar, Ilunga-Mbenga, Bynum, Fisher, Powell, Vujacic, and Walton returned the glory that has marked much of the Los Angeles Lakers franchise history;

Whereas Lakers owner Jerry Buss, General Manager Mitch Kupchak, Head Coach Phil Jackson, and the entire roster and coaching staff have joined previous great Lakers teams in winning the NBA championship; and

Whereas the hustle, team defense, and overall unselfish play of the 2008–2009 Lakers are emblematic of the tradition that has been a hallmark of the franchise for more than 63 years, and serves as a model for coaches and players everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the 2008–2009 National Basketball Association (NBA) World Champions, the Los Angeles Lakers, are to be congratulated for an outstanding and historic season; and

(2) the Lakers, in winning their 15th NBA World Championship, capped a remarkable, unprecedented single-season turnaround that captivated basketball fans across America and around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I now yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia and on behalf of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleagues, and principally Ms. WATERS from the State of California, in the consideration of H. Res. 566, which provides for the recognition of the National Basketball Association Champion Los Angeles Lakers for capturing their 15th NBA championship.

House Resolution 566 was introduced by Representative MAXINE WATERS of California on June 19, 2009, and currently has the support and cosponsorship of 50 Members of Congress, none of whom are from the city of Boston, courtesy of Chairman TOWNS. The measure has been considered and approved by the Oversight Committee and now comes to the House floor as a means of highlighting the Lakers’ successful 2008–2009 NBA season and their final victory.

Madam Speaker, the Los Angeles Lakers stand as one of sporting history’s greatest franchises. The team was founded in 1946 in Detroit and moved to Minneapolis where it adopted its name, the Lakers, after Minnesota’s State nickname, Land of 10,000 Lakes. The Lakers relocated to Los Angeles in 1960.

In the 1980s, the Lakers became one of the NBA’s most electrifying and successful teams, winning five championships with Hall of Famers Earvin “Magic” Johnson, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, James Worthy, and Coach Pat Riley. The Lakers’ dominance extended into the 21st century as they won three consecutive NBA championships from 2000 to 2002.

Thanks to this year’s impressive NBA Finals victory over the Orlando Magic, the Lakers now boast the NBA franchise record for the most wins, the highest winning percentage, and the most NBA Finals appearances. Of course, I would be remiss if I failed to mention that my own beloved Boston Celtics still hold the record for the most NBA Finals championships. You would think they would have picked someone else to do this resolution, but I am happy to congratulate a job well done.

Led by Head Coach Phil Jackson, one of the most successful coaches in NBA history, and Finals MVP Kobe Bryant, the Lakers’ road to the NBA championship was lined with its fair share of challenges. While playing in the highly competitive Western Conference, the Lakers earned the conference’s best regular season record and were dominant throughout the playoffs.

For this accomplishment, Madam Speaker, we stand to commend the Los Angeles Lakers franchise, the players, coaches and, of course, the diehard Lakers fans on a job well done. I am sure that the Lakers’ championship is an enormous source of pride for the residents of Los Angeles, the surrounding area, and the great State of California as well.

In closing, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 566.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I sympathize with the anguish and the agony that my colleague from Massachusetts must have in reading and supporting this resolution. I can only hope that this is truly captured on film for future use.

I rise in support today, as a Utah Jazz fan, in recognizing a great accomplishment in the world of sports. What these athletes are able to do and how they do it is truly remarkable. So I rise in support of H. Res. 566 to congratulate the 2008–2009 Los Angeles Lakers in bringing home their 15th NBA championship.

For the Lakers, this was a season of redemption that ultimately ended in victory and a historic achievement. The conclusion of the 2007–2008 season saw the Lakers experiencing a humiliating 39-point blowout to the

Boston Celtics in game six of the NBA Playoffs, I will remind my colleague from Massachusetts. From that moment, the storied franchise made a commitment to redeem themselves and immediately began the long, arduous process of working their way back to championship glory. One year later, this long and difficult journey culminated with victory and established themselves as the standard against which every franchise in the NBA will be measured.

While the entire Lakers organization can be proud of this team's accomplishments, the season saw some amazing individual milestones.

Coach Phil Jackson cemented his status as one of the winningest coaches, not just in the NBA but in all of professional sports, capturing an unprecedented 11th championship ring. Truly amazing.

Kobe Bryant of the Los Angeles Lakers, who came to the season as the league's reigning MVP, coming off a summer in which he helped lead Team USA to the gold in Beijing, won his fourth NBA title and his first NBA Finals MVP.

Pau Gasol of the Lakers was selected to his second All-Star appearance, his first as a Laker, and was the first Spaniard to be on an NBA title team.

Individual accomplishments aside, there is no question that this team was just, indeed, that, a team, receiving significant contributions from a host of role players that made winning this championship possible.

Shannon Brown, acquired as a throw-in in a midseason trade, played his way into the playoff rotation and made a number of significant three-pointers in key playoff games.

Derek Fisher, one of my personal favorites, the old veteran guard who was slumping his way through the playoffs, emerged in game 4 of the NBA Finals to hit a game-tying three with 4.6 seconds remaining to push the game into overtime. He followed it up with a go-ahead 27-footer that would give the Lakers the lead and the game.

Collectively, this team all season long maintained their commitment to excellence and mental toughness. They were a reflection of the entire organization—owner, Jerry Buss; general manager, Mitch Kupchak; Hall of Fame coach, Phil Jackson—and are a model of excellence; in other words, they are truly champions.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, at this time it gives me great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the lead sponsor of this resolution, Ms. MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I am very appreciative of my colleague from Massachusetts and his leadership on this issue and for recognizing me to stand as a proud Los Angeleno, joined by 50 other of my colleagues to congratulate the extraordinary Los Angeles Lakers for their 2009 NBA cham-

pionship. This resolution, H. Res. 566, commemorates the Los Angeles Lakers' 15th National Basketball Association championship.

Prior to the 2008–2009 season, the Lakers won 14 National Basketball Association championships with a cast of Hall of Famers and coaches, which included NBA greats such as Jerry West, Wilt Chamberlain, Earvin "Magic" Johnson, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Shaquille O'Neal, Pat Riley, and current Head Coach Phil Jackson.

This season, Kobe Bryant, Lamar Odom, Derek Fisher, Pau Gasol, and Trevor Ariza led the 2008–2009 Lakers to a 65–17 regular season record and the number one spot in the Western Conference Playoffs. Not only did Trevor Ariza help to bring another championship to Los Angeles, he also attended Westchester High School in my district.

The Lakers entered the NBA Playoffs with home court advantage as a result of the team's regular season performance, and in the first round of the playoffs, the Lakers defeated the Utah Jazz in five games to advance to the Western Conference Semifinals.

The Lakers then faced the Houston Rockets in the Western Conference Semifinals, winning seven games, and advanced to the Western Conference Finals where they faced the Denver Nuggets. The Lakers clinched the Western Conference Finals in six games, thanks to the outstanding play by Pau Gasol and Kobe Bryant, which closed out the series.

In the NBA Finals, the Lakers matched up with the Orlando Magic, led by Dwight Howard. The Lakers won the first two games of the Finals in Los Angeles, including a hard-fought game 2, during which Kobe Bryant and Pau Gasol combined for 53 points, propelling the Lakers to a 101–96 victory. The Lakers lost game 3 in Orlando by a score of 108–104; however, Lakers guard Kobe Bryant scored 31 points and played all but 8 minutes of the game.

The Lakers followed their loss in game 3 by winning the next two games in Orlando to win the 2009 NBA championship. For his outstanding play during the NBA Finals, Lakers' guard Kobe Bryant was presented with the Bill Russell NBA Finals Most Valuable Player Award and his fourth NBA championship. Lakers Head Coach Phil Jackson won his 10th NBA championship as a head coach and his 12th NBA championship overall.

Congratulations to the Lakers players, coaches, and staff on winning the 2008–2009 NBA championship.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I am confident the Utah Jazz will be back at some point, but for now, congratulations to the Los Angeles Lakers. I, too, will be supporting H. Res. 566. Congratulations.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I, as well, want to congratulate the Lakers and the gentledady from California. I

congratulate her on her resolution and for the victory that it represents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 566.

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. BROUN of Georgia. 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.

□ 1930

HONORING THE LIFE OF HARRY KALAS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 350) honoring the life and accomplishments of Harry Kalas for his invaluable contributions to the national past-time of baseball, the community, and the Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 350

Whereas Harry Kalas, an iconic and beloved sports broadcaster passed away on April 13, 2009;

Whereas Harry Kalas was born on March 26, 1936, in Naperville, Illinois;

Whereas Harry Kalas is a 1959 graduate of the University of Iowa with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Speech, Radio, and Television;

Whereas immediately following graduation, Harry Kalas served in the United States Army for two years in Hawaii;

Whereas following his service, Harry Kalas began his broadcasting career with KGU Radio broadcasting games for the University of Hawaii and the Hawaii Islanders of the AAA Pacific Coast League;

Whereas Harry Kalas was a member of the original Houston Astros broadcast team in 1965;

Whereas Harry Kalas joined the Philadelphia Phillies broadcast team in 1971, calling their games for the past 38 years, including 26 years with his great friend and Hall of Famer Richie Ashburn;

Whereas Harry Kalas had diverse talents, calling University of Houston football, Southwest Conference basketball, Big Five basketball, University of Notre Dame football, and NFL games, throughout his illustrious career as well as providing voice-overs for NFL films and numerous commercials;

Whereas Harry Kalas broadcast the opening of the Astrodome, Veterans Stadium, and Citizen Bank Ballpark;

Whereas in 2002, Harry Kalas was the Ford C. Frick Award Winner, named after the former National League President and Major League Baseball Commissioner, which is annually bestowed by the National Baseball Hall of Fame to a broadcaster for "major contributions to baseball";

Whereas Harry Kalas called 7 National League Championship Series and 3 World Series, being the voice of the 2008 World Champions;

Whereas Harry Kalas called all of Hall of Famer Steve Carlton's starts as a Phillie, as well as all of Hall of Famer Mike Schmidt's 548 homeruns, making the phrase, "outta here", an often imitated but never duplicated signature home run call well known in Philadelphia and the rest of the baseball world;

Whereas Harry Kalas was named Pennsylvania Sportscaster of the year 18 times and was inducted into the National Sportscasters and Sportswriters Association Hall of Fame in 2008;

Whereas Harry Kalas was a remarkable husband to his wife, Eileen, and father to his three sons, Todd, Brad, and Kane;

Whereas his son Todd followed him into the field of sports broadcasting; and

Whereas Harry Kalas, not just as a voice, but also as a husband, father, friend, and veteran, will be sorely missed in both the Philadelphia region and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life and accomplishments of Harry Kalas for his invaluable contributions to the national past-time of baseball, the community, and the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present House Resolution 350 for consideration. This resolution honors the life and accomplishment of Harry Kalas.

House Resolution 350 was introduced by my colleague, Representative JOE SESTAK, on April 21, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee by unanimous consent on June 18, 2009. Additionally, House Resolution 350 enjoys the support of over 50 Members of Congress.

Born on March 26, 1936 in Naperville, Illinois, Harry Kalas graduated from Naperville High School in 1954 and from the University of Iowa in 1959, after receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in Speech, Radio and Television.

Following his graduation, Mr. Kalas served in the United States Army for 2 years, after which he began his distinguished career in broadcasting by calling baseball games for the University of Hawaii, as well as the Hawaii Islanders of the Triple-A Pacific Coast League.

In 1965, Mr. Kalas made his major league baseball debut as a sportscaster

with the Houston Astros. Six years later he embarked on what would become a 39-year Hall of Fame career as a sports broadcaster with the Philadelphia Phillies, where he was ultimately paired with his good friend and Phillies' Hall of Famer, center fielder Richie Ashburn.

Nicknamed "Harry the K" by Phillies fans, Mr. Kalas originated his now-famous "Outta Here" home run call in the mid-1970s and, as the nearly 40-year voice of the Phillies, called a number of memorable Philadelphia and Major League Baseball moments. Among them were the first games played at the Houston Astrodome, Veterans Stadium and Citizens Bank Park, also Mike Schmidt's 500th home run, and every one of Steve Carlton's starts from 1972 to 1986, and, of course, the Phillies' two World Series championships in 1980 and in 2008.

In recognition of his distinguished career, Mr. Kalas received the Ford C. Frick Award in 2002 from the National Baseball Hall of Fame, which actually bestows the award to broadcasters who have made major contributions to the game of baseball.

However, Mr. Kalas' career was not limited to baseball. In addition to his work with the Phillies, Mr. Kalas called a variety of notable sports events over the course of his nearly 50-year career and served as the longtime voice of NFL films, as featured on the HBO program "Inside the NFL." Mr. Kalas also lent his voice to a number of well-known commercials and television specials. But most importantly, Mr. Kalas will be equally remembered as a devoted husband to his beloved wife, Eileen, and father to his three sons, Todd, Brad, and Kane.

Regrettably, Harry Kalas passed away on April 13, 2009. In honor of their beloved friend and colleague, the 2009 Philadelphia Phillies can be seen wearing a black "H.K." patch over the heart of their jerseys, and Mr. Kalas' famous home run call can currently be heard playing in Citizens Bank Park after every Phillies homer.

Additionally, the Phillies have renamed their TV broadcast booth the Harry Kalas Broadcast Booth.

Mr. Speaker, let us further honor this distinguished American through the passage of this commemorative resolution to honor his life and achievements.

I urge my colleagues to do so and support House Resolution 350.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague and friend from the State of Florida, Mr. ROONEY.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, you know, I wasn't planning on speaking tonight, but earlier this evening Mr. CHAFFETZ informed me that you were commemorating the life of Harry Kalas. And even though I represent the 16th district of Florida, as many Floridians, I came from somewhere else. I

was born and raised in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and my entire childhood could probably be summed up as being a diehard Phillies fan. And I can remember clearly going down to the Jersey Shore in the summer times, as so many Philadelphians did. And after being put to bed at night by my parents, sneaking out behind the couch there was a table, and I stored an AM radio there, and night after night listening for hours to the voice of Harry Kalas, the mellow, laid back voice that so many Phillies fans just came to admire and love. And how many people listened to that voice for so many hours in the City of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia region.

He truly will be missed. And you know, I always told people that I wanted to grow up and be a baseball announcer, and it was because of Harry Kalas. And somewhere I went off track. But I wanted to take the time here on the House floor to commemorate the life of Harry Kalas. And someday I hope to be a baseball announcer and I hope to be as good as Harry Kalas was.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks and adding that personal touch.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I will reserve.

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 350 honoring the voice of the Philadelphia Phillies legendary broadcaster, Harry Kalas, for his contributions to the national pastime of baseball, to the greater Philadelphia community, and to this Nation.

Mr. Kalas graduated from the University of Iowa in 1959 with a degree in Speech, Radio and Television. Upon graduation he was drafted into the United States Army, and when discharged he began working as a broadcaster.

He began his 44-year career as a Major League Baseball broadcaster with the Houston Astros in 1965. Kalas called the first game at Houston's famed Astrodome.

In advance of the 1971 season, he was hired by the Philadelphia Phillies. There he would remain for the next 39 seasons, 27 of which Kalas was paired in the booth with Richie "Whitey" Ashburn.

Harry Kalas made many memorable calls while broadcasting for the Phillies, including every start of Hall of Fame pitcher Steve Carlton's Phillies career, and Mike Schmidt's 500th home run on April 18, 1987. Of course, when Harry called the dramatic Schmidt home run, he intoned the player's full name, Michael Jack Schmidt.

His most memorable call, however, came last October 29 at the culmination of the Phillies championship run. As the pitcher struck out the last batter, Kalas' golden voice erupted: "The Philadelphia Phillies are the 2008 world champions of baseball."

He had a number of signature calls, but none was more famous than "That ball is outta here!" home run call.

Mr. Kalas' contribution to baseball did not go unrecognized during his years as a broadcaster. He was inducted into the broadcaster's wing of the baseball Hall of Fame in 2002, and was named Pennsylvania Sportscaster of the Year 18 times.

In addition to his work with the Phillies, Kalas was also the voice of NFL films and called various sporting events over his career, including Notre Dame football.

Sadly, Mr. Kalas passed away here in Washington, D.C. at Nationals Park in the visiting team's broadcast booth on the afternoon of April 13, 2009, while doing what he loved, preparing to cover a Phillies game.

I ask my fellow Members to join with me in honoring Harry Kalas for his exceptional contributions to baseball and, through that, for his contributions to the community and to the Nation and people like Mr. Rooney, who grew up hearing his voice and coming to enjoy that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I do want to ask all of our colleagues to join with the lead sponsor of this resolution, Mr. SESTAK, in supporting his resolution honoring Mr. Kalas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 350.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

THE DAUGHTERS OF IRAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the women of Iran are standing shoulder to shoulder in the streets protesting against the rigged, corrupt Iranian elections. At least that's how it began. Now these legions of women, mostly wearing black, full-length Islamic dress, stand in defiance of their government's treatment of women. These

women have shed their blood, suffered the same beatings and imprisonment as men. Some have sacrificed their very lives.

In America our hearts ache as we watched the video of Neda Agha Soltan. She was shot by her own government henchmen as she walked through the streets. She bled to death in that street, a martyr for democracy in Iran. Neda was only 26 years old, but her voice still cries from the grave: "that the people of Iran demand human rights, equality and freedom from tyranny."

Young women like a girl named Parsia told reporters, and I quote, "This regime is against all humanity, more specifically, against all women." She continues, "Lots of girls and women in these demonstrations. They're all angry, ready to explode, scream out and let the world hear their voices. I want the world to know that as a woman in this country, I have no freedom."

The women of Iran have a rich history of fighting for freedom. In the early 1900s, in Persia, later called Iran, Britain and Russia tried to rule Persia through a puppet government.

□ 1945

In 1906, the Persian people fought the shah, and became a constitutional republic. They had a Congress called the Majlis to make their laws.

American economic expert Morgan Shuster was appointed to that democratic government in 1911 to organize Persia's finances. At that time, members of the Majlis were threatened or were bribed by Russia, with support from Great Britain, to disband that constitutional government. Shuster wrote in his memoirs about Persian women who armed themselves and who marched on the Congress.

He writes about those bold, brave women, "Out from their walled courtyards and harems marched 300 women with the flush of undying determination in their cheeks. They were clad in their plain black robes with the white nets of their veils drooped over their faces. Many held pistols under their skirts or in the folds of their sleeves. Straight to the Congress they went."

These "Persian mothers, wives and daughters" dropped their veils and waved their pistols, saying they had decided to "kill their own husbands and sons and leave behind their own dead bodies" if the Congress "wavered in their duty to uphold the liberty and dignity of the Persian people and nation."

Because of these courageous women 100 years ago, the Persian Congress stood firm in their struggle for liberty and freedom for the people. However, Russian Cossacks marched into Tehran a week later, disbanding the government by force and executing every constitutionalist they could find.

History speaks to the courage and bravery of Iranian women, which goes back for centuries. It is no surprise

they are again at the forefront of the struggle for human rights and dignity in Iran. The women of Iran are not the property of the government, and should not be punished because they demand equality with men. These women present a great challenge for the hard-line government. They are a force to be reckoned with, and the government knows it.

My grandmother used to tell me that there's nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker: The women of Iran have made up their minds. They are not going to take it anymore. Like their sisters in freedom 100 years ago, they are not going to give into the black-booted thugs who are trying to steal freedom and human dignity from them. Iran is their country. These women are no longer going to be treated as second-class people. Woe be to those who try to stop them. The daughters of Iran have inspired the world with their bravery. Their cause is righteous. Their actions are just. May the almighty who rules the universe make them strong and courageous.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFGHANISTAN BUILD-UP

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. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, I read a column in the Raleigh News and Observer, entitled "From Vietnam 1959 to Afghanistan 2009." The column was written by Joseph Galloway, a military journalist and co-author of a book on Vietnam called, "We Were Soldiers Once and Young."

[From the News & Observer, July 19, 2009]

FROM VIETNAM 1959 TO AFGHANISTAN 2009

(By Joseph L. Galloway, McClatchy-Tribune Information Services)

BAYSIDE, Texas.—It was just about half a century ago, on the night of July 8, 1959, that the first two American soldiers to die in the Vietnam War were slain when guerrillas surrounded and shot up a small mess hall where half a dozen advisers were watching a movie after dinner.

Master Sgt. Chester Ovnand of Copperas Cove, Texas, and Maj. Dale Buis of Imperial Beach, Calif., would become the first two names chiseled on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial—the first of 58,220 Americans who died in Vietnam during the next 16 years.

The deaths of Ovnand and Buis went largely unnoticed at the time, simply a small beginning of what would become a huge national tragedy.

Presidents from Harry Truman to Dwight Eisenhower to John F. Kennedy to Lyndon B. Johnson to Richard M. Nixon to Gerald R. Ford made decisions—some small and incremental, some large and disastrous—in building us so costly and tragic a war.

The national security handmaidens of those presidents, especially those who served Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford, were supposedly the best and brightest that Harvard and Yale and Princeton could contribute.

Presidents right up to today's like to surround themselves with such self-assured and certain men, men whose eagerness to find war the answer to most problems often grows in direct proportion to their lack of experience in uniform or combat.

This small history lesson can be read as a cautionary tale to President Barack Obama's team as it oversees an excruciating slow-motion end of one war, Iraq, and a pell-mell rush to wade ever deeper into another one in the mountains and deserts of remote and tribal Afghanistan.

