



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009

No. 129

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 14, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO 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.

CARGO SCREENING SOLUTION

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, last week marked the eighth anniversary of 9/11. Congress should honor the memory of that tragedy by solidifying its homeland security agenda. That means taking the right steps to keep the Nation safe, free and prosperous. At the same time, Congress should resist initiatives that do not actually improve security and impair international trade.

The international maritime community has long voiced their concerns

with the blanket application of the 9/11 law mandating 100 percent scanning of all U.S.-bound containers from more than 700 ports around the world. The countries that have raised concern include United States allies such as the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Singapore.

H.R. 1, implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007, called the public's attention to issues of supply chain security and the potential threats faced by this Nation and all of those with a stake in this supply chain.

One hundred percent container scanning as a security tool may seem like an appealing way to ensure container security, but it is fraught with various operational and technical challenges. In addition, it provides a false sense of security, as the effectiveness of the analysts become degraded, given that there will be information overload and desensitization of the analysts.

Requiring 100 percent scanning of all in-bound sea containers, more than 11 million containers annually, may be well-intentioned, but it is not feasible, given the current technology. A 100 percent scanning requirement could simply strangle commerce, have a significantly damaging impact on American manufacturing and cost a lot of jobs.

The international flow of containers will also be slowed as a result of the severe bottleneck in busy ports. Similarly, U.S. ports such as Long Beach, New Jersey and Los Angeles will have their congestion problems exacerbated if the international maritime community makes similar reciprocal demands on the United States.

One other important point: The backup in cargo traffic caused by 100 percent scanning could inadvertently cause a higher security risk. Major delays in inspecting and processing containers would put the cargo in

greater risk of tampering at the docks. 100 percent scanning will also bring about huge costs to port operators, shippers and ocean carriers. Costs incurred through such a requirement will eventually filter down to the very constituents that we are trying to protect. This will be essentially hurtful as consumers deal with rising prices and a weak economy.

U.S. manufacturers, large and small, have a substantial interest and concern regarding the security of our Nation's ports and the safe transport of their products. This legislation would levy counterproductive Federal mandates on industry, unnecessarily increase costs, cause massive delays and disruptions in the global supply chain and ultimately cost American jobs.

More can and should be done to secure our borders and supply chains against terrorist activities. H.R. 1, however, will impose additional cost burdens on the United States economy, both small and large, with the establishment of cargo security inspection protocols that rely simply on unproven technologies and that do not ensure security improvements that are commensurate with the expenses that would be incurred to implement these programs. This legislation will add uncertainty and costs to the international supply chain, severely impacting the flow of legitimate trade, but with little demonstrative improvement in security.

My colleagues, there is an alternative approach which has broader international consensus, and that is a risk-based approach, coupled with the concept of total supply security along the chain. Such an approach, where all stakeholders in the supply chain undertake security measures to protect their cargo, is less duplicative and more holistic. A layered, risk-based, targeted approach to cargo security, rather than a one-size-fits-all, such as in H.R. 1, will provide more effective security with better utilization of limited resources.

□ 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.

H9445

So, my colleagues, striking the proper balance between security needs and the free flow of legitimate trade will continue to be a challenge that will face all of us into the future. Unfortunately, slowing the international supply chain and adding significant costs by implementing unproven technologies is not consistent with the challenge today.

Congress should rethink cargo screening mandates in H.R. 1 before more time, money and limited resources are wasted by the Department of Homeland Security.

HAVING HONEST, MEANINGFUL DEBATE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate, as always, the chance to address the House.

You know, two days before the President gave his speech here to the joint session last Wednesday, the President was on television, and I watched and typed up his comments, and he talked about the critics of his health care plan, including me as a critic of what I understand his health care plan to be. And the President said these exact words.

He said, "You have heard the lies. I have got a question for all those folks. What are you going to do? What's your answer? What's your solution? And, you know what? They don't have one."

That is simply not true. It is so difficult to try to have a meaningful debate over a bill, and even as I have, take H.R. 3200, the bill we have been given, and read directly out loud from that bill to show what it actually says, and then have the President of the United States call critics of the bill liars. We are lying. You have heard our lies.

He keeps talking about "his plan," "his bill," "this plan," "this bill." Then he came over as a guest here in the Chamber. Now, some people don't understand why the President speaks from the lower podium rather than the upper podium. It is because this is the People's House. He is an invited guest into this House, and that is why he is at the lower podium.

We were given just excerpts just minutes before the speech started, and that came by Blackberry, by e-mail, because we were told there was simply not time to get us a copy of the speech, as has always been done in a joint session any time I have been here in the last 4½ years, and I am told that has been the tradition. It is not a right, so nobody made demands. But imagine our surprise when we look up here in the gallery and see that every reporter appeared to have an entire transcript that they looked through as they went through his bill.

But I kept seeing in the transcript of the brief excerpts we were given the President referring to "the plan," "this

plan," "our plan," "this bill," and again "this plan," without telling us what bill he is talking about if it is not H.R. 3200.

How do you have debate on a bill that is not the one before you? And there was debate all the next day among people. Is he embracing H.R. 3200? Some thought he was. Some thought he wasn't. Well, what bill? He says he is going to call us out if we misrepresent "his bill."

