current democratic government of Honduras accepts Zelaya's return to power. This threat not only deliberately ignores the rule of law and the checks and balances carefully crafted in the Honduran constitution to prevent the rise of tyranny, but it also seeks to replace them with mandates from outside actors who are carrying water for Chavez, for Castro, for Zelaya and the like. The U.S. position undermines the fundamental right of the Honduran people to elect their own leaders in multiparty, transparent democratic elections, free from coercion.

How our present course of action serves our interests or supports Honduran democracy remains an important yet unanswered question. Elliot Abrams, currently at the Council of Foreign Relations and a former official with the Reagan Administration, recently wrote it was Zelaya who wanted to mess around with that election and hold a referendum on that date, allowing him to be reelected in perpetuity, just as his mentor Chavez had done in Venezuela, and now that Hondurans want to go back to regular elections, what does the U.S. do? The United States won't allow them to do so.

The presidential candidates in Honduras, Madam Speaker, have not changed since Zelaya was removed from office. The dates of the election have not changed. The presidential term has not been moved or modified. The Supreme Electoral Tribunal is taking steps to ensure that this is the most transparent election in Honduran history.

□ 2015

The U.S. should be assisting rather than undermining the preparations for the upcoming elections to ensure that there is no interference with the democratic electoral process in Honduras. Mary Anastasia O'Grady of the Wall Street Journal wrote, ''A lot of Hondurans believe that the U.S. isn't using its brass knuckles to serve their democratic aspirations at all, but quite the opposite, the aspirations of a neighborhood thug. Though some in our country believe that being popular among Latin America's left-wing dictators is the key to a successful U.S. policy in our hemisphere, freedom must be and must remain our driving force.'' Freedom, Madam Speaker. If it is not, the U.S. would have not only forgotten the meaning of democracy but would have forgotten what our Nation is, what we stand for and what defines us. Freedom.

## HONORING ERNIE HARWELL

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I quote:

''For, lo, the winter is past,
The rain is over and gone;
The flowers appear on the earth;
The time of the singing of birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.''

Every April, we Michiganders heard Ernie Harwell recite these lines from the Song of Solomon from his broadcast booth; and we welcomed him and another season of Detroit Tigers baseball back into our homes. Ernie Harwell is not only a part of our culture; he is a part of our families.

For 42 summers around radios and sand lots throughout Michigan and America, Ernie's voice embodied and expressed the grace, skill, triumphs and travails of the greatest of American games—baseball. Everyone either tried or knew someone who tried to mimic his legendary calls of ''long gone,'' ''he stood there like a house by the side of the road,'' or ''that foul ball was caught by a youngster from''—and on pins and needles we'd wait to hear from what city the lucky fan hailed. Of course, down inside we knew no one, including Ernie, knew where the fan was from, but it didn't matter. We knew where Ernie's heart was. It was and is with baseball and with us.

But a heart as big as Ernie's is not confined solely to Detroit or to baseball. Across the country, generations of sports fans grew up listening to Ernie. He announced games for both NCAA and pro football teams; for the Masters golf tournament in his native State of Georgia; for the Major League Baseball All Star Game and World Series; for the Brooklyn Dodgers, New York Giants, Baltimore Orioles, and yes, for the Detroit Tigers, who, in gratitude and admiration, placed Ernie's statue in the main concourse at Comerica Park.

Yes, Ernie is also a part of the Detroit Tigers' family, as Tiger Hall of Famer Al Kaline affirmed: ''Ernie is probably the most beloved person who has ever been in Detroit with the Detroit Tigers. He is loved by everybody and rightfully so. He's a great broadcaster, but an even better person.''

Yet while we and the Tigers and sports fans across the Nation embrace him, no one, of course, loves Ernie more than his wife of 68 years, Lulu, and their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. So blessed with their love and support, and faithful and thankful to God for bestowing this bounty upon him, Ernie now courageously faces the recent diagnosis that he is afflicted with incurable bile duct cancer. Viewing his condition not as an end, but as a beginning, Ernie says, ''Whatever's in store, I'm ready for a new adventure. That's the way I look at it.''

Madam Speaker, may we all honor this man, savor his company amongst us in the time God grants, and greet all of our lives' challenges with the faith, equanimity and dignity of Ernie Harwell.

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

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

## ESCALATION OF THE CZARS DEBATE

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

Mr. SOUDER. With the embarrassing demise of Mr. JONES, the czars debate has escalated even beyond where it was when we left for the July break. Depending on how you count, there are some 30 czars. It's been said, in many different places actually, that there are more czars in this administration than the Romanovs who ruled Russia for three centuries had czars. There's an energy czar, an urban czar, an infotech czar, a faith-based czar, a TARP czar, a stimulus accountability czar, a nonproliferation czar, a terrorism czar, a regulatory czar, a Guantanamo closure czar, a climate czar, a cyberspace czar, many more. They even had for a while a de facto car czar, Steve Ratner, who wasn't a czar but ultimately he became the car czar even though initially they said there wasn't going to be a car czar.

Now, the challenge here is that this appears to be an extra-constitutional approach. Now, the Constitution says government officers with significant authority, principal officers of the government, are to be appointed by the President subject to approval by the Senate.

Now, this has been interpreted, with the expansion of government, even to go five layers down; that they're expected to have delineated duties, deputy secretaries, assistant deputy secretaries, directors of different offices, come up to congressional committees, come up to the Hill, if not actually to get approved by the Senate, but at least to be accountable for what they do. We have it in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, we call in many of these different people who have all sorts of delineated duties.