The story grows out of a battle in the very beginning of the American takeover of the war in South Vietnam in the fall of 1965 when a defense secretary, Robert S. McNamara, counted the bodies and the beans and offered his president two directly opposing options.

In the wake of the Ia Drang Valley battles of November 1965—the first major collision between an experimental airmobile division of the U.S. Army and regular soldiers in division strength from the People's Army of North Vietnam—President Johnson ordered McNamara to rush to Vietnam and assess what had happened and what was going to happen.

Up till then, just more than 1,000 Americans, mostly advisers and pilots, had been killed in Vietnam since Ovnand and Buis. Then, in just five days 234 more Americans had been killed and hundreds wounded in the Ia Drang. McNamara took briefings from Gen. William Westmoreland, the top U.S. commander in Vietnam, and from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and assorted spy chiefs and diplomats. Then he flew to An Khe in the Central Highlands and was briefed on the Ia Drang battles by then Lt. Col. Hal Moore, who had commanded on the ground in Landing Zone XRAY in the Ia Drang.

On the plane home to Washington, McNamara dictated a Top Secret/Eyes Only memo to Johnson dated Nov. 30, 1965. In that report he stated that the enemy had not only met but had exceeded our escalation of the war and we had reached a decision point. In his view there were two options:

Option One: We could arrange whatever diplomatic cover we could arrange and pull out of South Vietnam.

Option Two: We could give Gen. Westmoreland the 200,000 more U.S. troops he was asking for, in which case by early 1967 we would have more than 500,000 Americans on the ground, and they would be dying at the rate of 1,000 a month. (He was wrong; the death toll would reach over 3,000 a month at the height of the war). "All we can possibly achieve (by this) is a military stalemate at a much higher level of violence," McNamara wrote.

On Dec. 15, 1965, the president assembled what he called the "wise men" for a brainstorming session on Vietnam. He entered the Cabinet room holding McNamara's memo. He shook it at McNamara and asked: "Bob, you mean to tell me no matter what I do, I can't win in Vietnam?" McNamara nodded yes; that was precisely what he meant.

The wise men sat in session for two days. Participants say there was no real discussion of McNamara's Option One—it would have sent the wrong message to our Cold War allies—and at the end there was a unanimous vote in favor of Option Two—escalating and continuing a war that our leaders knew we could not win.

Remember. This was 1965, 10 years before the last helicopter lifted off that roof in Sai-

gon. It's a hell of a lot easier to get sucked into a war or jump feet first into a war than it is to get out of a war.

There's no question that Obama inherited these two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan, from the Bush/Cheney administration. But the buildup in Afghanistan and the change in strategy belong to Obama and his version of the best and brightest.

The new administration has dictated an escalation from 30,000 U.S. troops to more than 60,000, and even before most of them have actually arrived commanders on the ground are already back asking for more, and why not? When you are a hammer everything around you looks like a nail.

Some smart veterans of both Iraq and Afghanistan, on the ground now or just back, say that at this rate we will inevitably lose the war in Afghanistan; that the situation on the ground now is far worse than Iraq was at its lowest point in 2006 and early 2007. They talk of a costly effort both in lives and national treasure that will stretch out past the Obama administration and maybe the two administrations after that.

Obama needs to call in the "wise men and women" for a fish-or-cut bait meeting on his two ongoing wars. Let's hope that this time around, there's an absence of the arrogance and certainty of previous generations of advisers. Let's hope that they choose to speed up the withdrawal of combat troops from Iraq and get out before the Iraqi people and leaders order us to leave. Let's hope, too, that they weigh very carefully all the costs of another decade or two of war in Afghanistan.

Failing that, they should at the very least begin an immediate drive to increase the number of available beds in military and Veterans Administration hospitals and to expand Arlington National Cemetery and the national military cemeteries nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the column's most salient point is its description of a time in 1965 when Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara presented President Lyndon Baines Johnson with a top secret memo. It indicated that the United States had reached a decision point with two available options. The first option was to arrange diplomatic cover and to pull out of South Vietnam. The second option was to increase the number of American troops by 200,000, bringing the total to more than 500,000 Americans on the ground.

Regarding this second option, Mr. McNamara stated, "All we can possibly achieve is a military stalemate at a much higher level of violence." I want to repeat that.

Regarding the second option, Mr. McNamara stated, "All we can possibly achieve is a military stalemate at a much higher level of violence."

From that time when President Johnson chose to escalate and to continue the war until its conclusion, America suffered 56,000 more casualties.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's administration has reached a similar decision point with regard to Afghanistan. Last month, on June 25 of 2009, I joined Congressman JIM MCGOVERN in offering an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that would have required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress which outlines an exit strategy for our Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

While I regret that this amendment was not approved, I still believe it's critical for the current administration to clearly articulate benchmarks for success and an end point to its war strategy in Afghanistan. The men and women of our military who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan have done a magnificent job. Many have been deployed four or five times.

Let's not forget, as General Petraeus has said, "Afghanistan has been known over the years as the graveyard of empires. We cannot take that history lightly."

That is why it is so important for this current administration to have an end point to its strategy in Afghanistan. This strategy must be articulated sooner rather than later so we can avoid going down the path of other failed empires, and so we can avoid the tragedy and the mistake of Vietnam, when elected officials in Washington never articulated an end point or an understanding of what was to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I have Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point Marine Air Station, Camp Lejeune being a Marine base, and I have Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. I've talked to many of all ranks in the Marine Corps. They're willing to go back and to go back again and again and again, but we're getting to the point where we're about to break our military. It is time that the new administration has an end point to whatever we're trying to achieve in Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I close, as I do frequently on the floor, I tell you without pride that I've signed over 8,000 letters in the last 6 years because of my mistake in giving President Bush the authority to go into Iraq. So I close tonight by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I close by asking three times: God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WORK WITH THE GOP ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, The Hill newspaper today reports that President Obama is pointing his finger at the Republicans, at the GOP, for the

stalled health care bill. The last time I checked, the Democrats were in control of the House; they have a 60–Member majority in the Senate, and they control the White House. Clearly, the finger needs to be pointed in a different direction or needs to be reeled in.

I wonder who the President will blame next for double-digit unemployment and for a doubled national debt. We were promised that the Democrats' \$1 trillion stimulus experiment would immediately create jobs and that unemployment would not rise above 8 percent, but in June alone, almost a half a million jobs were lost. This has driven unemployment to its highest level in 26 years.

Where are Democrats going to point their finger on that one, Mr. Speaker?

What happens when the \$646 billion energy tax that the leadership in this House has rammed through raises energy costs on every American family by over \$3,100 and when this energy tax is seen in home utility bills and at the gas pumps, costing up to 7 million Americans their jobs? They're going to lose their jobs. Which direction will the President then point his finger, Mr. Speaker?

When the administration's multitrillion-dollar health care experiment is shoved down our throats before August, costing, as the CBO says, more than 750,000 jobs, I ask again: Which direction will the President point his finger?

The bottom line is that, instead of playing the blame game, I urge congressional leadership and this administration not to ignore the recent deficit and the unemployment news. I urge them to scrap this multitrillion-dollar government health care experiment and takeover. I urge them, instead, to work with us Republicans. Work with us across the aisle to develop a health care plan that helps small businesses create jobs instead of taking away jobs and one that gives Americans better access to lower insurance costs. Work with us to rein in spending and to rein in this egregious, outrageous Federal debt. Work with us to institute meaningful reforms that will truly stimulate the economic growth and that will create jobs for all Americans and that will not just create more bureaucracy. Work with us, Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker, Democratic colleagues. Work with Republicans.

We are accused by the Democrats of being the Party of No, n-o, but Republicans are the Party of Know, k-n-o-w. We know how to create jobs and how to stimulate the economy. We know how to lower the costs of all health care expenses for Americans all across this Nation. We know how to help small businesses by leaving dollars in their pockets, by cutting their tax base and by giving them the money they need to create new jobs and to buy inventory. We know how to stimulate the economy by leaving dollars in people's pockets so that they can invest in their children's futures and in their children's college education funds, so they

can pay off credit card debts, so they can buy new cars and buy new homes. Those are the things that will create a stronger economy.

The Republicans have presented alternative after alternative to the Democrats' plan, but our plans are being quashed by the Democratic leadership, and won't see the light of day. It's not fair to the American people that their Representatives are shut out of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, we need to return to regular order. We need to go through what historically has happened in this House so that we have appropriations bills that are presented here with an open rule so that Members can present their amendments. We need to go through regular order, and we need to stop bringing big bills to this floor through the suspension process where they don't have any vetting in the committee process. We need to return to regular order and to go back to what this country was founded upon, and that's freedom and democracy.

THE PRESIDENT PROMISED

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President over the past few days has been telling the American people, Trust me. This health care plan we're talking about is going to be a great thing for America. It's not going to cost Americans a lot of money. It's going to provide better quality of care, and nobody will be left out.

So I decided to go through what the President has promised on other occasions just to see if he deviates from his plans when it's more convenient for him. For instance, let's just go through some of the things he has promised.

He said Americans and the Members of Congress would get 5 days to read bills that were going to affect the American people. We've had bills that we didn't get until 3 a.m. in the morning that were 1,100-pages long, and we had to vote on them that very same day. There's no way to read 1,100 pages of legalese and have them understood in just a few hours.

He said no lobbyists would be in his administration. There are lobbyists, a number of them, in his administration. He said no taxes on those making under \$250,000. That's not true. We've already levied taxes on people making under \$250,000.

He said no earmarks and no pork-barrel projects. In the omnibus spending bill which he signed recently, there were 8,000 pork-barrel projects in that bill. He said there was going to be openness in the health care debate. There has been not a great deal of openness, and a lot of it has been conducted behind closed doors. He said the people were going to see almost every aspect of it because he was going to have roundtable discussions throughout the entire debate.

□ 2000

He said he was going to cull spending and there would be no new taxes on people under \$250,000. This is the highest amount of spending since World War II. There's been \$1.4 trillion in new taxes. He said he was going to cut each budget of each cabinet by a hundred million dollars. That has not yet been accomplished. He said he was going to try to block and oversee the problems with the TARP plan, that \$700 billion. He said there would be no Big Government, but there's been a takeover of the auto industry, the financial industry, the energy industry, the health care industry, and it's the largest budget in history that he proposes.

He said that he would allow people to withdraw from their 401(k) accounts without any penalty if they were unemployed and having a difficult time. That was not in the stimulus bill. He said there would be a \$3,000 tax credit for every person hired by business. That was not in the stimulus bill.

And then, of course, we come to the health care plan. He said this plan is going to be very good for America, and I want all of my colleagues to take a good look at this plan of the Democrats' health care proposal which the President supports. All of the white spots are new agencies that are going to be making determinations about people's health care. It looks more like a roadmap that's been messed up. You can't figure it out. You have to go from here over to there to get health care, and it's going to cost a great deal of money.

In fact, the plan is supposed to cost, we believe, between 1 and 3 trillion dollars, that's 1 and 3 trillion dollars that we don't have that's going to have to be raised through tax increases and fees, and this is going to be part of it. They're going to end up taxing everybody for this health care plan.

And finally, this is going to result in about 4.7 million jobs lost, because when small business in America has to pay for this conglomeration of health care, they're going to have to cut back on employment of their employees, and a lot of those jobs will probably go overseas.

This is a terrible thing for America right now. And the reason I bring all of the things up that the President has promised, he's promising the American people a very good health plan. Trust him, everything is going to be fine. There is nothing to worry about. And yet it's going to cost so much money, it's going to cost rationing of health care, and it's going to cost everybody in this country and the future generations a great deal of money that we don't have. And I think that is a heck of a legacy to leave to our young children and our posterity.

I want to end by reading what was in the Wall Street Journal on the front page: Congress' chief budget scorekeeper casts a new cloud over Democrats' efforts to overhaul the Nation's health care system, telling lawmakers

Thursday that the main proposals being considered would fail to contain costs.

They say it will, but this article and this man says it will not. It will not contain costs, one of the primary goals, and could actually worsen the problem of radically escalating medical spending.

I hope everybody in the House is paying attention to this.

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

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

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

(Mr. SOUDER 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 Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE WESTERN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, 134 Republicans came here to the floor and spoke for 1 minute each about the issue of jobs and where they had been, for, indeed, we were promised that there would be jobs that would be created and saved if we simply passed a stimulus bill and didn't take the time to read it like a couple of others we did. Unfortunately, the reality has not been quite the same. In fact, this is basically the report card that we came up with.

This administration said that if we quickly pass that huge stimulus bill, there would be some unemployment but it would only be 8 percent. In fact, the dark blue line here is what they said would be the recovery path of our economy. They said if we didn't do that, we would follow a trajectory of the light blue line and actually have 9½ percent unemployment. That is a difference of 3 million workers being

out of a job if we took the time to actually read the bill and think about it.

The sad part is, though, after 5½ months, the trajectory line is actually the red dots there, which means we are far exceeding anything that was projected whether we did the stimulus or didn't do the stimulus. In fact, you can arguably say that we might have been better off not doing anything at all.

The Vice President was correct when he said that this administration totally misread the economy. Nonetheless, Speaker PELOSI and President Obama have teamed together to put up the largest budget, and we're still in the process of voting for it. We are on track now, Mr. Speaker, of actually spending \$4 trillion in this year's Congress. We are spending money like it was Monopoly money with the possible exception that you can't pass go and you don't get \$200 every time you do it.

To put this kind of concept in place, at \$4 trillion, we would be spending \$1 billion every 2.2 hours. To put it in perspective again, if you tried to pay off \$4 trillion, that means every single household in America would have to cough up 35 grand to cover it. And the problem that we have with that is simply we don't have that kind of money lying around, whether we spent it or not. In fact, we will be predicted to be in a deficit. CBO scores this year's deficit at \$1.85 trillion. That's the amount of money we'll spend that we have absolutely no funds for.

Now, you can see on this chart, back there at the turn of this century, we actually had a surplus. You can notice when 9/11 hit we went into deficits. Those grey lanes are the deficits run up by the big-spending George W. Bush—at least, he was accused of that. What we have over here is what we have been spending ever since. The light red lines are the estimates of the Obama administration. The dark red lines are the estimates of our Congressional Budget Office, and they predict that this year it's \$1.85 trillion that we will overspend.

Now, this isn't perhaps the best view. This is only a 1-year shot of what we are doing as far as our finances. If we actually took a bigger view of it and tried to find all of the things we still owe, we are actually at about \$11.6 trillion in total debt. And if you add things like the bailouts and the bank rescues and the auto recovery loans we have, we're about \$23 trillion in debt, which is difficult when our total gross domestic product is about \$14 trillion.

Let me put that in a kind of perspective for you.

When we went to the Moon, if you put the money we spent on that effort to go to the Moon in today's dollars, we would have spent around \$200 billion. Everything FDR did in the New Deal to try to get us out of the old original Depression in today's dollars would be about \$500 billion. If you took everything we spent on World War II, that's about \$4 trillion. Today, we are spending, in real dollars, \$4 trillion and

a deficit of almost \$2 trillion and a total deficit of \$23 trillion of everything combined. That was not the change that we were promised.

And the proponents of the stimulus package, quite frankly, view its failure in the fact that we didn't put enough money into it and that perhaps we should have another stimulus package to spend more money. The Democrats' solution, quite frankly, is we need to spend more money. The bottom line, though, is spending money is not the same thing as creating jobs. There are other alternatives that are out there.

The Republican Party has introduced almost a thousand bills of alternatives that have never been allowed to be discussed on this floor. We had one called the no-cost stimulus bill. It was estimated that it would grow our gross domestic product by \$10 trillion and create 2 million jobs and would cost the taxpayers exactly nothing and has still yet to be allowed to be discussed on this particular floor.

Now, we come here today as part of a Western Caucus with the understanding that much of what we do in the West is a catalyst for us solving this particular problem in moving our economy ahead.

Unfortunately, this administration, which misdiagnosed what the stimulus would do, has also misdiagnosed the opportunity that so much of our public lands have offered to us. It is not an effort to try to destroy the environment, but there are enough resources we have in this country that we could create an energy policy that would indeed build real jobs.

Unfortunately, this administration looks at the gift that it has at its disposal and instead goes in the opposite direction. It creates an environmental policy that is aimed at benefiting special interest groups so that instead of our using our resources to create jobs, we actually are sacrificing jobs to a false ideology.

In this opportunity today, we are going to be talking about some of the things this administration is doing which actually harms this country and loses jobs when we have a great opportunity to try and grow jobs if we'd just use the resources that we have wisely.

I am joined and will be talking with Representative MCCLINTOCK of California. He has a unique area that deals with the forest area that has a chance of actually bringing people together for a benefit that could grow jobs, help the economy, help the environment, and for some reason, we simply are not doing it.

We will be joined later by Representative THOMPSON of Pennsylvania; not necessarily the West, but he has the same situation with a forest in Pennsylvania and, once again, the administration's misuse of land policy is costing people jobs and should not be there.

I'm joined by my good friend Representative BROWN from Georgia. He's going to try to put all this into some kind of perspective at the same time as

we deal with this issue and other issues, all of which have the same problem of costing us jobs. And hopefully there will be a few more Members who will join us before this hour has concluded.

And I'd also like to talk about a couple of policies that this administration has started which, in reality, costs American jobs when we should be producing jobs with the resources that we have.

But, Mr. Speaker, with that said, I would like, first of all, to yield some time to Representative MCCLINTOCK of California, who has a wonderful opportunity of creating jobs in California, desperately needing the jobs, desperately needing the income, but is faced with a unique barrier that's going to be extremely difficult to overcome.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I want to thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding and for organizing this Special Order for the House tonight and for the attention he's devoted to the suffering in my district that's been caused by the lunatic fringe of the environmental movement that now seems to be so firmly in control of our national policy on public lands. At this point, we're not just trying to create jobs, we are desperately trying to stop losing them because of these policies.

You know, a generation ago we recognized the importance of proper wildlands management. We recognized that there is a balance between the environment and the economy and that both can thrive through proper policy. We recognize that nothing is more devastating to the ecology of a forest than a forest fire, and we recognize that public lands should be managed for the benefit of the public. We recognize that in any living community, including forests, dense overpopulation is simply unhealthy.

So we carefully groomed our public lands, we removed excessive vegetation and gave timber the room that it needed to grow. Surplus timber and overgrowth were sold for the benefit of our communities. Our forests prospered and our economy prospered, and forest fires were far less numerous and far less intense than we see today.

□ 2015

But that was before a radical ideology was introduced into public policy—that we should abandon our public lands to overgrowth and overpopulation and, in essence, to benign neglect. We are now living with the result of that ideology. Forest fires that are fueled by decades of pent-up overgrowth are now increasing in their frequency and their intensity and their destructiveness. One victim of this wrongheaded policy is the environment itself. Recent forest fires in my region make a mockery of all of our clean-air regulations. And anyone who has seen a forest after one of these fires knows that the environmental devastation could not possibly be more complete.

But these policies also carry a tremendous economic price. Timber is a renewable resource. If it is properly managed, it is literally an inexhaustible source of prosperity for our Nation. And yet, my region, which is blessed with the most bountiful resource in all of California, has literally been rendered economically prostrate by these policies. A region that once prospered from its surplus timber is now ravaged by fires that are fueled by that surplus timber.

Which brings me to the story of the townspeople of Quincy and El Camino, both little towns in the northeast corner of California. Two months ago, 150 families in each of those little towns received notice that the sawmills that employ them must close. The company made it very clear in its announcement that although the economic downturn was the catalyst, the underlying cause was the fact that two-thirds of the timber that they depended upon had been held up by environmental litigation. Despite the recession, they still had enough business to keep those mills open—and to keep these families employed—if the environmental left had not cut off the timber that those mills depended upon.

Now bear in mind that the population of the town of Quincy is about 400 families—the greater Quincy area about 1,250 families. We are talking about pink slips going to 150 of those families. And they are not the only ones who have lost incomes. Many more jobs were lost indirectly—the folks who drive the trucks and sell the supplies—all lost their jobs as well. This occurred despite the groundbreaking work of a local coalition called the Quincy Library Group that forged a model compromise between environmental, business and forest management advocates a decade ago. That work had culminated in legislation called the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act. It was adopted 11 years ago in this very Chamber by a vote of 429-1. This consensus agreement provided for sound and sustainable forest management practices that in turn would support both local jobs and healthier forests. As Senator FEINSTEIN, a Democrat, pointed out at the time, every single environmental law, including the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Forest Management Act, would be followed as this proposal is implemented. Yet despite a model compromise that produced a model law, the will of the Congress, the livelihoods of hundreds of innocent families, and the fire safety of scores of mountain communities is being challenged and undermined by a constant stream of litigation from groups purporting to support the environment. And I say “purporting” because, as the Web site of one of those groups declares, their number one policy goal is to “eliminate commercial logging on all public lands in California.” Their policy is not to protect the environment. Their pol-

icy is deliberately to destroy commercial enterprise.

We held an informal hearing in Quincy after the mill closures that my friend from Utah was kind enough to join us for. And the stories we heard at that hearing were absolutely heart-breaking. It is a story of how, despite the law, this constant litigation, which is ultimately rejected by the courts, has nevertheless delayed implementation of the Forest Recovery Act until the mills collapse, and that's what we are dealing with today. They know they don't have to win the litigation, all they have to do is draw out the process. And they have done that very successfully until 150 families in Quincy and another 150 families in El Camino lost their jobs. We then held a formal hearing here in Washington, and from that hearing, Congressman HERGER has introduced his bill, H.R. 2899, to prevent frivolous litigation from continuing to destroy those jobs and continuing to impede the fire safety measures that are so vital to the preservation of these forests. I'm in the final stages of preparing legislation to at least grant litigation relief for the land that is actually within the Quincy Library Group territory defined in the legislation. And of course these bills are already being attacked by the same radical groups responsible for the litigation and regulation that is destroying these jobs, destroying these families, destroying these communities and destroying our forests. These extremists even oppose the salvaging of timber that has already been destroyed by forest fires or by disease. Now think about that. Trees that are already dead cannot be salvaged because of lawsuits filed by these extremist groups. And again, they know if they can simply delay the salvage for 2 years, the trees decay to the point where they can't be recovered. And they would rather let those trees rot on the ground rather than to be removed and salvaged to provide jobs for families and lumber for homes and revenues for the national Treasury.

The economic suffering this is now causing is immediate, and it is acute. But an even more ominous effect is placing at risk our mountain communities and our national forests to intense wildfires made possible because overgrowth is no longer being removed. As one forester told me, those trees are going to come out of the forest one way or another. They are either going to be carried out, or they will be burned out. When the excess timber was carried out, we had a thriving lumber industry that put food on the tables and clothes on the children of thousands of working families throughout northern California. More importantly, we also had much healthier forests and far fewer and milder forest fires than we suffer today. This isn't environmentalism. True environmentalists recognize the damage done by overgrowth and overpopulation and recognize that the role of sound forest management practices

is to maintain healthy forests. We are also watching them systematically shut down our public land for public use and public benefit. And every time a little town like Quincy or El Camino is strangled to death by these policies, it has a ripple effect throughout the Nation. Our Nation loses tax revenues, commerce withers, the price of raw materials rises and public resources are diverted to provide economic relief. And our forests suffer as well.

But there's one infinitely higher cost that I haven't mentioned yet, and that brings me to the tragic news that I must impart to the House tonight. There is a raging fire in the Shasta/Trinity National Forest as we speak right now. It's called the "Backbone Fire." About 2 hours ago, I received word that a young man, Thomas Marovich, Jr.—20 years old—from the little town of Aiden in my district, was killed this afternoon fighting that fire. And every time a little town like Aiden mourns the loss of a promising young man like Thomas Marovich, Jr., it is not only a tragedy—if preventable, it is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the great silent majority of Americans to rise up against the most radical elements of the environmental movement that now seem to control so much of our public policy and to demand that we restore our public land for public use and public benefit, and that we restore the sound forest management practices that once minimized the forest fires that are now again destroying communities and taking lives.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Absolutely.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This is truly a tragedy that you have mentioned that is taking place in your home district. As I was out there in the community of Quincy, I was noticing that the concept that they said is that if they could thin those forests, they could minimize the risk of forest fire as well as using the resources that would be pulled out to create jobs at the same time.

Could this fire have at least been mitigated if we had gone through these practices of thinning the forest under proper procedures that would help the forest as well as help the economy at the same time?

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Well, that is why for many years we thinned those forests, to reduce the intensity of those forest fires, to reduce the number of those forest fires, and from that excess timber, we provided a thriving economy throughout that region. And by the way, we also provided a tremendous revenue stream to the national Treasury because that timber is on land owned by the people of the United States. So we had healthier forests, and we had a healthy economy. Both have been imperiled by those policies. And then to that you have to add the tragedy of the human loss of those heroic young men like Mr. Marovich who gave his life today to try to stop those

fires, which are much more intense today and much more numerous today than they were a generation ago when we practiced sound forest management practice.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To the gentleman from California, I thank him for joining us here. I know that we all send our sympathy to the community and especially the family at this time of their particular loss in a heroic effort to try and help and save others.

Part of the problem that the gentleman from California is talking about is because of the land that is owned by the Federal Government. On this particular chart, everything that is in red is owned by the Federal Government. You will notice that it has a preponderance in the West. And where Mr. McCLINTOCK is talking is that area in California surrounded by red. Let's face it. If you live in that area that is surrounded by red, you really don't have a whole lot of options. The Federal Government controls what opportunities you do or do not have.

Let me give you just one example in my State of a different area. And I want to introduce you to a young man by the name of Mr. Pitchforth. Mr. Pitchforth is a young and exciting school teacher who got 12-, 13- and 14-year-olds excited by geography and history, which by itself should give him some kind of hero's medal. This September, though, he is not going to be teaching school. He is not going to be teaching school because the district in which he lives is one of those red areas in which this administration unilaterally and arbitrarily decided to take 77 oil and gas leases and suspend them, take them off the market, making them unusable. And in so doing, took neighboring and abutting pieces of property owned by the school trust lands and make them also sterile for this time period. The schools lost money. And in so doing, their reaction was to fire the first teacher hired. Mr. Pitchforth is not there anymore. You see, this doesn't deal with just people who are working in oil and gas. There's collateral damage from every one of our decisions that the government makes. Mr. Pitchforth isn't working because of a choice he made, but because of a choice some bureaucrat back here in Washington made. And it's not fair. It's not fair for him. It's not fair for his family.

There's other collateral damage that takes place in this area where the Secretary of the Interior decides to pull these leases and suspend these leases for the rationale that the Bush administration did them too quickly. Actually, the Bush administration took 7 years to go through the process. I guess 7 years was not enough time to decide whether we were doing the right thing or not, at least that is what the Secretary said. Let me read to you a letter from, once again, somebody who is not directly employed but who is in the transportation business that does the shipping of materials both to and from

those potential sites. As he wrote the county commission where he lives, Let me applaud your efforts in trying to get the message to our Interior Department that their actions have caused great harm to the economy of our area and to individuals living there. At the end of 2008, we employed over 230 truck drivers and leased 204 trucks. Our payroll was \$12 million a year. But since the first of the year, we have laid off 36 trucks and 47 drivers. There are now 47 families without income nor payroll benefits associated with them. Our overall payroll is down 29 percent, projected now to be down to \$9 million by the end of this calendar year. On a personal note, my son who has worked in the oil fields for the past 8 years has never been unable to find employment until now. He has been off now for 3 months and is getting very discouraged. My daughter is a single mother of two growing boys. She has been struggling to make ends meet with the economy the way it is now and seems she has lost hope of ever finding employment elsewhere. To Brett who is the field manager who was laid off on July 1, July 13 he and his wife had a baby. To Jody and Jeff, two truck operators, Jody lost his truck because he couldn't make payments after he was laid off because of the decision made by the Secretary here in Washington. Curtis was a craftsman and a cabinetmaker who lost his job due to the cancelled contracts once they realized these leases were taken off the table. Travis, a construction worker, husband, father of two children, laid off, once again, as soon as a bureaucratic decision here in Washington was made that had unintended consequences far beyond what was anticipated when a bureaucrat in Washington decided to make decisions on what should take place on the ground out there and took the opportunity of solving our problems and creating problems and taking jobs away from people.

We talk about the numbers unemployed. Each of those unemployed numbers is a face and a real person with a real family and a real issue. I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Georgia to try and put this in perspective. And then we will be joined by two other members of the Western Caucus.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank you, Mr. BISHOP, for yielding me some time. I was really touched by the faces that you've brought forward to the American people tonight here on C-SPAN about these people who have lost their jobs and my good friend TOM McCLINTOCK talking about the National Forest and the mismanagement that is going on because of the endless environmental wacko lawsuits that are going on there and the unfortunate untimely death of this young man who was fighting those fires that probably could have been prevented if we had managed the forest in a better way, in a correct way, according to normal silviculture practices.

□ 2030

Civil culture means forestry practices to the best extent for economic purposes, and I thank both of you for bringing the face of people to this discussion tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a medical doctor, and I've seen the faces of a lot of patients who have struggled with the cost of health care expenses, the cost of health insurance and medication and hospital bills. In over 3½ decades of practicing general medicine in rural south Georgia and now northeast Georgia, I've literally given away in my services several hundred thousand dollars of my services if I had charged for them.

We have a proposal that I call ObamaCare that's being debated here in the Halls of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the director of the Congressional Budget Office last week said that if ObamaCare is passed it's going to cost 750,000 people their jobs across America. Three-quarters of 1 million people are going to be put out of work just because of passing a bill that supposedly is going to make everybody covered by health insurance.

But the Congressional Budget Office director also said that even in the next 10 years not everybody would be covered. Let me say that again, because what we keep hearing from the Democratic side is we're going to cover everybody; everybody's going to have health care. Well, everybody does have access to health care today. Federal law requires it. What everybody does not have is health insurance.

But our Democratic colleagues want to give free health insurance to illegal aliens, and that's what ObamaCare does. It gives free health insurance to illegal aliens. The 12 million, 15 million illegal aliens in this country who are criminals have entered this country illegally. Virtually all of them have illegal documents. They've broken many Federal laws. They're criminals. And my Democratic colleagues want to give them free insurance. It's going to cost 750,000 American citizens jobs to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this House considered a bill just a few weeks ago that they, my Democratic colleagues, call cap-and-trade. I call it tax-and-trade or tax-and-cap because it's about taxes. It's about revenue. We hear over and over again that it is going to create all these green jobs. Well, it will create some green jobs. In fact, I saw a friend, my next door neighbor in the hall over in the Cannon House Office Building, bring in a chart where he's going to talk about green jobs, and it indeed will create green jobs, but what you're not being told is what happened to Spain.

Our President has lifted up Spain as being the model of what we need to do on these green jobs and environmental policy. Well, about a decade ago Spain put into place a similar piece of legislation as our tax-and-trade bill that's languishing over in the Senate, and I hope the Senate will defeat it. But in

Spain, for every single green job that was created, 2.2 other jobs cost. In other words, 2.2 people were put out of work for every one person put to work by these green jobs that tax-and-trade is going to create.

I know my Democratic colleagues can add and subtract. I don't want to accuse them of not doing so, but if you subtract 2.2 from 1, you get a minus 1.2, and that's exactly what's going to happen. If the American people don't stand up and say "no" to tax-and-trade, or tax-and-cap, whatever you want to call it, and tell the U.S. Senators, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be disastrous and it's going to cost American jobs and to defeat it over there in the Senate, there will be 2.2 people put out of work for every 1 person that is put to work.

I already said the Congressional Budget Office says 750,000 people are going to lose their jobs because of ObamaCare, but it's going to do many other things, too, that are disastrous. ObamaCare is going to insert a Washington bureaucrat between every patient and their doctor, and the Washington bureaucrat is going to be making, Mr. Speaker, every single individual in this country's health care decision. The patient, the patient's family won't be able to make those decisions. The doctor won't be able to make those decisions. It's going to be a Washington bureaucrat that makes that decision.

We were told by our Democratic colleagues it's all about lowering costs; but just last Friday the Director of the Congressional Budget Office said that it's not going to rein in the cost of health care. In fact, it's going to cost more money.

So let me get this right. It's going to cost more money to put in place ObamaCare; it's going to take decisions away from patients and their family and their doctor about making health care decisions; and it's going to put a Washington bureaucrat in charge of those decisions, and that Washington bureaucrat is going to say whether a patient can get needed treatment, surgery, x rays, MRIs, or not.

We already know in countries such as Great Britain and Canada that in those socialized medicine, government-run programs, that the death rates for cancer overall are much higher than here in the United States. Women who get breast cancer in Canada and Great Britain, roughly 50 percent of them are dead after 5 years. Prostate cancer, the same, roughly 50 percent of people that are diagnosed with prostate cancer in those countries, or 60 percent, are dead in 5 years. Here in the United States, it's over 90 percent are still alive. So what's going to happen here? Our death rates are going to go up for all cancers.

Just today, we had a bill here on the floor that I talked about that is one to try to encourage people to understand diabetes. As a medical practitioner, I've treated diabetes for years, and the end result of diabetes and the reason

it's so important to catch it early and to treat it is that people die at a young age when they have diabetes, a lot younger than they should if it's treated.

But the thing is, as we ration health care and the Washington bureaucrat tells patients that they can't get the tests that they need, they can't get the life-saving coronary bypass surgery or stints and the procedures they need to help them not die from heart attacks or from strokes, the Washington bureaucrats are going to say particularly to the elderly that you can't get the dialysis that you desperately need because you're old and it's not cost effective, it's not comparatively effective, and thus, you just must die and not get the treatment that you desperately need.

So people are not only going to be put out of work but people are going to be in poor health. We're going to degrade the quality of health care delivered by doctors and hospitals across this Nation because a Washington bureaucrat's going to say "no" to patients and say "no" to doctors.

This is going to be disastrous. We're creating a debt and a deficit that's unprecedented in the history of our Nation. We're going down a track right now, Mr. Speaker, that every great nation in history has gone down: Great Britain, Spain, even Rome. We're going down a track of spending money that we don't have, creating debt that we cannot pay. We're robbing our children and our grandchildren of their future. They will live at a lower standard than we live today because of this huge debt that we're creating, Mr. Speaker, this huge deficit that this administration is creating.

I hear from our friends on the Democratic side, even just this week I heard them blame President Bush for the debt and deficit. Well, I blame President Bush for being a big spender and he was. While I was here during the tail end of his Presidency, I fought all those big spending bills. I fought the Washington bailout of Wall Street.

But President Bush was just a piker compared to what this administration's doing. We're creating unprecedented debt and deficit that our grandchildren cannot pay. So their standard of living is going to be worse than it is today.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be a lot of people put out of work. During the Great Depression all the spending that FDR did did put some people to work, but the unemployment rates bounced up and down and stayed very high.

Mr. Speaker, in my district in Georgia, many counties have over 13 percent unemployment today. I've talked to several managers of plants, manufacturing plants in my district, that tell me that if this tax-and-trade bill that the Senate has over here that this House passed, they are they're going to lock the doors. Those jobs are going to go overseas because they can't afford to pay the higher energy tax.

Most Americans are going to have a hard time, particularly the poor and the people on limited incomes are going to have a hard time paying the higher energy cost.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have stood up over and over again and have talked about the proposals that we have made, proposals to stimulate the economy and create jobs; proposals to lower the cost of health care expenses to all Americans; proposals that would stimulate the economy; proposals that don't cost our grandchildren their future and, in fact, will not even cost the taxpayers today any increase in their taxes. But those proposals are not heard because the leadership of this House and the leadership of the Senate across the way won't let those proposals get to the floor to be discussed, and it's not right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we're robbing America of its future. We're robbing Americans of their jobs today. We're going down a track that's going to put more and more people out of work. It's going to create more problems for people paying their utility bills, their gasoline, their home heating costs and things like that. Even with the mandates from our friends on the Democratic side that they are putting on health care, it's going to literally lower the income of people who are working, and it's not right and it's not fair.

Mr. Speaker, it's got to stop. The American people need to stand up and say "no" to ObamaCare, "no" to tax-and-spend policies that this administration, that this leadership in this House and the Senate are bringing forward because it's going to destroy America.

And I thank my friend from Utah, Mr. BISHOP. I see he has a poster here that we have a lot of these unemployed people in my district. Praise God that we don't have 14.7 million people in my district out of work; but more and more people are becoming unemployed, and they're going to continue to lose jobs in my district in Georgia, and I'm sure they are in yours in Utah if we don't stop this outrageous spending that the leadership of this Congress, of this administration, are doing. We've got to stop it, and it's up to the American people to demand from their Senators and their Congressmen and this administration saying "no" to this outrageous spending that's going on.

□ 2045

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate Representative BROWN from Georgia for joining us. He provides a unique element to the Western Caucus of giving a Southern input, which we find so similar to the problems that we're facing, as well as a medical background. Part of the problems he's talking about is the reason that the policies we have been creating as a government is part of the problem why we have 14.7 million unemployed right now.

I'd like to go to the Eastern part of the country, if I could, and yield some

time to Representative THOMPSON from the State of Pennsylvania, who also has a similar problem, similar situation, with a similar heavyhanded result of bureaucratic Washington decisions, and it has direct impact, so that these unemployed are not just faces, they're real people.

Then, we will be happy to be joined by Representative LUMMIS from Wyoming, who has the same things in her home State as well.

Representative THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for coordinating this event tonight. I'm very proud to represent Pennsylvania's Fifth District and am very proud to be a part of the Western Caucus. We have a lot of wonderful natural resources that, frankly, help to make, Mr. Speaker, make this country strong, and I believe as a part of our promising future if we use them and use them wisely.

Federal policies that lead to job losses is a very personal one for me and many of my constituents in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. My district is home to Pennsylvania's only national forest, the Allegheny, or the ANF as we often refer to it—513,000 acres.

The ANF is as special as the district that I represent and has a long history as an economic and a tourism center for the region. Nearby, in Titusville, Pennsylvania, Colonel Edwin Drake founded the world's very first commercial oil well in 1859. The energy industry has been the economic engine in that region in my district ever since. Now this includes the ANF.

For 86 years, the forest has successfully operated for multiuse purposes. These uses include recreation tourism as well as timber harvesting, oil, and natural gas production. Frankly, before this forest was formed 86 years ago, it was an oil and gas field.

Since oil and gas has been the economic engine in the region for over 60 years, when the ANF was created, the Federal Government only purchased the surface rights. This was done intentionally by the Federal Government in order to leave the mineral rights, meaning the rights to oil and gas and minerals, in private hands. And for some 85-plus years there's been a positive working relationship between the Federal Government, who owns the surface rights, and the private and oil gas developers, who own the mineral rights.

However, this longstanding and beneficial relationship recently has been ruptured. Last fall, the Forest Service was sued by three environmental groups: Sierra Club, the Allegheny Defense Project, and the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics. The Sierra Club is based in the Speaker's home district in San Francisco, California. The Allegheny Defense Fund is based somewhere in Oregon. And the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics—well, they

won't identify themselves. We don't know.

These groups are attempting to apply the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, to the permitting processes, which effectively will shut down energy production in the forests.

Let me be clear, oil and gas production is the major economic force in the region, and has been since that first oil well was drilled 150 years ago.

Penn State University performed a study and concluded that for every 100 direct oil and gas sector jobs in northwestern Pennsylvania, 23 industry support jobs are created, with an additional 40 ancillary jobs in the retail and residential sectors. Want a true economic stimulus that leads us to energy independence? Let's support that industry. Again, I can't emphasize enough how important these jobs are to our region and the local economy.

As a direct result of the lawsuit, the forest service indefinitely suspended the permitting process for all new oil and gas leases in January of this year. To make matters worse, the Forest Service released a settlement this past April that sides entirely with the environmental groups.

This settlement was reached behind closed doors and was reached with no industry input. There was no judge, no court that told them to do this. Applying NEPA was a decision made by the Forest Service and did not even take into account the people that it would hurt directly and the most. No court told them to do this, which means that it was a policy change that occurred within the National Forest Service.

Now, while these environmental groups would like everyone to think that oil and gas production in the ANF goes unregulated, it's rigorously regulated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. And they do a great job. They always have.

Today, I, along with Mr. BISHOP and 18 other members of the Congressional Western Caucus, sent a letter on this topic to Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack. The Secretary, unlike some Members of Congress and environmental groups, knows that the Forest Service is a part of the Agriculture Department, not the Interior Department.

The bottom line is that Congress and the President have this year alone spent about a trillion dollars in the name of job creation. Yet, some within the administration are also actively trying to make policy changes like this that kill good-paying jobs which have existed for 86 years.

Not too long ago, I was in Bradford, Pennsylvania, on a Sunday morning, and I picked out a small church to worship in. And at the end of the service I had a young mom come up to me. She had three little kids in tow. They weren't very big. The oldest maybe was four years old.

And she came up to me and she said, You're Mr. THOMPSON. She said, I want to thank you for what you're trying to

do to stand up for the right things of making sure that we have the rights to access to subsurface rights. You see, her husband makes his living working on oil wells. At that point, he was struggling to find a job and struggling to be able to support his family because of a policy change by this administration which attacks the subsurface private property rights. And that's not right.

I've talked with businesses that have been in the business, have lived their entire life for generations in the Allegheny National Forest, that own subsurface rights and have every right for 86 years to access oil, natural gas, and minerals that they own. And, because of that arbitrary policy change by this administration, that's been shut down. And these folks who have been in business for just generations are no longer able to support themselves.

This type of attack, this type of policy by this administration on private property owners, it impacts timber workers, it impacts drillers, excavation companies, businesses, schools, townships, and families. Frankly, they're all suffering. And they're suffering because of the arbitrary and devastating policies of this administration on private-property-right owners.

I thank the gentleman from Utah and I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This clearly shows we are desperate to create jobs and yet we have an Interior and an Agricultural Department whose decisions are killing jobs and the ripple effect those jobs have.

I'd like one other illustration of how this is happening. My good friend, Representative LUMMIS from Wyoming, one of my favorite elements about Wyoming is that fact I'm an old schoolteacher. And this chart clearly shows that the blue line is what Wyoming pays their schoolteachers. The red line is what Montana pays their schoolteachers. And the only difference between those two States is Wyoming clearly realizes what can happen and how much good you can do when you develop the resources that are there in that particular State.

I yield to the gentlelady from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding. The chart he shows is exactly right. The fact that Wyoming chose to develop its mining resources and Montana chose a path that retarded the development of its mining resources is the difference in the teacher salaries, as pointed out in that chart.