Now, a clear way to avoid the checks and balances of this system is to put them under the White House rather than having a delineated position. This gives them potentially a consulting position as though they were a policy person at the White House, even though they're moving through the bureaucracy. The motive behind this obviously is that many things are not just in one department. For example, almost any of these different categories; obviously faith-based czar, there are departments in each part of the administration. TARP crossed multiple things. Terrorism crosses many of the departments. So the question is, when you have a traditional line structure, what do you do when you have things kind of stove-piped, and how do you interrelate with this?

Well, it's one thing to have advisers in the White House. Quite frankly, the Bush administration was pushing the edges of this in their faith-based office that went from an office inside the White House to then appointing a faith-based office in each department that then the faith-based policy person had some influence over, although it wasn't as direct.

By calling somebody a czar presumably means they have the power of the President to go behind and use their staff authority as though they were line, which is exactly what the founding fathers were debating about. There's a great new book, Plain Honest Men—The Making of the American Constitution, by Richard Beeman, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania. It's the first update probably in about 30 years of actual minutes, letters and things during the constitutional debates. And one thing through that book you constantly see is they couldn't agree on what powers the President was supposed to have. They went back and forth. Alexander Hamilton got so mad because he wanted it to be a permanent position that went basically for life, like a Supreme Court Justice, and he stormed out of the convention for nearly 30 days, only came back to sign it. So clearly there was a debate, and Hamilton lost, for accountability and a checks and balances of the system. And the czar approach is avoiding those checks and balances.

Now, my friend and colleague, Congressman KINGSTON has introduced a bill, the Czar Accountability and Reform Act, the CZAR Act, that has three simple points to it. The person has to have advice and consent of the Senate. He is to not be exempted from the competitive service by reason of confidential, policy-determining, policy-making or public-advocating character, which is kind of the debates we've had on the task forces around health care. With the former President Clinton it came up in multiple debates in the last White House where they say that Congress can't get e-mail oversight, we can't call certain people up because it's a policy-making decision, advice to the President. This bill would say it doesn't apply to a czar.

And also if they perform or delegate functions which but for the establishment of such task force, council, or similar office would be performed or delegated by an individual in a position to which the President appoints an individual by and with advice and consent of the Senate, which basically means a czar can't take authorities from people who would have been approved by the Senate.

Now, we actually have a model for this. It's the Office of the National Drug Control Policy. The so-called drug czar was the first czar. But we actually have legislation that guides his budget, that even gives the duties and delineation of his duties and the deputy director's duties and other people underneath it. It says which things he has line authority for. As chairman of the committee that did the last five-year reauthorization of this, we had all sorts of how high-intensity drug trafficking areas are supposed to be used; the national youth anti-drug media campaign; the counter drug technology assessment center. We had appropriations for his staff and how much he would have for his staff and how much for his appropriations. We had specifics on how he was going to relate to the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Attorney General, homeland security, defense. We had guidelines of what reports come to Congress and of the different relevant committees. Because while Government Reform had primary jurisdiction over the drug czar, it also went to Judiciary, to Energy and Commerce and other committees, so there were different reporting strategies. In fact, czar was a slang term up until this administration.

For example, in high intensity drug trafficking area it says, ''Designation—The director, upon consultation with the Attorney General, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Homeland Security, heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies and the Governor of each applicable State may designate any specified area of the United States as a high-intensity drug trafficking area.'' That's explicit. That's not somebody wandering around with undefined authority. He's got a specific budget and so on.

Here's the great irony. We had one czar who was in the cabinet, approved with the advice and consent of the Senate with a specific budget. And our current director of the Office of National Drug Control, Gil Kerlokowski, is a good man and would have been clearly cleared. But this administration chose to take the one czar that was approved with advice and consent of the Senate and take him out of the Cabinet, and now he's not certified either. So now even the one czar who has descriptions, who was following the pattern under this administration, has been changed. And the danger here is we do not know how the interrelationships between the people cleared by the United States Senate are working with noncleared people. We run into background check problems like Mr. JONES. But we run into other huge questions, and that is so much power centered in one place that's not accountable to Congress, that it's not even clear how we do oversight of that function.

I criticized the last administration when they did too much of this and we had some back and forth about why they wouldn't appear in front of the different committees, even on policy advisers. We need to have direct, aggressive oversight in this House and in the Senate to find out how this is working, how decisions are being made, who's commanding what, and are the people now running the agencies' hands tied. The people who we delineated their duties, who were cleared with advice and consent of the Senate, are their hands now tied by a bunch of people who haven't gone through this process, who haven't been vetted, who do not have clear line authority, but are using the staff power coming out of the President of the United States to usurp the constitutional power of those who are designated principal officers and commanded by the Constitution to report to the House and Senate.

---

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

(Mr. INGLIS 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.)

---

## HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, I believe that we can all agree the health care reform proposals ignited debates in homes and workplaces all over the country. The intense interest in health care policy by so many Americans made this August district work period unusually exciting. My offices were busy taking phone calls, e-mails, and having people drop by voicing their concerns. This healthy health care debate has led many Americans to become involved in politics for the first time.

Whenever we in Congress do something really important, we need to get outside the Beltway because that's where the great wisdom in our country lies. All of us in the Congress share three goals for health care reform legislation: We want to make health care insurance more affordable and accessible. We want to improve the quality of health care. We want to reduce the cost of health care. Where we disagree is how to accomplish these goals.

I would like to share some of what I did and learned concerning health care over the recess period. As a scientist and engineer, I seek out the facts to guide my decisions. I also earned my master's and doctorate degrees in human physiology, the basic medical science.

□ 2030

This training led me to a 20-year career teaching anatomy and physiology to both medical and nursing students. That's why one of the things I did and that my staff did was to read the House leadership bill, H.R. 3200, and the amendments by three House committees.