We have been blessed in Wyoming by having low unemployment and it created an opportunity, until recently, for people from other States who have suffered job losses to find gainful employment and make a new life in Wyoming.

A number of families have relocated, especially from Michigan, to the State of Wyoming, and predominantly the community of Gillette. Gillette, Wyom-

ing, has become Wyoming's third-largest city and is growing in a way that brings young families vibrancy, activity, and the arts and recreation to a wonderful Wyoming community in northeast Wyoming.

It's brought a lot of new people to Wyoming from Michigan looking for a new life and looking for work. Many of them came from the automobile industry and manufacturing industries and mining industries, quite frankly, that were devastated due to the economic downturn. But they were able to find jobs in Wyoming, and we're so happy to have them.

Then, along comes Waxman-Markey, a bill that creates a national energy tax and a bill that creates a tremendous threat, especially to coal mining jobs.

Jobs in the Wyoming mining industry are high paying. Eighty-six percent higher than the average wage in the State. The average annual wage in the mining industry in Wyoming was \$73,000 in 2007. It is an extraordinarily liveable wage in Wyoming.

But, if you look at the total coal mining jobs in the U.S. and the changes in policy under Waxman-Markey and other bills going through this Congress, the outlook for those Michigan residents who have proudly relocated to Wyoming is not very prosperous.

Job losses related to Waxman-Markey, optimistic projections, total U.S. job loss in 5 years: 14,000 jobs lost in coal mining alone. A pessimistic number for job losses 5 years from now in coal mining alone: 35,000 jobs.

Let's project it out because, as you know, Waxman-Markey doesn't take effect completely until the year 2050, but let's just go out 10 years and 15 years.

The projected loss in jobs in 10 years due to Waxman-Markey, under the most optimistic scenario that can be put together: 20,000 jobs lost in coal mining alone. And the pessimistic number: 67,000 jobs. That's the entire population of my community of Cheyenne, and then some.

Of course, 20 years out the optimistic job loss in coal alone: 50,000 people. And the pessimistic number: 125,000 people in coal alone. These are not jobs that can be replaced by green jobs. These green jobs are not projected to pay 86 percent higher than the average wage in my State.

Not only is the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill, the national energy tax, an attack on coal-producing States around the Nation, but other bills going through this Congress are having the same consequence.

Let's take, for example, the Interior Appropriations bill that just passed the House. It had a provision in it that when a company acquires a Federal lease to mine more coal, they will pay a bid bonus payment. That occurs now. The problem is, these bid bonus payments are such a large amount of money that they have been spread out

over 5 years so the companies can borrow less money or use production that they're currently accomplishing to pay in 5-year increments for those big coal bid bonus payments.

Under the Interior Appropriations bill that just passed this House, they will have to pay that all up front. These are staggeringly large numbers, in the tens of millions and sometimes hundreds of millions of dollars.

□ 2100

Companies in this financial crisis cannot borrow those kinds of moneys. Consequently, there will be companies that will not bid, thereby reducing the receipts to the American taxpayer when there's not competitive bidding for the coal or there may be no bids at all because no company can borrow enough money to pay the entire 5-year payment up front.

One little amendment in an enormous bill that has tremendous consequences to coal mining jobs went through without discussion, and there are many such amendments in these bills every day that are an attack on jobs in this country, an attack on jobs in my State. The attack on jobs in the Appalachian States is unbelievable under the cap-and-trade bill. If I were in an Appalachian State, I would be even more concerned than I am for my State of Wyoming, and as the number one coal-producing State in the country, I am tremendously concerned about the loss of jobs.

These policies are not good for America. They're not good for my State. They're not good for the West, and they're certainly not good for the hard-working people of America.

I thank Mr. BISHOP of Utah for allowing me the time to speak this evening.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming who has so clearly pointed out how small decisions that we make here still have enormous impacts. We have seen what this administration has done in an effort, for whatever reason, to harm the creation of jobs when it deals with land policy.

This week the Secretary of the Interior decided to have a time-out on new leases of uranium mining, which will lose at least 1,100 jobs. He earlier decided to put a halt on the development of oil shale projects. That could be up to 1 million jobs. It is estimated at 160,000 jobs that will be lost from the delay on Outer Continental Shelf development. An effort to stop the timber harvest in western Oregon immediately costs another 5,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at what we're doing here, it is very clear that small business and families are struggling today. Republicans have put forth thoughtful, serious alternatives which have been ignored and not even discussed. It's also clear that the President's economic decisions have not produced jobs, not produced prosperity, and simply have not worked. It doesn't mean that we're out of options. We can still have a real recovery.

If we emphasize and create an environment that empowers small business and empowers Americans and we focus on job creation, we stop the attack on the West and other areas of public lands and the people who live there and allow them to develop the resources that we have been given to create real jobs in this country, we can do that. That is still an option that we have. But we have to do it, and we have to do it together.

There are a lot of other examples that I would like to go into. Mr. Speaker, but time does not allow that—maybe at some other time—where decisions by this administration have actually harmed families and their creation of jobs. Once again, we have to change directions. That has to stop.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Justin Cox, Physician, Office of Attending Physician:

OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,
U.S. CAPITOL,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for trial testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in connection with a criminal case now pending in that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JUSTIN COX,
Physician.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE IS A MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCMAHON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to stand here in the House of Representatives, representing the people of the great boroughs of Staten Island and Brooklyn in New York for the Freshmen Energy Hour. I am privileged to be joined by my colleague, as I come from Hudson Valley in New York, my colleague from the Ohio Valley, the great JOHN BOCCIERI, the gentleman from Ohio, who will join me in this Freshman Energy Hour.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today to talk about the American Clean Energy and Security Act, which was passed recently by the House, and to speak to its merits in order to urge the Senate to pass it as well. I sat here and lis-

tened to our great colleagues from across the aisle for some time this evening speaking on this issue. They conclude that they hope that the Senate looks upon this bill unfavorably as they criticize the initiatives of this bill.

I know that my colleague will mention it, but I would just like to remind them what their former candidate for President in last year's election, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, said about the cap-and-trade legislation as recently as February 17, 2009. He said: It's cap-and-trade, that there will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. The Europeans are using it now. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain—look, if we do that, we stimulate green technologies. I have great faith in the American industry. This will be a profit-making business, create jobs. It won't cost the American taxpayer a thing.

So I am pleased that those who spoke before me from across the aisle in opposition to this bill referenced the opinion of the United States Senate. And I am glad that Senator MCCAIN was honest and forthright enough to admit that this legislation does, indeed, create jobs, provides for the security of our Nation, and takes care of the environment as well, and, indeed, it is important for us for our future.

As we know, the recently passed Energy and Security legislation comes at a time when inaction will have undue consequences. This comprehensive energy and clean environment bill is a necessary vehicle to ensure our future economic and environmental viability in the 21st century green economy.

I would like to start out by commending the leadership of the House who brought forward this bill and saw that it was passed. The regional differences arising from energy-based issues are often quite lofty, but the leadership did an outstanding job of moving through the legislative process with consideration for different Members' interests.

Since the bill's passage before the Independence Day recess, many Members, myself included, have experienced varying degrees of concern from our constituents, particularly regarding the cost and impact of the bill to their wallets, and quite a lot of this concern has been raised because of misrepresentations from our gentle colleagues from the other side of the aisle as to the aspects of this bill. Together with Mr. BOCCIERI, I would like to address some of these concerns and the pervasive misinformation that has been put out there today and explain how this information will be a cost-saver for consumers and homeowners, will cut down on pollution, and will increase our national security.

At a time when we are importing increasing amounts of energy from hostile regions of the world, we cannot afford to go down the path of energy insecurity. This legislation will redirect

us on a path towards energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I sat here and listened to our colleagues from across the aisle this evening and all day long, hundreds of minutes, I understand, that they spoke about this issue and the creation of jobs in this country. What I found very disconcerting as a New Yorker is that they've totally forgotten the issue of national security and how important energy independence is to this Nation. It's so important to me, Mr. Speaker, because I come from Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, where, on 9/11, over 10 percent of the people who were killed in the attack on the World Trade Center came from our boroughs, although we have less than 5 percent of the population in that area.

I remember that day as clear as any other in my life—in fact, more profoundly. It was a bright, sunny day. And I remember it because I was involved in my first election campaign that day. It was a primary for the New York City Council. We were in church at about 9 a.m., as we do on every Election Day after opening the polls and campaigning a bit. The police officer who I was with received an emergency call and took us out and said that something terrible had happened and we have to go down to the harbor.

When we got down there, we saw the World Trade Center aflame, and the second plane had just struck. We went back to our office to close down the election, and as we were there, we saw the horrors of what transpired on television as the buildings collapsed. I will never forget it. I will never forget being on the pile the days after and the bucket brigade. I will never forget seeing President Bush say to our Nation and to those who lost their loved ones that we will never forget.

After we closed down the election, we weren't sure what to do that day, so we went to the local hospital and set up a blood bank to await the injured people to come back from the site. But as hour and hour went on, we realized that no one was coming back and the enormity of the tragedy. I mention this because I think it's so important that our Nation does not forget the costs of dependence upon nations around this world for oil who want to see our great American democracy torn down. Our way of life is an affront to them, and they will do anything to tear down America.

So when you have this discussion about energy and whatever they want to call it, let us never forget that this is about energy security first and foremost. America cannot go on the way it has, relying on foreign oil from countries who want to tear our country down. Even though we made a pledge at that time to end dependence on foreign oil, the chart that I have here will show that just in the last year, in 2008, the amount of oil that we imported from foreign countries was 66.4 percent of our usage. The dollars we spent overseas, \$475 billion. How many of those

dollars go to al Qaeda? How many of those dollars go to terrorists who want to bring destruction and terror to our country and to our allies' countries around this world?

How dare anyone stand on the floor of this House of Representatives, this noble and esteemed body, and not talk about this anytime they talk about energy, anytime they talk about this bill. I consider it an affront when people misrepresent the facts of this bill for their own political reasons and not to bring the true facts to the American people.

Look again at the ways, since the time that the attack occurred, the way that our dependence on foreign oil, our imports have gone up so dramatically. We have, indeed, forgotten. We have forgotten those who we lost that day. We've forgotten our pledge to have security, to have energy independence, and it is something that this bill will seek to do.

At this time, I would like to ask my colleague, Mr. BOCCIERI, to share with us some of his thoughts from the perspective of the people of the great State of Ohio.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from New York and his insight and accuracy with respect to this issue and the importance that it has for our Nation. Now, I must give you this prelude.

I approach this legislation from a very deep perspective that I've had throughout my life. For the last 15 years, I have served in the United States Air Force as a C-130 pilot, and I have to tell you that there is no matter before this Congress more important than the steps we are taking to create a situation by which our Nation can become energy independent.

I must tell you that I hail from the Midwest, and I know my friend hails from New York, but I have to tell you that this bill and this legislation coming before the Congress is about Midwest innovation and breaking our reliance on Mideast oil. The pillars of this legislation are creating jobs, thousands of jobs in our country and hundreds of thousands of jobs alone in my district in Ohio, the 16th Congressional District.

The pillar of this legislation is about national security, about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil. Those two noble causes right now are a track worth defending right now. I stand here with my colleagues today to tell you that we must do something. We will be judged by two measures, Mr. Speaker, two measures: by action or inaction.

I remember in the 1970s when I stood with my father in line to wait so that we could fill up for a tank of gas. Back then, back then we had a Democrat-controlled Congress. We had a Democrat President, but we didn't have the political will to make this happen. This Congress and this President are saying, No more. No more to outsourcing our dependence to foreign petro-dictators,

if you will, that don't have the interests of the United States at stake.

My colleague talked about some of those, and let me just put this down to you right now. In 2003, a U.S. Department of Defense study concluded that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. We talked about how much oil we've used from overseas. We imported over 66 percent just last year, accounting for nearly 16 percent of all import spending.

My friends, we must do something. Now, this is not just John Bocchieri saying this on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is not my friend Mike McMahon from New York saying this or my friend Frank Kratovil from Maryland suggesting this. Every Presidential candidate running for the highest office in our country last year said that this is a matter of national security.

You heard the words of my friend from New York when he talked about Senator John McCain, who I have great respect for, a man who I flew out of Baghdad while he was visiting our troops, a man who put his life on the line for the country. I want the American people and our colleagues here tonight to listen to this. It's about cap-and-trade.

There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. Let me repeat that. It is a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain. We're doing a cap-and-trade program right now in the United States here that's been in existence for 19 years. Look, if we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. This will be a profit-making business. It won't cost the American taxpayer. Let me repeat that again. John McCain said that it's a free-market approach and it won't cost the American taxpayer.

Joe Lieberman and I introduced a cap-and-trade proposal 7 years ago which would reduce greenhouse gases with a gradual reduction. We did the same thing with acid rain. This works. It works. My friends, this is about our national security. John McCain and every other Presidential candidate running for office last year said that it's a matter of national security.

□ 2115

The Department of Defense is saying it's a matter of national security. But all of a sudden, our friends here that we have this debate with are running away from national security. For what, I have no idea.

But I'll tell you this much. This is our opportunity to put America on a track where we can create jobs in the heartland and in the cities of great New York and in the suburbs of Maryland. We can create jobs and we can protect our national security.

After having fought—one last point, Mr. MCMAHON. After having served

overseas flying wounded and fallen soldiers out of Baghdad, it is very clear that our presence in the Middle East is about that 66 percent that Congressman MCMAHON talked about, because 40 percent of that 66 percent that has come from overseas comes from the Middle East. And this is the time that we have to act.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Congressman BOCCIERI for that passionate insight on this issue. And as you point out, I talked about the horrors of our energy dependence on the Middle Eastern countries here on foreign soil, on our domestic soil and through terrorism.

But certainly, we thank you for your service to our country. And also it's quite clear that the men and women who are wearing our uniforms right now fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan are doing so, so much so because we can't get off our addiction to that foreign oil, particularly from the Middle East, and that's what this bill is about.

We'd like to hear from our equally great colleague from the great State of Maryland, FRANK KRATOVIL.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Let me thank the gentleman from New York for, first of all, leading us in this discussion this evening on such an important topic and, of course, my friend and colleague from Ohio, Mr. BOCCIERI, for passion.

I want to follow up on just a couple of things that you had mentioned, Mr. BOCCIERI, talking about this issue from a historical perspective. You know, so many times in this country we talk about for years and years the things we need to do, and yet when push comes to shove, we don't always have the political courage to do what needs to be done. You were speaking about discussions you had with your father.

You know, every U.S. President since Richard Nixon has advocated the need for energy independence. In 1974, Nixon promised it could be achieved within 6 years. Gerald Ford promised it could be done in 10 years. And Jimmy Carter pledged to wage the moral equivalent of war to achieve it. And yet, here we are, in 2009, and for the first time really we have made steps, really aggressive proactive steps in reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

I want to read you something that President Nixon said at the State of the Union address in 1973. Looking at the year 1974, which lies before us, there are 10 key areas in which landmark accomplishments are possible this year in America. If we make these our national agenda, this is what we will achieve in 1974. We will break the back of the energy crisis. We will lay the foundation for our future capacity to meet America's energy needs from America's own resources. That was Nixon in 1973.

Gerald Ford, in 1975, said, I am proposing a program which will begin to restore our country's surplus capacity in total energy. In this way we will be able to assure ourselves reliable and adequate energy and help foster a new

world energy stability for other major consuming nations. We must develop our energy technology and resources so that the United States has the ability to supply a significant share of the energy needs of the Free World by the end of this century. President Ford, in 1975.

So, looking at it from a historical perspective, we have talked about this for years and years because Presidents in the past have recognized, and Congresses in the past have recognized, that it is essential for our own national security that we reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

In 1970, our oil imports have grown from nearly 24 percent in 1970, to nearly 70 percent of our total consumption now. Last year alone, the United States spent \$475 billion on foreign oil.

Needless to say, as Mr. BOCCIERI mentioned, and as you mentioned, much of this funding benefits nations that support terrorism or, at the very least, anti-American political extremism. How long should we continue to provide dollars to nations that seek to destroy us?

And so, although this bill focused also on the issue of climate change, for me, and I'm sure for many other Members, this issue had more to do with, from my standpoint, an issue of national security, reducing our dependence on foreign oil and doing what we should have been doing back in the 1970s and moving our country forward.

Now, let me say something about our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Objections have been raised with a number of bills that have come before this Congress, and arguments that we are moving too quickly. Some of those arguments I've agreed with. But the key in moving this Nation forward is not simply to have people that stand in the way of making progress. Regardless of arguments that they make, if we were to give as much time as our opponents on the other side of the aisle would allow, many of them would still object to moving this country forward.

So we need to find a reasonable balance between some of the objections that are made in terms of process and yet, at the same time, make sure that we are not simply standing in the way of progress simply as a result of being in opposition for whatever we do to move this country forward.

And with that, I'll yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Congressman KRATOVIL. And those are points extremely well taken. And you can only wonder whether President Nixon and President Ford would be very disappointed, having understood how important this issue is to our national security to have the other side of the aisle, as you say, really giving out such misinformation about the effects and particulars of this bill to really scare the American Nation. And I can tolerate that when it's issues of a more domestic nature and whether, you know, we should, when it comes to

different types of issues that we vote on on resolutions before the House or domestic issues.

But when you talk about national security, it really borders on unpatriotic, in my mind, to use misinformation to scare the American people at a time when we can really get ourselves off foreign oil.

You know, how many times have we heard about the study from the MIT economist that, according to the other side of the aisle, will cost every American family \$3,100 under this bill? That very economist has come out in public and said that it is untrue, that they are misrepresenting the conclusions of his report.

And everyone from the CBO to everyone else down has pointed out that when you take in all the different ramifications of the bill in consideration, that at worst, in the year 2017, I believe it is, that the average American family, at most, would see an increase of \$175 a year. Now that's in 8 years. So between now and 8 years from now there is no increase, and there are natural increases anyway. And in fact, in some parts of the country, like the Northeast, which I represent, there will actually be a decrease in cost because of the way that we generate our energy now and the way it's transmitted.

In fact, the National Resources Defense Counsel says that in the Northeast they will see a decrease of \$5 per month on your electricity bill. That's why three Republicans in New Jersey voted for this bill. That's why a Republican in New York voted for this bill. They didn't listen to the misinformation. They understood it was about national security, and it delivers electricity to homeowners at a cheaper cost.

Yet, I believe to engage in misinformation on this very vital issue of national security is wrong.

Congressman BOCCIERI, I'd like to yield to you, sir.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentlemen from New York and Maryland for their insight. And we talked about what our friends on the other side are suggesting about the cost. But let me ask you this profound question: What is the cost of doing nothing? What is the cost of doing nothing? 500 billion, \$1 trillion overseas?

This is a matter of our national security. And I must tell you that if 27 percent of all America's cars were hybrid electric gasoline vehicles, much like Ford has produced with its Escape, and much like we have with some of the other models coming before the market, if just 20 percent of all American cars were hybrid gasoline electric models, the United States could stop importing oil from the Persian Gulf. Just 20 percent of the vehicles on our roads, we would end our dependence on oil from the Persian Gulf.

This is the pillar of our legislation, national security, creating jobs and moving away from our dependence on

foreign oil. That's what an energy policy in the United States should encompass. That's what it should evolve into, and that's what this legislation is about.

If you will just indulge me, I want to read some quotes here from some of our colleagues who were running for President on the other side of the aisle. Rudolph Giuliani said we need to use and expand the use of hybrid vehicles. Remember, just 27 percent of all vehicles on the roads of the United States would end our dependence on oil from the Persian Gulf. Clean coal, carbon sequestration, which is very important to a State like Ohio, where we have a great abundance of coal and carbon capture. We can use that in Ohio. \$180 billion in this bill for carbon capture and sequestration and studying that.

The United States Air Force is testing synthetic fuels right now, blended fuels at Wright Patterson Air Force Base because they know, back in the 1940s, when the United States bombed the Ploesti Romanian oil fields and cut off the Germans' supply of oil, the Germans quickly transitioned to synthetic fuel, a derivative of coal. We're reaching that in Ohio, and the United States military is doing the same.

We have more coal reserves in the United States than oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security.

Let me reference our friend, Mitt Romney, a good American, suggested that there are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less dependent on foreign energy and to develop our own sources. That's the real key, of course, additional sources of energy here, as well as more efficient use of energy. That will allow the world to have less oil being drawn down from the various sources it comes from, without dropping prices to too high of a level. It will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy.

Let me add Mr. Huckabee. Mr. Huckabee, a good American, plays the guitar very well by the way, I should add. Mr. Huckabee said, So it's critical that our own interests, economically and from a point of national security, we commit to becoming energy independent and that we commit to doing it within a decade. We sent Americans to the Moon in a decade. We can become energy independent in a decade. We have to take responsibility for our own house before we can expect others to do the same for theirs. It goes back to my basic concept of leadership. Leaders don't ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves.

Very, very profound statement right there. And we know it's often been said that fear is not a tool of leadership; it's a tool of the status quo.

One last one. Our good friend, Mr. PAUL. We serve with him here; I just spoke with him the other day on the floor. Mr. PAUL said, True conservatives and libertarians have no right to

pollute their neighbors' property. You have no right to pollute your neighbors' air, water or anything. And this would all contribute to the protection of all air and water.

One last point, Mr. McMAHON. The Truman Project suggested that economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and other intelligence experts to place increased pressure on weaker nations that may be unable to provide basic needs and maintain order for their own citizens. This is a matter of national security.

I yield back.

Mr. McMAHON. You're so right, Congressman BOCCIERI, and you put that so eloquently. And you have to wonder why it is that the national leaders of the Republican Party get it, yet it seems to be that the Members of the House of Representatives from the Republican Party don't get it at all.

Before I yield to our great colleague, also from the great State of New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO, I just want to make two points because on the issue of national security, I was shopping in my local supermarket over the weekend, and I spoke to a gentleman who had heard some of the myths about the bill and we spoke about national security. He said to me, well, if we just drilled all our oil in this country, we wouldn't have this problem. Well, we know that physically that couldn't happen immediately. But even if it were to happen, the truth of the matter is, a generation from now those resources would be depleted as well and we'd be in the same place that we are now.

The point of the matter is that we cannot go on the way that we have. And, certainly, I know that there are some who will say, well, global warming, that's a myth. Okay. Take that, if you want to make that argument, go ahead. But pollution and the effects of pollution are not a myth.

In my district we have the highest rate of lung cancer in America. And why? Because we're downwind from the factories in New Jersey and Ohio and across this country. And it blows across and into the people of Staten Island and Brooklyn, and we breathe, and also from the cars and the smog, that terrible air. And it's time, across this country and all those places and those great States that I mentioned, and in my area as well, to have clean air.

□ 2130

There was a very disturbing report on TV this morning. You know, children who are conceived and who are born in areas that have high levels of pollution, that have high levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or PAHs, if they're in the womb when they're exposed to that, their IQ rates are four or five points less than those of children who are conceived and who are born in areas that do not have that pollution. So you could argue about global warming until the cows come

home. We know that it's real, but even if you think it isn't, pollution is not a fiction.

As JOHN MCCAIN mentioned, and as we know in New York—and my great colleague is about to speak from Upstate New York—acid rain was a problem, Congressman TONKO. Certainly, in the lakes in Upstate New York, in the Adirondacks and in the Catskill Mountains, they were dead. The lakes were dead, and that was caused by pollution from sulfur dioxide. We now know, because of cap-and-trade, a program which was implemented in 1990 at a third of the projected cost at that time and in half the time projected to clean up, it is very successful, and those lakes again are alive.

Referring to Upstate New York, it's a privilege and an honor to welcome our colleague from the great State of New York, one who is a real leader on the issue of energy and on a clean environment, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative McMAHON. It's a pleasure to join with you and with our colleagues from Ohio and Maryland in dealing with the facts of the matter and not with the fiction.

I know that you had earlier gone through the mathematics and the calculations of the impact, as reported by the opposition in the House, as to what this is costing us. To take claim of \$3,100 and basing it on a study done where the author has said you have misapplied that information from the MIT study and to grossly inflate it at \$3,100 when, more appropriately, it's between the range of \$65 and \$80, it has an impact on a family. Then the author further addresses it by saying that it needs to be additionally calibrated to go toward the final package that was passed by the House, which has an even lesser impact. Yet leave that aside, and talk about the cost of doing nothing.

Many people will lament, I'm certain, in each one of our districts, as we travel through our districts, about the job loss, about the exportation, and about the offshore/across the shore of American jobs. Well, no one is there to talk about that same impact of sending \$400 billion a year to regimes that are unfriendly, that are terrorist in nature, that are certainly not the most secure or stable governments in the world, and we're supplying \$400 billion a year. That is the cost today. That is a tax. Call it what you want. It is a tax on the American public. We can go forward and address, in a more secure and energy-independent manner, the sort of solutions that will then grow American jobs. American clean energy jobs are what this whole proposal is about. So it speaks to our sustainable quality that we can encourage that which allows us to grow energy security.

How so?

Well, the Union of Concerned Scientists has said that the renewable electricity standards in our package in the House version will produce well over 300,000 jobs. Then we also have the

American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy that is talking about energy efficiency standards that are, again, part and parcel to this package that will grow over 225,000 jobs.

So there, just in a sampling of what can happen, you see how American jobs begin to grow and how they get cultivated from this very aspect of legislation. Those are real jobs. Those are factual bits of information that need to be exchanged and shared with the American public.

People know that our destiny here is controllable by our own actions. They know that. They want us to go forward. They want us to grow this green energy market. They want us to be able to respond in analytical terms where we embrace the intellectual capacity of this Nation and where we grow those technical jobs. There are incentives in this legislation. There are those underpinnings of support to, again, foster those kinds of jobs so that we can stretch this innovation economy and so that we can enhance the number of jobs that are science-and-tech related or are coming through ancillary forces out there that further extrapolate the good outcome and that grow the jobs that are so essential.

American jobs producing American power to then retrofit all of that activity into the American job market: manufacturing, making it more efficient.

We want to keep jobs here. Let's produce a package that retrofits American manufacturing centers to allow them to produce a product wisely, more effectively, efficiently, and then, yes, more competitively in the global market. It all begins with sound energy policy.

They don't want to face those facts. They just want to use applications of fear and say it will cost every family \$3,100 when they have been defied in that statement by the very author of the study they cite. That is unacceptable, and the public deserves better than that. They deserve the facts that show how we can grow jobs, how we can create United States' jobs—American jobs—and how we can make us a global technology leader. We need to do it so that we can compete globally. If we're not creating these products, if we're not implementing those sorts of changes, we're falling drastically behind places like China, Germany and Japan, and we can continue to list those countries. It's imperative that we do this.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it's rather telling—and before I defer to my colleague from Maryland—that, today, the other side of the aisle did 130 one-minute speeches, asking the question: Where are the jobs?

Quite clearly, as you have stated and from these independent studies, from the balance of the studies, by 2020, there will be either 250,000 or 300,000 green jobs created in this country, as shown on this map of our country. It shows where the jobs will be created all

across this great Nation. Each circle indicates from 4,000 to 85,000 to 250,000. All of these jobs across this country will be created. This is where the jobs are. It is in doing legislation that is insightful, that is thoughtful, that takes some courage to stand up and to deal with difficult issues, and that doesn't run away from the fact that this is, indeed, an issue, not only of domestic financial security but of, first and foremost, national security.

Congressman KRATOVIL from Maryland, I yield to you, sir.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for your comments.

I want to follow up on something you said. You were talking about misstatements that were made in terms of the costs. I want to go back to that in a minute.

You know, one of the misconceptions that you hear when you're back in your districts and elsewhere across the country and that was played up nationally is that, you know, the status quo is acceptable, that Congress doesn't need to take any action, that we're good where we are, and that, at this time, we don't need to do anything. Of course, that is not accurate.

As you folks know, the Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act, meaning that the EPA today, without congressional action, could take action on their own to reduce greenhouse gases without any of the protections that were provided under the bill that we passed here in the House. So the argument that Congress could sit back and do nothing is clearly inaccurate simply based on the Supreme Court case in 2007 that demonstrated otherwise. So that ship, in a sense, has sailed.

Congress had an obligation to do it, not simply because of the Supreme Court case, but as we're talking about here, obviously we needed to do it in terms of national security and in terms of reducing our dependence on foreign oil, Mr. MCMAHON, as you pointed out so clearly and also you, Mr. TONKO, in terms of moving us forward in these new green energy jobs that we need.

In terms of the cost issue that you raised, that is the best example of how in a national debate statements are made that are so clearly factually inaccurate. As you folks know, I spent 14 years as a prosecutor, and my life and profession were governed by facts. When you see a misstatement like that in terms of facts, it's somewhat overwhelming, particularly, as you said, in the study that was cited by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The author of that study that was cited came out publicly and said that he was being cited inaccurately and that that was not what he said.

The interesting thing is, in looking at it in terms of energy efficiency, not

only, arguably, will it not cost our constituents more, but arguably, it will cost them less because of the energy-efficiency savings that will result from that bill. In Maryland, as an example, the study that you cited, Mr. MCMAHON, indicates that Marylanders could arguably save \$8 per month as opposed to the arguments that they're going to pay \$3,900 more. So the facts that have been given are oftentimes inaccurate.

As you go around and as you're having this discussion with people on whether we should have the policies that were included in that bill, it's interesting from a Maryland perspective, because I heard quite frequently people saying, You know, Mr. KRATOVIL, we don't want cap-and-trade. Well, in Maryland, we've had cap-and-trade since 2007. Maryland has participated in a regional greenhouse gas initiative since 2007, so we already had that.

Again, the interesting thing is, in terms of the Federal standards that were set in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 17 percent, in Maryland, it's 25 percent. So, in many ways, in Maryland, the argument wasn't so much whether or not we should have these policies; the question was whether or not we should have these policies nationally so that we're all playing by the same rules.

So many of the facts that have been given are inaccurate. As I said, it is incredible when you think about the fact that, for the last 40 years, there has been a recognition among Presidents that, in terms of national security, we must reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Ronald Reagan: The best answer, while conservation is worthy in itself, is to try to make us independent of outside sources to the greatest extent possible for our energy. 1981, Ronald Reagan.

President George H.W. Bush, October 25, 1991: When our administration developed our national energy strategy, three principles guided our policy—reducing our dependence on foreign oil, protecting our environment and promoting economic growth.

Arguably, this bill does all three.

Yet, despite that recognition dating back to Nixon, despite the fact, as Mr. BOCCIERI has correctly pointed out, that every major Republican Presidential candidate acknowledged the need for reducing our dependence on foreign oil and despite the fact, as was mentioned, that Senator MCCAIN specifically promoted cap-and-trade, when we take the vote in the House, we only have a few brave Republicans who are willing to cross party lines.

Now, why is that?

In my view, despite arguments that are made in terms of process, despite arguments that are made somewhat substantively related to the bills, the bottom line is, ultimately, the votes that are being taken on major issues facing this country are still predominantly based on politics and are not

based on what is in the best interest of this country.

As we talked about after this vote, were we to have the vote tomorrow, I would make it again. It was a vote that was very important to this country. It is a vote that will move this country forward, and we need to do what we're doing tonight to convince the people of this country that we were right, as I think we were.

With that, I will yield back.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Mr. KRATOVIL. You did that very eloquently, and I think it certainly moved some of the people who are watching.

You know, before I yield to our great friend from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI), you had pointed out about how facts are so important for a prosecutor and about the author of that study and that the facts were being misused. Publicly, the author said, No, you're misusing my study. These are the real facts. I could see people would misuse it until he made that statement. Maybe they misunderstood it. Yet, when he clarified it and said that they were misstating it, can you imagine that I heard it cited on the floor of this House this evening just prior to our hour here? I find that incredible, and it's certainly something that speaks to the fact that, for some, unfortunately, it's more about politics here than it is doing what is right for the American people.

I yield to our colleague from the great State of Ohio, JOHN BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman MCMAHON.

So let me get this straight: The pillars of this legislation are about creating jobs right here in America that can't be outsourced. When you build a brand new nuclear reactor, when you build an electric hybrid car, when you build an electric grid, those are jobs and those are materials that cannot be outsourced. So it's about creating jobs. Another pillar of this legislation is about national security and about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil. Who wouldn't be for that? Let's go over this again.

In 2003, a Department of Defense study suggested that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The CIA and other intelligence experts said that the economic disruptions associated with climate change are projected to put pressure on weak nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and maintain order for their civilians.

□ 2145

If we just invested in electric hybrid cars and 27 percent of our vehicles here in the United States were gasoline-electric hybrid models, the United States could stop importing oil from the Persian Gulf. 66.4 percent of our oil came from overseas last year, over 40 percent came from the Persian Gulf. We're fighting two wars there. Our Nation's military is there. It's time to bring our troops home safely, honorably and soon, end this addiction that we have to Middle Eastern oil.

Teddy Roosevelt, a great Republican, said this: In a moment of decision, the worst thing that you could do is nothing. What about drilling? In the Senate version, we're going to expand drilling here in the United States. Expand it in the Gulf of Mexico. We know that we can't sustain that, though, with 22 million barrels of oil consumed here in the United States every day and only 3 percent of the world's reserves here in the United States. After we consume 25 percent of the world's oil, we can't sustain it. Do the math.

What about jobs? Manufacturing, in 1950, accounted for over half of every job in America. We're at 10 percent now. Let's produce jobs here. Let's make solar panels so that they can recharge our batteries. Let's do things like fuel cell research like we're doing in the 16th Congressional District. Let's do electric hybrid vehicles, plug-in hybrids like we're doing in the 16th Congressional District. Let's research clean coal, and coal is an abundant and cheap source of energy. We're going to use it, we're going to make it cleaner, and we're going to make certain that it is a long and sustaining source of energy for us for years to come.

Let's talk about the 8,000 manufactured parts that go into a wind turbine. Can you imagine the Timken roller bearings being made in my district making the roller bearings for these big wind turbines? Can you imagine SARE Plastics in my hometown making the molding and the plastic molding that would go in to making the fiberglass infrastructure. These are jobs that cannot be outsourced because we're going to use them. We're going to consume right here, consume that energy right here in the United States.

This is one of the most important issues that we have to tackle. This is about the longevity of our country, quite frankly, my friends. This is about what my four children will have to look forward to, a Nation where we've become, like Mike Huckabee said, a Nation that can't feed itself, that can't fuel itself, or produce the weapons to fight for itself will be a Nation forever enslaved. Are we going to be economic slaves to a condition that we can correct? I think not. We have the courage. We can make that happen if we can find 60 patriots in the United States Senate to make sure the United States is ending our addiction to foreign oil.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, JOHN.

I now yield to the great gentleman from the great State of New York, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. It is a pleasure to join with all of my colleagues in this colloquy.

Just yesterday and today in this Nation's Capital, a number of people got to meet the Apollo crew. They got to shake hands with astronauts that made history. They set foot on the Moon. We won a space race that took and demanded a huge investment by this Nation in science, technology, in growing our intellectual capacity, in creating a

vision, in stating in bold measure how we were going to reach that goal.

We're at that same moment of challenge. Just think of it. If we had allowed defectors that perhaps divided us or shared misinformation or preached politics of fear, we perhaps wouldn't have won that race. And that was so critically valuable and important to the American Nation, to Americans at large.

That same sort of challenge, that sort of boldness of leadership, the demands for truthful exchange are upon us today, and to grow these opportunities, we'll deal with the facts. And I'm impressed by this House for the leadership and the membership that has really embraced that sort of factual information and advanced an agenda like the legislation that we're proposing and promoting here this evening.

You know, when we look at situations, as Representative BOCCIERI made comment, we can grow jobs but we can also grow intellect. We need to grow the brain trust of this Nation. This measure invests in that development of the human infrastructure. And certainly when Representative KRATOVIL talked about previous administrations through the decades talking about reducing our demands on foreign importation of oil, 60 percent of what we consume today imported from some of the most troubled spots in the world with unstable governments, it's more than that. We have a gluttonous dependency.

Efficiency can reduce the demand side, and for far too long we did not have a comprehensive energy policy in this Nation. We addressed only the supply side and ignored the demand side. Well, now we're talking about both sides of that equation: producing our own supplies and reducing per capita usage of that precious resource. That's what this is about.

Now we talk about innovation. We talk about growing those jobs. All of us have cited moments in history that have inspired us. I represent the city of Schenectady in upstate New York, dubbed the city that lights and hauls the world. Just over a century ago, they were the epicenter of invention and innovation. They allowed the world to be changed by the simple dynamics of creative genius in that location and an outstanding workforce. Blue collar, white collar workers that rolled up their sleeves and got the job done.

Over a century later, we're at that same point where we need an energy revolution. This Nation is poised for that sort of development. Are we going to walk away? I don't think so. I think it's that boldness of leadership that will bring us to the point that we need to be.

And speaking of GE, as a center in that city of Schenectady, they are already inspired by this legislation because we have advanced within the framework and the multiple needs that are addressed by this legislation, bat-

tery innovation, advanced battery manufacturing, batteries that can respond to energy generation, batteries that can respond to storage of intermittent power like wind and solar, and batteries that can address transportation sectors, both heavy fleets and lighter fleets. They have a battery application that they believe can respond to those multiple needs.

And they have proposed, at a press conference, to be the site in my district to do advanced battery manufacturing. They are competing for the dollars that are part of this package if it is successful and certainly working on the input that came from the stimulus package, from the Recovery Act.

Working with those applications, they want to go forward and make certain that we can build in this State of mine, in New York State, and your State, MICHAEL, in a way that will have 350 to 400 jobs in the manufacturing sector of advanced batteries. That is progress. That is stability. That is security. That is a greening up of thinking. That is job growth. That is intellectual capacity that is stretched to a far greater degree.

And think of it again. 40 years ago this week, we accomplished our goal because we committed to that goal. We didn't stand up in a House of Representatives and deny the facts or twist the facts or reject the truth. It all began with an honest exchange, and that's what we're doing here. We're going to make certain that the facts are addressed.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, Congressman TONKO, and you put that eloquently. And certainly when the other side was engaged today in just long-winded speeches asking the question, "Where are the jobs?" you certainly will tell them with the stimulus package and with the ACES bill, with the Energy Security Act, we have jobs in Schenectady, New York, and Staten Island, New York, and anywhere else where we can build wind turbines and get back the technology that we invented and is now being used overseas.

Gentlemen, we have about 9 minutes left or so, so maybe I could ask you all to kind of make a final remark. And we'll start with certainly the most youthful member—that's a tough one to say.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I think Mr. BOCCIERI is younger than I. You certainly look younger.

Mr. McMAHON. The person who lives the closest to Washington.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Since this will likely be my last round here as we go through this, let me thank the three of you for the courage to take the vote that you took on this bill. And as I mentioned in the last few discussions that I have had, I do think that it's important in moving our country forward that we do have people in this House that are willing to make difficult choices and to take difficult votes that ultimately are the best for this country even at times when it's politically

difficult to do so. So I thank you for the courage to do that.

You know, people forget that just last year when we were running for office we had \$4-a-gallon gas, and people were looking at Congress and saying, What are you doing about \$4 in gas? And I mentioned when that was going on that what we do oftentimes in this country is we deal with the crisis but we don't always deal with the underlying issue that led to the crisis.

And so now as the gas prices have dropped, many have forgotten what we were facing just a year ago. Many have moved on. And yet my view is we should not forget the position we were in 1 year ago because we could, at any time in the future, be again paying \$4 a gallon, \$5 a gallon for gas as long as we are held hostage by those that control our energy. And until we make a decision, as we did in this vote, to move forward towards renewable energy, renewable fuel and ending our dependence on foreign oil, we could, at any moment, face the same situation we faced last year. And none of us as Americans should forget the anger that we had last summer when we were doing that. Many have forgotten. We should not forget that.

We should deal with the underlying issue that led to the energy crisis that we faced last year, and that is reducing our dependence on foreign oil, moving towards renewable energy, and making positive steps in terms of our own national security.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, Mr. KRATOVIL, for participating.

And Mr. BOCCIERI, before I yield to you, I hope you will accept my heartfelt apology for even thinking that Congressman KRATOVIL could be younger than you, sir.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You are forgiven this time.

Let me thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this important dialogue about the course of this country. Now is not the time to let up off the accelerator. Now is the time to put the gas down, put the pedal to the metal to make sure we do this, because this is about our national security, my friends. The CIA is saying it. The Department of Defense is saying it. Both Democrats and Republicans alike running for President said it last year, and a whole host of Presidential candidates and Presidential minds before that said that this is a matter of our national security.

This is not an issue of partisan politics. It's about patriotism. This isn't an issue about Democrats or Republicans. It's about America and where will our course be in years to come.

Forty-four percent of our oil comes from the Middle East where my friends right now are putting their life on the line for our country and for our national security and because of our economic interests of oil in that region. Let's bring them home. Let's become independent. Let's create jobs here in this country. Let's protect our own na-

tional security and move away from our dependence on foreign oil.

Folks talk about the cost. What is the cost of doing nothing? What is the cost of doing nothing? We're going to outsource a trillion dollars of American taxpayer money, a trillion dollars, to enrich regions of the world that don't believe the same that we do when we can believe in Midwest innovation instead of relying on Middle East oil?

□ 2200

This is the time that we can make the decision. This is the time to move away from the politics of the past and look towards the future. We can't allow detractors to use fear as a tool of leadership when we know, as it's often been said, that it is a tool of the status quo.

We will be judged by action or inaction. I'm glad that we chose to act. Thank you for having me tonight.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you. Congressman TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I thank Congressman McMAHON.

Representative BOCCIERI asked what is the cost of doing nothing. Well, beyond the lack of progress that we should taste in this Nation, it is the denial of this generation's children and grandchildren who will need those career paths developed by us. We need to cultivate that thinking that will allow them to have these new energy jobs, these new environmental jobs, these new plans for economic recovery. That is what gets really lost in the discussion.

When China's now the number one producer of solar panels in the world, when Germany's number two export after cars is wind turbines, when six of the 30 top advanced battery-manufacturing solar and wind companies are American, we need to do better than we're doing today.

As I made mention, the space race of decades ago was an investment made by this Nation in robust fashion. Today, we're in a green energy race with far many more global competitors. Whoever wins this becomes the go-to nation. They will be the exporter of energy ideas, energy intellect, energy invention.

Do we want to deny this generation, future generations from those concepts, from that prize? I don't think so, and if we're going to deny them, let's at least deal with the facts. Let's talk factually. Let's not create a \$3,100 price tag when we've been warned over and over again by the author of that study that it is grossly inflated. Let's move forward factually. Let's move forward in green fashion. Let's provide for an innovation economy. Let's speak to the generations of Americans that are counting on us to do a job, do it thoroughly, do it directly.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank Congressman TONKO for those inspiring words, and thank you all.

You know, it's funny, but in conclusion, I think we all have hit on the very important themes.

Congressman KRATOVIL pointed out that it is about the domestic side, how much we pay for oil and gas, and what happened last summer, \$4 of gas, America was outraged, that somehow a year later we've forgotten that because there are those in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress who use misinformation and misstatement of facts to somehow take the American people's focus off what has to be done.

Just think about how many people you talk to at home who said, what, now I have to have an energy auditor in my house when I sell my home? We know that's not in the bill; yet, there are those who on the other side of the aisle have used that misrepresentation of fact to scare the American people, and that's wrong.

Congressman BOCCIERI is a great veteran, a great flyer of planes for the United States military service. We thank you for your service, and you remind us that right now there are young men and women wearing the uniform of our country in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, standing in harm's way because we have not dealt forcefully and effectively with our energy policy, and it's time that we end that.

And as I said to you, coming from New York City and having lived firsthand the horrors of the acts of terrorism on our shores, in our country, we cannot forget the sacrifice that was made that day by those who lost their lives and those who got to the site and came to the rescue and continue to suffer the deleterious effects of their health.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2920, STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER (during the Special Order of Mr. McMAHON), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-217) on the resolution (H. Res. 665) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2920) to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PAYGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I find that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going a bit through revisionist history again. We hear them talk over and over again about the things that have happened, what was happening about gas prices last year. They never mentioned that the Democrats were in charge of the Congress

when a lot of these things that they talk about were happening, but I think it's important that we always point that out.

A rule was just reported in by my colleague from the Rules Committee, and I've just come from the Rules Committee myself where we reported out a rule for a bill that's going to be heard on the floor tomorrow called the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009, and I thought it might be important to talk a little bit about that rule and that bill tonight because I know this is going to create some confusion in the minds of the American people as to why in the world are we passing something called Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009 here just before the August recess.

It's also a confusing thing I think to people because they don't understand why we have to pass legislation that says you should pay for things as you go. Most people in this country do that. That's what they expect us to do in the Congress, but that isn't what's going to happen and there's several things going on with that bill that I think need to be explained. Some will be explained tomorrow.

But first of all, that bill did not go to the committee, the Budget Committee, from which it is coming. And when I asked the chairman of the Budget Committee today, he said there just wasn't time to do it. We're dealing with the appropriations bills, we're dealing with the health care bill, and there simply wasn't time to do that. But just like the American public expects us to read bills before we vote on them, I think they expect our bills to go through committee and go through the process of legislating. That's what we're here for.

But, no, there's no time to do that. We keep hearing that from the majority party: there's no time to do what we're sent here to do. But we know that this is just another diversion on their part, and I think I have an appreciation for why that's happening.

Today, the headline in Politico: "Poll, Public Starts to Lose Trust in Obama; Health Timeline on Life Support; Obama Good for K Street; Energy, Health Care and Finance Agenda a Boon to Lobbying."

I think what the majority wants to do is sort of take some of the attention away from some of the headlines that are coming out. One of the interesting things about this bill that's going to be dealt with tomorrow, which is it's supposed to be PAYGO, you pay-as-you-go. However, it exempts 40 percent of our budget. So 40 percent of the budget is not going to be included in PAYGO, and yet they are increasing spending on that 40 percent of the budget at least 8 percent a year.

So how in the world are they going to control spending if 40 percent of the budget is exempt and you're allowing it to increase 40 percent a year? You simply ignore that. It's as though the family sits down—they're always comparing what we do here with what the

family does. It's like you sit down at the family table to talk about your budget and you say, well, we're only going to deal with 60 percent of the budget; we're going to put 40 percent over here and just going to ignore it, and we're going to spend whatever we want to on that side of the budget. That's exactly what they are doing with this, and it just seems really ridiculous, and I think the American public needs to understand that a little bit.

Now, what they say is, well, this was all instituted in the past; we're exempting things Republicans exempted. But the very first PAYGO bill was passed under Democrats in 1990, a bipartisan effort to try to rein in spending. But what's happened since then is they've ignored it. They even had a PAYGO rule in the rules that the Democrats passed when they took over the Congress in 2007, but the rule is not strong enough for them so now they want to put it in statute.

I think it's simply to divert attention from the headlines. The President's approval ratings are going down. The health care bill is creating many, many problems. We asked today 134 times on this floor where are the jobs that were promised. The economy is going south, and what do the Democrats want to do? They want to divert the American public's attention away from all of those things and say but we passed a law that says we have to pay for these things as we go along. Passing this law is going to make no difference to them than their rule does.

You know, I find it just so interesting that when you say you're going to do something you don't do it, but that's normally the way the Democrats do it.

□ 2210

JOBS LOST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend VIRGINIA FOXX for getting up here and kind of giving us some indication of what we mean by PAYGO. That's a very confusing word. Been hearing it a lot. I haven't seen anything, pay or go, since they've been talking about it. But we seem to be pretty good at spending money around here and don't seem to be very good at paying for it.

Just a thought here. We had a stimulus package that was over a trillion dollars, and I believe that was borrowed money. We have a budget that increased our taxes by \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. So, that's money they're coming after to pay for it. But I don't think that pays for that \$1 trillion.

Their appropriations request increased all the nondefense spending by 12 percent this year. The number of

months that jobs have grown under the Democrats since we got started this year is a whopping zero.

So they were talking about why were we asking today on the floor of the House, Where are the jobs? I get really excited about green jobs and green energy and the things that people talk about.

I heard our colleagues in the previous conversation, one of them show us a map of the United States and he said this would create 250,000 new green jobs. I think that's fabulous. It's just unfortunate in the last month and a half we've lost 1.2 million jobs in the United States. So they've got to have a comparison.

The conversation that was going on the previous hour was about energy independence. And I'm for energy independence. And any American that's got any sense at all is for energy independence.

I once asked a man how big an array of solar panels would it take to power Austin, Texas. This man was a physicist at the University of Texas—to power Austin, Texas, for a period of time, and what would that period of time be. He said a proper-sized panel in a non-air conditioned time—and you know in Texas it's hot, so air conditioning is our biggest problem, not heat—in a non-air conditioned time, a properly sized panel could power Austin, Texas, for about an 18-hour period of time before the Sun went down and the power went away. And then you would have to have an alternative power to power it during the night, or storage capacity, which our friends were talking about.

So I said, Well, that doesn't sound too big. How big would that panel be? He said, Approximately the size of the Panhandle of Texas, which is about 280, maybe 300 miles long and about 150 miles wide.

I'm not saying solar is not a solution. But are you going to replace the coal-produced power in Pennsylvania with a solar panel in today's world—and do it economically? No. But it will help, and we can help on an individual basis and we can power businesses with it.

Let's be realistic about energy, and let's go after every form of energy and clean up that energy. That's the solution to our problems. That's a real energy plan.

You know, we in Texas have been having an abundance of natural gas for a long time. We're real proud of our natural gas. We think it's good stuff. Burns clean and we like it. A lot of our folks up here on the East Coast, they didn't like our natural gas until they found some. All of a sudden, guess what? They found some gas shale, a lot of gas shale in the State of Pennsylvania, and I'm hearing an awful lot of colleagues that a year and a half ago were bad mouthing natural gas saying, Natural gas sounds good. I'm with Boone Pickens. Let's power our automobiles with natural gas. Let's produce natural gas.

And, rightfully so, they should be proud of their resources. I'm not knocking their resources. I'm proud they've got it. And I predict that there's shale gas that spreads from Pennsylvania all the way down to Fort Worth, Texas. And I think the geologists will prove it. There's a lot of natural gas in that shale. And we ought to use it. And that's how we free ourselves of foreign oil.

We free ourselves by drilling offshore in a clean drilling procedure, which we have. And we haven't spilled a drop of oil in a drilling procedure in 15 years in the seas. All of our spills you read about are shipping spills, not drilling spills.

So let's go out and seek our energy where it is, and let's create our alternative energy, wind and solar, and let's not forget nuclear, the cleanest energy out there.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I certainly will.

Ms. FOXX. In having this energy debate that we were having a few weeks ago before the Democrats passed their national energy tax, which they call cap-and-trade, that CBO predicts will levy \$846 billion in new taxes on the American people, we talked a lot about this issue. We have been talking about different issues in the last couple of weeks.

But I heard during that debate that during the last 18 months of President Bush's term, that his administration doubled the use of wind and solar and that they did that in 18 months. But they went from about 1.5 percent to about 3 percent. Did the gentleman hear the same information I heard?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. FOXX. You know, President Obama has said he would double the use of solar and wind in his first 4 years. Yet, President Bush did it in 18 months—the last 18 months of his term, he did it. So, going ahead and doubling it again, going from 3 percent to 6 percent, doesn't seem to me it's going to be a terribly difficult job.

But I heard this also, and I'd like the gentleman to tell me—check my facts—that, at the most, we are going to be able to absorb 10 percent of wind and solar in our electric grid because wind and solar are not as dependable as other forms of energy, and that to put more than 10 percent into the grid would jeopardize the Nation's energy source. Have you heard that figure too?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. Reclaiming my time, I do not claim to be a physicist, but I have talked with people in the power industry, and because it is not a continuing flow of power but it is an alternating form of power, to make it effective over a 24-hour period, 365 days a year, the power has to be boosted. It's the only way it can be effectively done.

I'm not saying it's not going to be a good source of power. Actually, what's kind of interesting is most projections as to what percentage of our overall national power, wind and solar com-

ined—actually, wind, solar, and hydroelectric combined, would be between 6 and 10 percent.

At maximum effectiveness—and, by the way, there's a lot of folks that have a lot of Texas envy in this world, and they are always picking on us like we don't know anything but oil and gas. Let me make this very clear: We have the largest wind farm in America in the State of Texas. The city of Austin has the largest municipally-owned wind power farm of any municipality in the United States. And, by the way, they are very disappointed.

□ 2220

It was on the front page of the Austin American-Statesman less than 3 or 4 days ago that the wind farm seems to be an unreliable source of power for them. Even though it's a green source and they've been very proud of being the greenest city in America because of that wind, but over liability and this same different flux of power issue, the only way it can be reliable is you put a gas-powered generator right side by side to keep the flow going. So that's not saying I'm not for it, but I'm saying the reality is we're a long way from replacing the massive amount of power that it takes to run this machine called America from wind and solar power.

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, ma'am. I yield.

Ms. FOXX. I think a lot of people don't realize one of the things that made us such a successful Nation has been the extremely reliable energy that we've had over the last 200 years. We developed energy and learned how to use it very, very well. I believe we are the smartest people and the most innovative people in the world, but what helped us become a manufacturing giant was not just our intelligence, not just our innovation, but our reliable sources of energy.

I worry a great deal about the pie-in-the-sky promises that have been made about alternatives. I, like you, want to see us use every alternative that we can, including foot power and walking a lot more, but I do think that we have a problem because we are hearing these unrealistic expectations of how we could go to alternatives and simply abandon carbon. I don't think we can do that.

You pointed out that our colleagues, who were here the hour before, talked about the creation of 250,000 new green jobs. I want to point out that I have heard that Spain, which went very much to green jobs and alternative energy, now has the highest unemployment rate in Europe. It appears that many of our colleagues have established Europe as the standard to which we should aspire, but when you start breaking down what the situation actually is there, you will see that simply making the goal of switching these jobs that we have now in manufacturing that are going to go away with this national energy tax, that are

going to go away with the national health tax, all of these new taxes that they want to put on are going to throw jobs out of this country.

We need to look a little bit deeper. I think that so much of what's happened, particularly in the last year and a half as promises were made, lots of promises were made—a lot of those promises were made in 2006, which have also not been lived up to—the American people are beginning to see that it's easy in a campaign to make promises. It's a lot more difficult once you're in office to fulfill those promises. I think that's one of the things that we're seeing now.

We've seen a tremendous change in our economy since the Democrats took control of the Congress. They keep talking about problems that they inherited, problems that President Obama inherited, but as I said earlier, they conveniently leave out the fact that in '07, '08 and up until this time, they have been in charge of the Congress, both Houses of the Congress. It's the Congress that establishes the budget. It's the Congress that appropriates the money, and much of the problems that we've had have come from the expenditure of money.

I wanted to point out something. I know that we talked today, as you said earlier, about jobs, jobs, jobs and that 134 of us came to the floor today. I think we should have had magnifying glasses to say that we're looking for the jobs that have been promised to us. That's what was promised by President Obama, promised by the majority in the House, but that we ought to talk about the fact that during the month of June alone, the national debt increased by \$223.7 billion, and as of June 30, 2009, the national debt had increased \$2.9 trillion since the Democrats took control of Congress on January 3, 2007. That works out to an increase of \$9,342.83 per person.

We know now that the American people are getting very, very concerned about that debt and about our deficit. And you pointed out the deficit earlier, but we have to keep pointing out to the American people who's in charge, who spends the money, and who's responsible for putting us into the situation that we're in.

Mr. CARTER. That's a good point to look at this chart that another one of my colleagues prepared. He calls it, "Oh, my," OMI, the Obama Misery Index. Those of us who have been around a while remember that the misery index was first created back during the Jimmy Carter administration and was about the misery that was coming upon people by the economic woes of the country. It's basically a combination of unemployment—that's the loss of jobs—and the accumulation of public debt.

Now, as my colleague from North Carolina pointed out, there seems to be an overwhelming trend in this House to blame everything on the Bush administration. So let's just assume for the

sake of assumption—because remember, Obama got elected and sworn in as President in the latter part of January, and so we'll just make February the leftover Bush stuff because that's the next month, and I would say it's a carryover. So the misery index was 11.6 percent. The blue indicates the unemployment numbers, and the red indicates the public debt, how much we owe to other people or to ourselves.

In March, the next month of the Obama administration, we see that our unemployment has risen to what looks to be about 13 percent and our public debt has increased by, I don't know, another 10 percent, something like that. So 21.7 percent in March, from 11.6 to 21.7. In April it jumps to 28 percent, and look at the public debt, and look at the unemployment that's there. The unemployment is the huge figure here. They wonder why we are saying, "Where are the jobs?"

Look. Wait a minute. Here is May. It has a 36.2 percent misery index. Look at the unemployment figures. They're getting off the page here. This month, 40.6 percent—oh, my, OMI, Obama Misery Index. And look at the unemployment figures, and look at the national public debt. This is just 5 months of the Obama administration. We have gone from a misery index of 11.6 to 40.6.

So somebody says, "Why are you asking the question, 'Where are the jobs?'" Well, because unemployment went from 9 percent—it looks like about 9, wouldn't you say—right there to 30 percent, roughly, 31 percent on the index. That's not the percentage of unemployment, but that's the increase.

Now, there's a real good reason because we're asking, "Where are the jobs?" I did a telephone town hall tonight, and I got to talk to some real fine people. I actually had kind of an unusual thing.

Junction, Texas, is out west of San Antonio. It's not in my district. In fact, I believe it's in Congressman CIRO RODRIGUEZ's district or it's in LAMAR SMITH's district, but it's not in my district. But the lady who was talking to me, her phone was registered in Temple, Texas, but she was calling from Junction. How that happened on my telephone town hall is anybody's guess. I don't know. I didn't try to figure it out. But I called a number in my district, and I got a lady in Junction. You go figure. I don't know how it worked; all right?

□ 2230

But the lady had something interesting to say. She said, by some people's analysis, we'd probably be one of those rich small businesses that are going to have to pay taxes under this new health care plan.

But although we may handle a lot of livestock and a lot of cash temporarily, the reality is I'd say we're in the category of folks that are just barely scratching through the drought to get by. And what we realize as something we can live on is very meager, along

with me and my family and my boys, who are also in our ranching business with us. We get by on a meager amount.

She said, sir, I'm worried that somebody thinks we're rich enough that they're going to put a 1 percent surtax on our small business, which is a ranch.

Now, not everybody lives in Texas and lives in the Southwest, and they may hear the word "drought" and think they understand what drought means. But in Texas, we know what drought means because we've lived through a period of time, back in the late 1940s and early 1950s that they wrote a book about it, "The Time It Never Rained." And, in fact, it didn't rain. And cows ate prickly pear cactus, and ranchers went out with burning torches and burned the thorns off the prickly pear cactus so that the cattle would have something to eat, because there was no grass.

And the hard tack folks that settled west Texas and central Texas worked from sunup to sundown and into the night burning what we call burning pear, burning prickly pear so their cattle wouldn't get those thorns in their lips and get infected, and they wouldn't get screw worms and the other things that were the blight of the 1950s until we were able to eradicate that problem. We know what hard times is in Texas because we've been in hard times.

And right now, we're going through a drought. Lake Travis, which is just about 40 miles as the crow flies from my house, is a huge lake. Right now it's a pond. We've got islands everywhere on it. It's the lowest it's ever been in memory, they tell me. I haven't been out to see it because I'm afraid I'd get too upset looking at it. But the LCRA tells me they're in terrible shape for water.

That lady living out in Junction, Texas, she's in terrible shape for water. And so she says to me, sir, not only am I worried about them taking my health plan away from me, making me go on some government plan I don't want to be on, but they're talking about taxing me as if I'm rich, when I'm not. I've got a family, my family and my two boys, or three boys' families running out of this ranch operation, and we're fighting the drought, and we're short on water. And we're losing livestock.

And I said, ma'am, I understand.

She said, that's not all. What they're doing with the fuel of this country, what they're doing with their cap-and-tax scheme that they've got there, I think that's going to make the cost of my farm fuel and my ranch fuel go up, and I'm worried. We cannot survive our fertilizer going up and our fuel going up, all of which comes from the petroleum industry. We can't afford it. We just can't survive it.

And why do they want to do that to us? What did we do to them?

I said, ma'am, I hear you. I'm sorry. You know, all my life I've lived under a system that I believe in. I still be-

lieve in it. I think it's important that the rule of law prevail in a constitutional system of government. I think the rule of law is as sacred to democracy and to our Republic as the Constitution is to that Republic, and as the Holy Book is to the church.

And it is imperative to every American that we support the rule of law. It should be sacred to us that says—we say this, I think it is the Rotary Club, but it may be another one of the clubs that says, before their club—we are a Nation of laws, not of men. I think that is extremely important for us to remember as Americans. We are a Nation of laws.

These laws are created by this body and other bodies at the State level. Those laws are not to be circumvented; and no man, no matter how high a rate, how much of the population votes for him, how many people love him, or think he's the greatest, or her, and think they're the greatest thing since sliced bread, they don't have the right nor the ability, nor should we allow them to circumvent our laws because of their programs.

It is our American responsibility to uphold the law. For 20 years I served as a judge of the highest trial court in Texas, at the State level. I did my best to uphold the law. Those laws were written in books, and they were passed by the Texas legislature and they're passed by the United States Congress, and we tried our best to uphold those laws.

The Supreme Court and the court of criminal appeals told us, interpreted the laws for us in Texas and in the United States. And we, as a court, tried our best to follow that direction from our court system, because the rule of law has to prevail.

I am very concerned, and I express this tonight, that procedures and rules are as important to an institution as anything else that there is, because they are the standard by which a group of free men and women decided to govern themselves by law.

Thomas Jefferson, a man held in highest regard, and at least many Democrats call the Founder of their party, even though he called his party the Republican Party at the time. But times change. Thomas Jefferson wrote rules for this House. And one of the rules has been repeated by our President of the United States. We're going to give—and I would point out, our Speaker of the House, when she came in and took her oath and told us how this Congress was going to operate, she said, We will give this Congress every time at least 72 hours to examine a piece of legislation.

Thomas Jefferson said 3 days for any piece of legislation before it's voted on. It should be given to both sides for their examination and preparation for debate. And that 3 days did not include Saturday and Sunday. That's what he—when he wrote the rules for this House, which were followed religiously, I guess you'd say for years and years and

years, decades, that's the tradition of this House. And it has been waived for every major piece of legislation since Barack Obama has been elected President.

As was pointed out on the last piece of legislation we had by JOHN BOEHNER right here on the floor of this House, they dropped 350 pages of amendments to the cap-and-tax bill at 2 o'clock in the morning to be voted on the next day. And that meant that we hadn't seen a completed bill, even at that point in time. And we voted on it the next day.

I'm not here to cry about procedures. I play under the rules that their Rules Committee writes. But I want you to know, when your historical procedures, as American people, are circumvented by this House consistently, every time, you should be concerned about those who do not follow the established rule of law. This should be a concern of the American people.

When the President of the United States and his White House friends go strong-arm the automobile companies into making a deal that circumvents the laws of this land, there's something wrong. And creditors' rights are established laws of this land. And yet the bankruptcy court was perfectly willing to let the parties make an agreement. But the parties were strong-armed by the politicians in the White House, strong-armed and threatened to the point that preferred creditors gave up their rights under the law out of fear, and the preferred creditors became, their rights went to the unpreferred creditors, the labor unions.

□ 2240

Now we have the Government Motors—we used to call it General Motors—that is owned by the Federal Government and by the labor unions, and those people who loaned money as secured creditors for years to General Motors had to take pennies on the dollar because they were strong-armed beyond the rule of law.

I'm sorry. That's not right. If we don't stand for anything in this House, if we let our people down on every vote, if we don't try our best to stand up for the rule of law, then we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. I don't care what party you're in. I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and in fact, many of them stand up and speak out for many of the things that I stand up and speak out for. I'm not saying this to point the finger at politics. Let's throw politics out the door right now. Let's talk about what our Founding Fathers intended for us to do if we are going to keep this Republic together.

They expect us to set rules and to follow them. They expect us to honor contracts between people. Now, you say to yourself, Well, sure, we honor contracts between people, but I don't know about those big corporations. You know, they're so evil. Maybe we shouldn't have to respect those people.

So, if at a time when the price of oil was \$6 a barrel, if the Clinton administration had said, We need to get some money into these coffers here, so we're going to sell some offshore leases, and we really will give you a good deal on these offshore leases if you'll buy them, even though we know you're not going to produce them at \$6 a barrel, oil companies would have said, Okay. We'll buy them. They'd buy these offshore leases, pay money for them, continue to pay money for them as the leases progress. Then, lo and behold, the price of oil goes to \$100 a barrel or to \$80 a barrel. Guess what? They start producing oil out there, and we have those people in this House who say that's an excess in profit, although the Federal Government got what it contracted for, and the oil companies got what they contracted for.

We believe in the sanctity of contracts whether they be between corporations, governments or people. It's what keeps the glue together in our society. Yet we are willing to say we don't care what the contract says; we want it renegotiated, and we're going to put economic pressure on you to do it. That's not the way we are supposed to act. We are supposed to hold the contract sacred, because, in reality, what created our Nation was a contract, a contract called the Constitution of the United States, where the States got together and said we will surrender our sovereignty in a bargain to protect us in our national defense, to work out our disputes of commerce and to make this country one Nation, gathered together from 13 colonies, from 13 States.

That contract is sacred, and every contract that comes therefrom is sacred. Now, if we don't like it, change the law. That's fine. We can do that. But I am concerned when we use the power of political might to strong-arm people out of their rights and out of the laws of our country. If the Republicans do it, I'm going to be just as mad at them as I am at anybody else. It's not a political thing. It's about what is right and what is wrong.

If we don't have rules, if we don't have rules we hold sacred, we are bound for destruction. We've got plenty of issues to keep us busy in worrying about our country without trying to change the rules of the game. Maybe people think that guy's half crazy, standing up there, talking about that stuff, but you know, I believe in this stuff. I believe passionately in the American people, in the Constitution and in the history of this country. You can rewrite it all you want to. It is what it is, and what makes us noble, what makes us fine, what makes us exceptional is that we are willing, for the good of the Nation, to hold certain things important, and I would say the rule of law is what separates us.

I'll tell you a story. I had the opportunity to go with the Foreign Operations Committee down to a very lovely country, to Nicaragua in Central

America. When I grew up, and in my college days, I lived with a bunch of ranching boys out in West Texas, and visited several of their operations out there. Being a native Texan, you know, we're all kind of caught up in the magic of ranch life, so I learned a little bit about what good-looking country looks like and what grass looks like and the cattle elite. I looked for how much water is out there that's available for livestock. I looked at Nicaragua and the part of Nicaragua that I went to, and I thought, man, this is some good-looking cattle country. Boy, a fellow could really raise a lot of nice cattle in this country. There's plenty of water. You could even irrigate because they've got water that's less than 18 feet under the ground. Now, you don't drink that water, but you could irrigate with it.

So I started asking the question: Why are these poor folks having such a hard time economically? Do you know why? Because they've never quite established the rule of law. In fact, they don't even have land titles in Nicaragua.

One of the things that they're trying to do with our foreign aid is to somehow establish a method of land titles, a method of saying you bought it; here is your title; you own it, and you can sell it to the next guy. Instead, they have to worry which regime is in power in Nicaragua as to whether or not they get to keep their land. So, after a while, after 100 years of a system like that, people start to not really invest too much in their land because you never know whose land it's going to be next year.

We have the rule of law. We have land titles. We know when we buy our homes, when we pay for them, when they're free and clear, and when our debts are off of them that we own that piece of ground and whatever's on top of it, and we can pass that on to our children. That can be part of our accumulated wealth, which makes the next generation healthier, richer and more prosperous. They don't have that ability, and yet they've got a beautiful place and the potential. What's missing? The rule of law.

It's sad. It's sad to think that a bunch of nice people who need to make that country work are limited by the fact that men and their political strengths are overpowering what they should have, which is the rule of law. I do not mean this as any criticism of the country of Nicaragua, and I hope it's our goal as Americans to try to help them establish the rule of law, especially the rule of land titles. I think it's important. My point is, our forefathers gave us that blessing. When we count our blessings, sometimes we forget that some of it is right there in that constitutional document that we have.

□ 2250

You know, I had somebody from Dell Computer tell me that they—what they

have to sell is what's in their minds, what they have created from their brains. Guess whose country wrote it into their founding document that your intellectual property belongs to you? The United States of America. It is in our Constitution that what you create with your creativity belongs to you and you have an ownership right in it and you can enforce it in a courtroom. The rest of the world is coming around to that.

But what we have been given are so many blessings by forward-thinking people in our past, and I'm here tonight, as we talk about all of these issues of the economy and what's going on, don't let us forget that that is not a country of men. This is a country of laws. And the way we operate on this floor of this House and the way we operate at the courthouse and the way we operate as human beings is governed by the rule of law. And if we ever lose that, we lose our country.

We've got lots of issues going on right now. We've got health care. We've got this cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax bill that's supposed to be protecting the environment. We've got runaway spending. We've got mounds of debt that's mounting up in every direction. The debt figure is unbelievable. And all of these things should be dealt with through this body and its democracy and its democratic principles. That's the way it should be dealt with, the rule of law. And if we do that, we will have met our obligations to the people who sent us here. And I challenge both sides to let the rule of law reign here. Let's don't change the rules. Let's don't stop debate. Let's talk.

Everybody says we need bipartisanship. How can you have bipartisanship if one side writes a 2,000-page bill and the other side doesn't get to do anything but say, "Yes, I like it" or "No, I don't"? How in the world is that bipartisan?

I think our Founding Fathers really thought that you are going to have liberals over here and conservatives over here and you're going to try to address an issue and you're going to sit down at a table and you're going to talk about what you can and can't do, and you're going to come up with a solution. I think that's what they thought we were going to do. We're not doing it right now. And I do honestly believe it would work, and I think there are an awful lot of people that sit in this room every day that feel the same way.

Let's have the courage to do that. Let's follow the direction of our Founding Fathers. Let's remember our history, and let's start talking to each other instead of imposing our will, one group of men and women imposing their will on another group of men and women. I really don't think that's what we intended when this House was created.

We like to say this is the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is the cradle of the democracy. It's the cradle of freedom, that liberty was born here and thrives here. Well, if liberty's born

here and thrives here, it's up to us to continue to keep her breathing and keep her thriving. And I don't believe we do it by ignoring the rules or changing the rules. I believe we do it by working together to come up with solutions.

And probably kind of like the good verdict you get in the courtroom, if you give a verdict in the courtroom and both sides are not completely happy, you've probably got the best verdict you ever could create. But if you've got a verdict that only one side gets everything and the other side gets nothing, it probably wasn't the right thing, nine times out of ten. I was always happy if both sides walked out mad at me. I figured we did a pretty good job because at least both sides had some give-and-take in what happened in the courtroom.

That's where we ought to be in here. When it's over with, both sides ought to say, We didn't get all our way but at least we got something done and we didn't impose the will of man over the rule of law.

I guess I just felt like preaching this late at night. And that's probably enough of all of that.

I do ask that the people back home—I know we're not supposed to address the people back home, but I will say that every man and woman in this House are addressing life-changing issues now and will be in the very near future, that the amount of accumulated job loss and debt is getting critical for all of us whether we are in this House or whether we are at home, and let's all try to work together to come up with something that will work.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I will yield back the balance of my time.

POPULIST CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I'm here tonight on behalf of the Populist Caucus, which is a caucus that I founded this year, along with many of my colleagues, who felt that there was not enough emphasis in this Chamber on discussing values that promote and expand the middle class.

So one of the reasons that we founded this caucus was to find a voice that was going to be consistent in pursuing policies and adopting legislation that we're going to help promote opportunities for middle class families to survive, and also to expand opportunities for people to enter at the middle class because we all feel, and this country's history has shown, that this country does best when we have a large, robust middle class.

And that's why, when we passed the Populist Caucus values, these are the primary things that we wanted to focus on: good jobs, middle class tax cuts, affordable health care, quality edu-

cation, fair trade, consumer protection, and corporate accountability.

Now, some of those basic values have been part of the ongoing discussion in terms of our health care reform bill that is currently pending in the House of Representatives. And as a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and the Health Subcommittee, much of my time this year has been consumed in making sure that the health care bill that we are putting forward addresses these values, particularly affordable health care, consumer protection, and corporate accountability.

So today, the Populist Caucus announced its health reform principles, and I'm going to spend some time tonight talking about those principles, talking about the importance of these principles to middle class families and those seeking to enter the middle class, and then sharing some stories from some constituents of mine back in Iowa's First District who are struggling right now to provide for their families, and address growing health care burdens that affect every American no matter where they live, no matter what they do.

As we have seen over and over and over again, health care costs continue to grow every year. They represent a larger and larger share of our gross domestic product. We see more and more families faced with the burden of bankruptcy because of unsustainable health care costs that aren't covered by their insurance plans. We see more and more Americans without any insurance at all, almost 50 million uninsured Americans. We also see many Americans who are underinsured; that is, they are taking policies out that don't provide them the type of coverage they need because they can't afford either to buy their own coverage if they're self-employed or if they're without employment, or many of them have insurance offered through their employers who are increasingly forced to put more and more of the burden of that insurance coverage on to their employees.

□ 2300

And so one of the reasons why we've been having this national conversation about health care reform is because we have to come up with a system that works for the American people and finally realizes the goal of universal coverage.

Now, some people who have health insurance and are sitting well in their own financial circumstances wonder why should I care about this; this doesn't affect me; this doesn't affect my family. But the reality is that each one of us in this country pays a hidden tax right now of \$1,200 a year so that people with no health insurance who go to the hospital emergency room and will be given treatment, because those hospitals cannot turn them away, somebody pays for that care, and we all

pay for it in the form of higher tax burdens and in the form of higher insurance premiums for the coverage that we have.

So that's why this issue is so compelling, and it's something that we have to address, and the sooner we address it the better.

The reason why it affects us all is because 7 out of every 10 cents spent on health care goes to cover chronic diseases, things like diabetes and obesity and all of the complications that can come from them including congestive heart failure, high blood pressure, problems with vision and foot care and on and on and on.

Now, the thing about chronic disease is that most of them are preventable through education and early intervention, and that's why our system right now is broken, because we pay for health care on a fee-for-services basis, which means if you get sick and you seek medical treatment, we will pay for that treatment. But we don't provide incentives to individuals to get healthy before they need a doctor or have to go to the hospital.

And that's why a national health care policy that makes sense has to emphasize prevention and wellness. That has to be one of the cornerstones of how we reduce that enormous burden of chronic disease in this country.

So let me start by briefly reviewing the Populist Caucus health care reform principles, and then I will spend time talking more about the details of each one.

The first goal of the Populist Caucus in addressing health care is providing more affordable health care, and we recommend a values system in this health care bill that ensures that every American has access to affordable, quality health care coverage. Now, that sounds simple in theory. In reality, it is a challenge that has faced this country since its founding.

The second component of our health care reform principles for the Populist Caucus centers around choices for families, populist values. The first aspect of our values for health care reform under choices for family is keep your coverage if you like it, and that is included in the House version of the health care reform bill. It allows consumers to keep their current coverage if they like it.

So if you have an employer who's currently providing you high-quality health care at an affordable price, like maybe a company like John Deere which employs many people in the First District of Iowa, nothing in this health care reform bill is going to change your ability to keep that coverage. If you like it, you get to keep it.

Second, one of the most important factors in choices for families is no discrimination, and you have to have a populist value that says, in insurance coverage, you have to eliminate discrimination that allows insurance companies to exclude people from coverage based upon preexisting conditions.

Now, we know this is an enormous problem in many different ways. There are millions of Americans who are denied health insurance coverage right now because of preexisting conditions.

I have a nephew who lives in Malcolm, Iowa. He has a young son named Tucker Wright, and when Tucker was a year and a half, he was diagnosed with liver cancer, and he was very, very fortunate that he was diagnosed and had an opportunity to have two-thirds of his liver removed at a very young age to save his life. But Tucker also faces a very bleak future because he has a long history, a long life of expensive medical care ahead of him.

Many of the existing health care policies have a cap on lifetime benefits; and once you meet that cap, you get no more coverage, no matter how sick you are, no matter how old you are, no matter what your medical needs are. And if you have been diagnosed with a serious disease like liver cancer, and your family wants to move or your parents want to look at other job opportunities right now, there's very little chance that you're going to be able to make that switch and get coverage because they will write an exclusion in the policy based upon preexisting conditions that say we're not going to cover you because you have this expensive treatment.

That's one of the major problems with health care in America today, and it's not just on access to care. It has enormous implications for employers and employees because right now in this country, literally hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of workers are working in jobs they don't like. And the only reason they're there is because those jobs offer them some level of health care coverage, and they know that if they leave the job they have, there's a very good chance that a family member, a loved one, won't be able to get coverage under a new plan at a new employer because of preexisting conditions.

And this bill that we are considering in the House right now eliminates discrimination in health care coverage based upon preexisting conditions.

One of the other very important elements of our Populist Caucus family values emphasis is including a robust and meaningful public health insurance option that operates on a level playing field with private insurance companies, increases consumer choice through a public option for insurance coverage that does these things—and these are critical achievements—one, competes on a level playing field; two, maintains minimal levels of coverage that ensure quality care for its enrollees.

And in the House plan, there are three basic forms of coverage that will be available: a basic plan, an enhanced plan, and a premium plan. And then there will also be something called the premium plus plan, and all of those plans will provide a minimal level of coverage designed to provide basic and emergency types of health care coverage for every person in America.

Another component that emphasizes these family values of the Populist Caucus is that this public plan option must reimburse health care providers adequately and equitably, and we're going to spend some time talking about what that means.

Another family value in the Populist Caucus health care package, it helps address current geographic disparities in health care. This is one of the most significant challenges that we face and one of the most significant problems with our health care delivery system.

Another key family value is that the existing infrastructure of Medicare which will be used under the current plan, a Medicare plus 5 percent reimbursement payment system, that that existing infrastructure has to be used to create a viable provider network; but it should only use Medicare as long as improvements are made in the way that Medicare's reimbursement structure and geographic disparity issues are addressed, and I'm going to be spending time talking about the challenges that we face and the problems we currently have in Medicare reimbursement.

Now, I want to move on to another key component of the Populist Caucus health care values: saving taxpayers money. Every medical economist who looks at our current health care delivery system is in agreement that the number one problem is a problem called overutilization, using too many medical services that aren't necessary, that waste money and result in worse outcomes. We have to address the problem of overutilization of care. It creates unnecessary costs and adds hundreds of billions of dollars and can lead to harmful medical errors.

Now, medical economists at the Dartmouth Atlas Project and places like the Commonwealth Fund who have looked at this estimate that every year in our health care delivery system we lose between \$500 billion and \$700 billion every year due to overutilization, and they have also analyzed patient outcomes arising from that overutilization, and the figures are shocking.

They estimate that every year 30,000 people die in this country because of too much medicine that exposes them to risks and actually results in their death. There are hundreds of thousands more who are injured because of overutilization, and it's not achieving the desired goal of medicine, which is to cure patients who need help and to provide it in a meaningful fashion.

□ 2310

One of the other concerns about saving taxpayer money is emphasizing prevention and quality care. We have talked about that. We need to shift to a health care delivery system that moves toward incentives, toward high-quality care prevention, nutrition, and wellness. And we have to reform Medicare part D, the drug package for seniors and people on Medicare. One of the most essential components of that is to

close the doughnut hole, give Medicare the ability to negotiate with drug manufacturers, and to seek rebates for all Medicare beneficiaries from those pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Now I want to talk for a moment about this problem that I mentioned called geographic disparities in payment for health care. This chart was prepared by The Commonwealth Fund to focus on the relationship between the quality of care and Medicare spending.

So, on this bottom axis it provides cost numbers to show annual Medicare spending per beneficiary in dollar amounts for every State in the country and places them on the chart according to that axis. The vertical axis has an overall quality ranking. And those quality rankings are taken directly from Medicare administrative claims data and the Medicare Quality Improvement Organizations Program data. So it's information already collected by Medicare.

The chart numbers are shocking in terms of showing the existing disparity in how we pay for Medicare and the direct correlation between how much we spend and the quality we get for our Medicare dollars.

Many of us who represent States who are up in the top 5 to 10—not top 5 to 10 percent, but the top 5 to 10 in rankings, these States right here inside this pink circle, States like New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, North Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Utah, Minnesota, Oregon, and Montana, are consistently providing the highest quality of care to Medicare patients at the lowest cost, because they also rank in the bottom 5 to 10 States in Medicare payments per beneficiary.

Then, contrast with what we see at this end of the chart. This chart reveals that the most expensive of States in terms of what we pay for Medicare per patient is the State of Louisiana, where we pay right now about \$8,500 per patient. Guess which State is also ranking 50th in terms of quality outcomes, according to Medicare data? Louisiana.

That is the hallmark of an inefficient payment system for health care delivery and it's a symbol of what is wrong with our health care payment system in this country. That's why we have to address this problem of over utilization, which is directly driving up these costs; rein in unnecessary and wasteful spending so we can use those savings to pay for a comprehensive health care reform package that provides access to care for all Americans.

So I want to move on and talk about some of the stories from my district that have shaped my commitment to making change in health care delivery.

Since I was elected to Congress in 2006, and was sworn in in 2007, I have received almost 12,000 letters and e-mails on health care. Health care is the number one issue that my constituents write to me about. And this year alone, I have received over 4,000 letters and e-

mails relating to health care. In fact, this small stack represents just a small portion of my constituents who have had serious issues with our health care system. And just in my hand I have over 200 stories from constituents of mine who have taken the time to write to me and explain their frustrations and concerns with our health care system.

These stories are the backdrop and provide the compelling evidence on why we need true health care reform in this country.

So let me start with this compelling story from Sandy Ingram in Daventry, Iowa, which is right on the Mississippi River, beautiful old city in Iowa, largest city in the First District.

Sandy starts her story: My story is not unlike many others who are struggling with their health insurance problem. In August of 2007, I was diagnosed with stage III breast cancer. Until that time, I was rarely ever ill, and I looked forward to retiring, like most other women in their sixties.

Until January 31, 2009, I worked for a company and was employed as an executive assistant to the CEO. I raised three children, all now educators, as a single mom and I finished a four-year degree at St. Ambrose University.

In the spring of 2007, I had my usual mammogram, and I told the technician I had a sore spot, and she made note of it. It came back as no change. As the weeks went by, it became more pronounced and painful, and I went to a nurse practitioner, who sent me for another mammogram immediately.

Over time, it was discovered that my mammogram test was positive and I received a call at my office with the news that every patient dreads: I'm sorry to tell you that you have cancer.

I set up an appointment with the surgeon and, with the help of my nurse practitioner, I found a wonderful young surgeon, Dr. Melinda Hass of Trinity Hospital. I met with her, went through all the necessary workup, and later received a followup phone call saying my cancer was much worse than they thought, and I could have cancer in both breasts. They found out the cancer had spread to my lymph nodes, and so I began chemotherapy.

The beginning of the third week, my hair began to fall out in the shower. I shaved my head, bought some caps and scarves, and moved on. I worked throughout the chemo by scheduling time off and going to work when I began to turn the corner from the side effects.

In December 26, 2007, I had bilateral breast surgery to remove both breasts. I made this difficult decision because I didn't want to have the chance of recurrence in the other breast. During the surgery, 22 lymph nodes were removed. However, 17 of the lymph nodes still had cancer. The feeling that I had that morning still gives me chills. My fight wasn't over yet.

I underwent another round of chemotherapy a few weeks after the surgery,

followed by 36 radiation treatments. I was physically spent and took a medical leave of absence and returned to work in August of 2008, ready to hit the ground running. Needless to say, I love my job, the people that I worked with, and was looking forward to being there until I was old enough to retire.

I was so pumped up that I unlocked my office door and prepared for a busy day when I came back to work. About an hour later, I had a phone call from a friend in customer service saying their assistant had just been let go. A few minutes later, my phone rang and it was my boss, asking me to come to the conference room upstairs.

What happened is my boss greeted me with tears in her eyes, a big white envelope in front of her. Seated at the table was the VP of manufacturing and the two of them broke the news to me that my job had been eliminated. It was only weeks after I had been declared cancer free by the 60-day check-ups.

I was stunned. They both assured me it had nothing to do with my performance. The response was predictable. They told me that I would have to leave the building immediately and could return to the office later to pack up my office. Everybody in the whole office was very shaken.

So now I'm unemployed. I have unemployment insurance and through COBRA continue to pay for health insurance on my own. That will last through July of 2010. At that point I will have to have some kind of insurance until my 65th birthday in November of 2010.

□ 2320

I continued to look for a new position. I have applied for several and may try to work part time to help pay for the COBRA coverage. I have done research about getting further coverage, and I have found I cannot get coverage due to my preexisting condition. There is some kind of stopgap health coverage through HIP of Iowa; however, since I paid health insurance premiums for nearly 20 years, I feel I should be able to keep it until I am old enough for Medicare. Health care reform is essential to all Americans. The time is now, and I am willing to help tell my story to get the bill passed.

Here is another story. This one is from Elle in northeast Iowa. She is 1 year old and has been diagnosed with cystic fibrosis. Her family had COBRA insurance, which is an extension of your insurance after you leave your job until you find more employment, from her dad's former employer in Minnesota. Her dad's employer offered a more affordable plan to the family, but when they realized the family resided in Iowa, they reversed the offer. Because of Elle's diagnosis, this family was unable to get private insurance in Iowa.

Her mother quit her job so that their income would decrease enough to get Elle on Medicaid. Quite understandably, Elle's parents are frustrated because they believed they shouldn't

have to quit their jobs to get health care coverage for their daughter. They believe that insurance needs to be accessible for all children, including those with chronic health conditions, and that is one of the number one objectives of the health care reform bill we're considering right now.

Here is another contact I got from Mark in Davenport. Mark was doing insulation in his mother's home so that she could take advantage of some energy savings rebates, which is something every American should be encouraged to do. Unfortunately, while Mark was putting the insulation in his mother's home, he fell through the ceiling and severely injured himself, suffering a collapsed lung, broken ribs, and dislocating most of the ribs from his vertebra. He was lucky to survive, but he had no health insurance because he was a self-employed private contractor. His medical bills were over \$20,000, and because of those high costs, he was forced to file for bankruptcy so he could get out from under his debts.

Here is another contact from Cynthia in Denver, Iowa, who 3½ years ago lost her husband to diabetes and heart disease. Since then, she's had to deal with major debts because they, like millions of Americans, did not have health insurance. When they tried to get coverage, they were told that because of her husband's preexisting condition, they would have to pay for premiums for a year without coverage for those claims. She continues to be without coverage because she is still paying off the bills from her husband's doctor and hospital costs.

Here is another story from Gus in Waverly. His daughter Jamie lives in Des Moines and works for a life insurance company. Jamie, like many Americans, has cerebral palsy and is confined full time to a wheelchair. But even with her limitations, Jamie chooses to work, and the only type of insurance help that she gets is through a Miller Medical Trust that allows her to work, but she can't work full time.

Because of the limitations of that trust, she has lost a much-deserved promotion. She hasn't taken a pay raise in years so she can choose to work and be a taxpaying citizen. Many of her advisers and social workers have told her that she should just go on full disability and her benefits would increase and be easy to get since she qualifies as a quadriplegic; yet Jamie is a perfect example of the American spirit. She wants to work, and she continues to work and does everything she can.

Her father doesn't understand why we would punish people like Jamie who want to work but still need critical access to health care. Let them earn more money that pays more taxes and help them support their own services. Who could argue with that? And that's what we want to do with comprehensive, meaningful health care that addresses these Populous Caucus values.

Here is another letter from Julie in Cedar Falls, Iowa. Several years ago

when Julie was mowing her lawn, she was severely injured when a bolt on the lawnmower cut her arm. She had to go to the emergency room for stitches. Later she learned that her emergency room visit was not covered by her health care coverage because, according to them, she should have waited to cut her arm when the doctor's office was open instead of visiting the emergency room. Given the severity of her wound, she couldn't have waited until Monday to see her doctor. The emergency room was the only option available for her at the time. Julie believes that the problem with health insurance companies is they look for any excuse to deny payment for an existing claim.

This is a letter from Mic in Davenport who was born with congenital heart disease. Mic has had three open-heart surgeries, the first at age 3 weeks, the second at 16, and the last at age 45. He owns his own company, employs 11 people, and provides group health insurance to his employees because it's the right thing to do, but also because he can't buy an individual health insurance policy with his congenital heart disease because it would be a preexisting condition.

Mic says, We're charged at the highest rate possible, and our rates go up by the maximum amount allowed per year because of my heart disease. In the past 2 years, we've risen to 60 percent and 75 percent increases. In order to keep providing insurance to my employees, I will have to drop out of the program next year to keep the rates manageable.

This story is from Randal Wehrman from LeClaire, Iowa. His wife, Beth, died from pancreatic cancer in August 2008 at the age of 56. And like many couples, during her illness, Randal had his own health emergency. He was diagnosed with prostate cancer, and as he describes it, we were launched into a health care arena and were impacted dramatically by how our health insurance performed.

Randal, like many Americans, tells me that he was reasonably satisfied before this point with how his health care insurance carrier had functioned. His wife was a registered nurse, so she was a very good medical consumer. He was in the property and casualty insurance business and had been a certified paramedic in the State of Iowa for the last 25 years, and as he notes, this would suggest that Beth and I were above average medical consumers. It also means, according to his background and his business, including a BA with a business administration degree from Simpson College, that he would have been an above average medical insurance consumer.

Here is the problem: Even though the Wehrmans' health care plan said it had a maximum out-of-pocket of \$1,500 per person in network and \$3,000 per person out of network, we paid just over \$10,000 out of pocket during calendar year 2008 for our health care. Here is how Randal describes it:

"You see, one has to read the fine print to find out doctor office copays, prescription copays and emergency copays do not fall under the maximum out-of-pocket expenses referred to in the bold print. While Beth's care included an out-of-pocket network expenses, mine did not, which means that we spent an additional \$5,500 of out-of-pocket items that were not included in our limits. We are fortunate that we could pay the additional, although not easily, but some cannot. For some, this situation could be financially devastating. And we know that by the high number of medical expense-related bankruptcies we see every year. This should be clearer and more concise, as it can have a substantial impact on the financial futures of many citizens."

Well, Randal, you are absolutely right, and one of the reasons why I introduced a bill to incorporate plain language into every insurance policy sold under the national health insurance exchange that's part of this health care bill is because I have had my own experience, not just as a consumer of health care, but helping clients, in the 23 years I practiced law before I came here, who had disputes with their insurance companies over coverage benefits.

One of the things I learned is that when you force insurance companies to write those policies in language that insureds can understand, you eliminate the type of confusion that highly sophisticated health care consumers, like Randal and Beth Wehrman, brought to the table and still wound up with unfair treatment based upon language in their policy that was difficult to understand and not part of the clearly stated coverage.

□ 2330

I'm very proud of the fact that my plain language amendment is incorporated in the American Health Care bill that we are currently considering in the House of Representatives. And I want American health consumers like Randall and Beth Wehrman to be able to look at that policy and see it written in language that is specifically intended to be understood by them so they have a deep appreciation for what they have, and they also have the ability to go into that National Health Insurance Exchange and compare it to other policies that provide the same basic types of coverage and say, is this policy a better policy for me than the one next to it? Does it provide better coverage? Does it have fewer exclusions? Does it cost less? And will it guarantee me the access to health care that my family needs? That's one of the major focuses of the populist values approach to health care reform.

So what else is important? Well, we spent time talking about how we can move from a system that rewards volume of medical care to a new model, a new system that rewards value outcomes. And we pay for performance.

And I am very proud to be introducing an amendment, along with my friends LEE TERRY from Nebraska, a Republican, and BART STUPAK from Michigan, who is the Chair of the Oversight and Investigations Committee on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Medicare Payment Improvement amendment, which has a very simple goal, to increase the quality of health care in America and create long-term substantial cost savings.

So what will this amendment do? Well, it starts by restructuring the Medicare payment system that I talked about earlier, by finally adding an incentive for physicians to provide high-quality care and decrease costs. And the way the bill does it, it adds a figure that measures value and includes it in the Medicare reimbursement equation. That value figure measures both quality of care and the cost of care, two components that directly relate to the overutilization of medical services that dries up our national health care costs.

One of the things we know is that regions that provide high-quality care at low cost will see their Medicare reimbursements improve and increase because it's a reward for providing value in the system. In contrast, regions that provide low-quality care at high cost will see their reimbursements decrease.

Now, this may come as a shock to most people, but that's the way an economic system is supposed to work: you provide incentives so that people in a marketplace who provide the highest quality at the lowest cost will create the most demand and drive consumers to their product or services. Every student of economics 101 can tell you that's the way economic models are supposed to work in this country.

But our health care payment system is flawed and it's reflected in this chart, and it's reflected in the hundreds of billions of dollars of waste in the system.

Now, one of the things that we can do is to shift from a fee-for-service reimbursement model to one that rewards quality and shifts the focus to provide efficient care.

Now, a lot of people mistakenly believe that when you're talking about efficiencies, you're only talking about cutting cost. That is not what I'm talking about, and that is not what the Populist Caucus values are based upon, because true efficiency in a health care delivery system is a system that consistently provides the lowest possible cost for the highest possible value over the lifetime of a patient's care. That is efficiency in health care delivery.

So this bill, the Braley-Terry-Stupak Medicare Payment Improvement amendment accomplishes that and provides a transition from our current quantity-based system to a value-based system.

How do we do that? Well, here's how: our amendment instructs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to measure quality and cost for hospital fee schedule areas, which have al-

ready been established, or other more narrow areas if the Secretary deems that appropriate. That could include hospital referral regions or even on down to the individual provider.

Two, our amendment instructs the Secretary to create a quality component to measure quality and to do that in consultation with the already existing Agency for Health Care Quality and Research, and an advisory group consisting of health care providers, health care plans, and other government agencies and other knowledgeable entities, including consumer groups that have knowledge about how to build efficiency and reward value.

Three, the Braley-Terry-Stupak Medicare Improvement amendment ensures an open and transparent process in the development of this quality component. And during some of our conversations about how you could possibly do this, we hear concerns expressed from people in this part of the country: you're not taking into account this factor. We hear concerns expressed from people in another part of the country: you're not taking into account this factor.

Well, the harsh reality is the medical economists who've been studying this issue for decades have already looked at every possible racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, regional, cost-of-living, cost-of-workforce factor and can find nothing to justify the reimbursement disparities we see right now.

To give you an example of that, one of the most significant factors contributing to overutilization in this country is what we pay for end-of-life care. And one of the things that researchers have discovered is spending more for end-of-life care does not yield better results and does not make people more satisfied and their families more satisfied with the care that they got. And, in fact, the exact opposite is true.

So let's talk about geographic disparities and how it relates to this problem of overutilization. Researchers and medical economists who looked at the last 2 years of spending in the life of Medicare patients at Garfield Hospital in Los Angeles, concluded that, on average, we were spending \$106,000 per Medicare patient in the last 2 years of their life. That was contrasted with the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, 2 hours from where I live, another world class medical facility, a teaching hospital. At the Mayo Clinic, patients in their last 2 years of life, Medicare paid, on average, \$33,000, a three-fold decrease from what's being spent in Los Angeles.

And you can look at all those other factors I laid out earlier, and none of them can justify that kind of a payment disparity. And, in fact, when you look at the regions of the country that are spending the most on those last 2 years of patient care in a patient's life, and you look at the quality assessments that are used, you'll learn that patients in the areas that spend much less are much more pleased with their

quality of life at that end-stage phase because more attention is placed on providing hospice care, providing a way for those patients to interact with their family on a meaningful basis, to be able to return to their homes and spend as much time there as possible without a lot of unnecessary tests and medical procedures that are very costly and do very little to improve the length of the patient's life or the quality of their life.

□ 2340

That's why this bill, this amendment—the Braley, Terry, Stupak Medicare Payment Improvement amendment—focuses on how we motivate health care providers to get better outcomes, to spend less and to get better quality care.

So, going back to my example, according to the 17 existing quality factors that Medicare uses to assess facilities, the Mayo Clinic ranked above Garfield Hospital in every single one of those quality assessments. That is what we're focusing on—quality outcomes at the best possible price over the life of a patient. That is efficiency.

Another component of the Braley, Terry, Stupak Medicare Payment Improvement amendment is that it instructs the Secretary to create a cost component to measure cost based upon the hospital fee schedule area or upon other more narrow areas. That cost component is the cost per Medicare beneficiary compared to the national average, which should be a reasonable thing for anybody looking at how we spend money and at how we decide who is outside the norm, who is below the norm, and whether they're getting the types of results that they should.

The Braley, Terry, Stupak Medicare Payment Improvement amendment also includes a risk adjuster in determining the cost component. This ensures that any area with a significant at-risk population—high rates of obesity and other socioeconomic risk factors that bill into the system—shall have them taken into account when determining the cost for that area.

Then the sixth component is to provide a transitional period from 2012–2014 when this quality cost figure is applied to the Medicare part B reimbursement equation in place of the current work geographic practice index. The work gypsy, as it's known, is currently used to measure the value of a physician's work only through the amount of inputs. Our amendment shifts the emphasis to a measure of value that is quality and cost.

So you may be asking yourself: Well, how in the world do you measure for quality in a system that has so many variables? Here is how the Braley, Terry, Stupak Medicare Payment Improvement amendment measures quality:

First, we look at health outcomes and at the health status for the entire Medicare population. We also focus on patient safety, which could fill up another hour by itself. Why? Because the

Institute of Medicine has published three seminal reports on patient safety, and it has identified the enormous problem in this country with patient safety. In fact, the Institute estimates that, every year, as many as 98,000 patients die because of preventable errors. This is the Institute of Medicine, which is not a partisan entity. They also estimate that, each year, over 1.5 million medication errors occur and that every hospital patient is subjected to some type of medication error every day they're in the hospital.

Patient satisfaction. This gets back to what we were talking about with end-of-life treatment. Increasingly, how patients receive care and respond to care is directly related to how they perceive their access and quality of care. It also measures hospital readmission rates because we know that one of the biggest drivers of cost is that of patients who are discharged from the hospital and who are later readmitted for conditions that may have been prevented if there had been better information communicated to them or if there had been better coordination of care upon their discharge.

Another factor we look at is mortality related to health care. Are patients dying in greater numbers as a complication of a specific problem? We know, for example, that hospital infections are an enormous problem. They lead to many hospital readmissions, to prolonged patient stays, to increased costs of care, and in the worst outcomes, to death. We also know that many hospital infections are entirely preventable from standard, simple precautions like hand-washing procedures that are not only adopted but that are enforced.

Then other things that we use to measure quality are other items determined by the Department of Health and Human Services, and if the advisory group has other recommendations, we certainly want the Secretary to take those into account.

How do you measure cost? Well, the cost component is measured through the total annual, per-beneficiary Medicare expenditures under part A for that area, and it also allows the Secretary to use other methods if it's appropriate.

So how much cost savings are we talking about? Hundreds of billions of dollars. We know that, by changing the incentives away from a fee-for-service toward a fee-for-high-quality and low-cost model, we create incentives for health care providers to improve their outcomes and to decrease their costs. We can use those cost savings to build a health care system that truly is universal and that helps us all.

Nobody said this challenge would be easy. Yet those of us who are committed to comprehensive, universal health care that is paid for, that is reliable, affordable, efficient, and high quality are committed to spending the time necessary to improve this bill and to make it work the way it needs to

work. It has to work if we are to function as a country.

So I ask you to join the Populist Caucus, to call your Representative or your Senator and to make sure that they know how important health care is to you, just the way my constituents called me, wrote me and sent me e-mails.

This is a challenge. The time has come for bold action. Americans deserve better. Americans demand better, and it is our responsibility in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to finally deliver on the promise of health care for all that is high in quality and that is low in cost.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 20 on account of bad weather and travel delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 28.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

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. 11. 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; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 22, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2745. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC23) received July 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2746. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification that the Office has designated thirteen new counties in eight states as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA), pursuant to Public Law 109-469; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2747. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's annual report to the Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5112 Public Law 109-145, section 104(3)(B) (119 Stat. 2670); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2748. A letter from the Director, Office of Legal Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Special Assessments (RIN: 3064-AD35) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2749. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Interest Rate Restrictions on Insured Depository Institutions That Are Not Well Capitalized — received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2750. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received July 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2751. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2752. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2753. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting 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.

2754. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Seattle, transmitting the 2008 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2755. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the 2008 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2756. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2757. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Elephant Trunk Scallop Access Area to General Category Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 070817467-8554-02] (RIN: 0648-XP59) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2758. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XP60) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2759. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Catcher Processor Rockfish Cooperatives in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XP57) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2760. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Suspension of the Primary Pacific Whiting Season for the Shore-based Sector South of 42 degrees North Latitude [Docket No.: 090428799-9802-01] (RIN: 0648-XP43) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2761. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Full-time Tier 2 Category [Docket No.: 010319075-1217-02] (RIN: 0648-XP65) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2762. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment [Docket No.: 0808061060-9710-02] (RIN: 0648-AW77) received July 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2763. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Determination of Endangered Status for the Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Salmon [Docket No.: 0808191116-9709-02] (RIN: 0648-XJ93) received July 16,

2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2764. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's activities regarding prison rape abatement during calendar year 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 15604 Public Law 108-79, section 5(b)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2765. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — July 20029 Revision of Patent Cooperation Treaty Procedures [Docket No.: PTO-P-2009-0025] (RIN: 0651-AC34) received July 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2766. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting an annual report concerning operations at the Naval Petroleum Reserves for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7431(C); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

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. TOWNS: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 22. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the United States Postal Service to pay its share of contributions for annuitants' health benefits out of the Postal Service retiree Health Benefits Fund; with an amendment (Rept. 111-216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 665. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2920) to re-institute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration (Rept. 111-217). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KILROY, Mr. WATT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide shareholders with an advisory vote on executive compensation and to prevent perverse incentives in the compensation practices of financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add New York to the New England Fishery Management Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve commuting and transportation options; to the Committee on

Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to add requirements for board of directors committees regarding risk management and compensation policies, to require non-binding shareholder votes on executive compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LEE of New York):

H.R. 3273. 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; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide members of the Armed Forces and their family members equal access to voter registration assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the definition of commercial motor vehicle in section 31101 of title 49, United States Code, to exclude certain farm vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 3276. A bill to promote the production of molybdenum-99 in the United States for medical isotope production, and to condition and phase out the export of highly enriched uranium for the production of medical isotopes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MASSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SRES, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish a program to improve the health and education of children through grants to expand school breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 3278. A bill to provide for a hospital in Cass County, Minnesota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs centers of excellence for rural health research, education, and clinical activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3280. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to assist veterans in highly rural areas by providing transportation to medical centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3281. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out demonstration projects related to providing care for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3282. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain veterans with readjustment and mental health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow for reimbursement of certain travel at a set rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H.R. 3284. A bill to prohibit the heads of executive agencies from entering into or renewing procurement contracts with persons that export certain computer or telecommunications technologies to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 3285. A bill to amend that portion of title 28, United States Code, commonly called the Tort Claims Act, in order to assure that individuals accompanying Federal employees who are engaged in missions for the United States Government in foreign countries have legal recourse against the Government for certain tort claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPES, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SIREN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. KILROY, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H. Res. 663. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any savings under the Medicare Program should be invested back into the Medicare Program, rather than creating new entitlement programs; 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. CLAY (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. FALLIN):

H. Res. 664. A resolution congratulating and honoring Barnes Jewish Hospital, Henry

Ford Medical Center, Johns Hopkins Hospital, and Integris Baptist Hospital for the completion of a successful 16 person kidney transplant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SESTAK):

H. Res. 666. A resolution recognizing Project HOPE for 50 years of exceptional service to improve and save the lives of millions of children and adults in developing nations through humanitarian assistance and health education; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 39: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 197: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 204: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 275: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. REYES, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 406: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 413: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WATT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 422: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 450: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 571: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 614: Mr. LATTA, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. TAYLOR.
 H.R. 621: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 635: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 690: Mr. LATTA, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 734: Ms. CLARKE and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
 H.R. 745: Mr. MASSA.
 H.R. 816: Mr. KRATOVL.
 H.R. 840: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. MAFFEL.
 H.R. 859: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 948: Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 949: Mr. KRATOVL.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1017: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1064: Mr. WU.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. ISSA and Mrs. HALVORSON.
 H.R. 1075: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 1101: Mr. SIREN.
 H.R. 1103: Mr. SIREN.
 H.R. 1158: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1189: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 1204: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1214: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 1324: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. LINDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KRATOVL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 1361: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1389: Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 1392: Mr. SPRATT and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1402: Mr. UPTON and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1415: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1458: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1614: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1625: Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1693: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1826: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1831: Mr. OLSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 1835: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1884: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1891: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1992: Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 2055: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2060: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SCHAUER.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 2072: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 2081: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2089: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 2095: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2140: Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 2144: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 2159: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2215: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2222: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2254: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 2267: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2476: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 2499: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. KRATOVL.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2558: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2560: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2568: Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2626: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 2648: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2695: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2724: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 2815: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 2870: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 2882: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 2891: Mr. MASSA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2909: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 2935: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 2936: Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2941: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3006: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 3040: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 3042: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3131: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3141: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 3154: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3155: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3166: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3169: Mr. CAO.

H.R. 3193: Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 3201: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 3202: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. FARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3203: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 3226: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3227: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3233: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 3245: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3250: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 3252: Mr. FILNER.
 H. J. Res. 56: Mr. WELCH.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 74: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. TANNER.
 H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. KANJORSKI.
 H. Res. 57: Mr. SKELTON.
 H. Res. 111: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 270: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
 H. Res. 311: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Res. 376: Mr. MASSA, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAO, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 487: Mr. SCHAUER.
 H. Res. 508: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 593: Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 605: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Res. 619: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 620: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 630: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H. Res. 631: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H. Res. 641: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 654: Mr. FILNER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

H.R. 2920, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The amendment to be offered by Representative RYAN of Wisconsin, or a designee, to H.R. 2920, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.