Tell us, Madam Speaker, we need to be told what the bill is before we can be called out as misrepresenting it. I would try read from the bill, if you would tell us what it is.

He also said in that speech, and I will read from the excerpt we were given, he said, "If you come to me with a serious set of proposals, I will be there to listen. My door is always open."

Well, I talked to my congressional friend TOM PRICE, who says he has been trying week after week to get to come talk to the President about his serious proposal. He has got a great one. I have a proposal. We have called over. And I am not going to call the President a liar, because I believe he knows his door is open. The problem is there are these massive gates and heavily armed guards between us and that open door that he says that is open to us.

Anyway, we had the Speaker of the House previously this year say the CIA lied. Now, of course, we have had the President say that we have spread lies. And they both used that "L" word.

We have been told that abortion is not covered, and everybody should know, especially people brilliant like the President, if it is not specifically excluded, it is included.

The President told the CIA they were not going to be pursued over the interrogations, that he had their back. I am not going to say he lied, because he didn't say whether he was going to stab it or protect it.

But it is time for the President and our leadership over here to quit using the "L" word, because that "L" word goes down in our well, and as my late mother used to say, Madam Speaker, what is in the well will come up in the bucket.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Eternal Father, strong to save, You are ever faithful in Your love and concern for us all. In turn, You ask us to be faithful, listening to Your word and taking it to heart.

You require us to be faithful to our commitments, to Your commandments, to each other and those we serve in Your holy name.

Forgive our faults and failures. Help us to learn from our mistakes. May we recognize personal shortcomings so to make us all the more understanding of others.

May Your forgiveness free us to live a new life and be more forgiving. Thus may Your compassion for the poor, the weak and the alienated, Lord, guide us 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 Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOHMERT 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.

HEALTH CARE REFORM FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, in his recent speech to the House and Senate, President Obama stated that leaving Americans without health insurance is wrong and "should not happen in the United States of America."

I could not agree more strongly with our President. When it is accessible and affordable, health care ensures high quality of life, helps families, and saves life.

In my home, the Northern Mariana Islands, our health care system is sorely in need of improvement. But the current health care bills being debated in the House and Senate exclude the U.S. territories from the exchange and affordability credits, denying the men, women, and children living there the benefits their fellow citizens will enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, to quote our President, this is wrong, and it should not happen in the United States of America.

I ask for the support of my colleagues in bringing health care reform

to all Americans, including those in the territories.

CONCERNS WITH GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE PLAN

(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, during the August recess, I was honored to host the largest congressional townhalls in the history of South Carolina: 1,700 people in Columbia; 1,500 in Lexington; 1,500 in Beaufort; and 1,200 in Hilton Head. During my 25 years of serving the public in the State Senate and Congress, I have not seen such passionate events full of patriots, 95 percent of whom support health insurance reform, but not a government takeover.

I presented my concerns in a handout with a government-run health care plan: \$1.6 trillion in costs, 100 million people losing their current coverage, \$818 billion in taxes, 1.6 million jobs lost, according to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and rationing of care.

I presented a better way, the Empowering Patients First Act, introduced by the Republican Study Committee led by Dr. Tom Price. It provides for portability, keeping current coverage, tax incentives to purchase insurance, lower costs through competition, and bars government-funded abortions.

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

IT'S TIME FOR US TO TALK ABOUT HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have got some news here. It says as of September 10, 11:23 a.m., reported by The Hill, Speaker NANCY PELOSI said, Democrats should cease efforts to sanction Representative JOE WILSON. It goes on to quote her and says, It's time for us to talk about health care, not JOE WILSON.

But Democratic leaders, it goes on to say, were looking into what formal action the House might take against WILSON, and then, But PELOSI dismissed that idea as well as a call for WILSON to apologize on the floor.

I am on to health care reform. I am not going to discuss JOE WILSON, she said. I think his actions spoke for itself. He has apologized. He will figure out what is appropriate for him to do.

And I am really confused. What do you call it when somebody says something that they are going to do, and then they don't do it? What is that statement?

AMERICANS' TRUST IN MEDIA REACHES NEW LOW

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans' trust in the media has plummeted to an all-time low, according to a new survey by the Pew Research Center. According to Pew, only about a quarter of Americans say that news organizations are not politically biased, less than one-third say the media generally get the facts straight, less than one in five say that the media deals fairly with all sides of the story, and just 29 percent had a favorable opinion of the liberal New York Times, the lowest rating for any international organization in the Pew survey.

Americans have lost faith in the national media. Whether it's health care or other issues, it's up to the media to restore the public's trust by reporting the facts fairly.

APOLOGY ACCEPTED

(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 come to the floor today to make the point that last Wednesday night during a joint session there was a very brief breach of decorum here by Congressman JOE WILSON, someone who is a true consummate Southern gentleman, an officer and a gentleman.

He immediately called the White House, the White House immediately accepted JOE WILSON's apology, and that must be the end of it. A gentleman that conducted himself as a gentleman immediately in the aftermath, without putting his finger to the political winds, he did the right thing.

No one has a claim to any further redress if the President of the United States accepts an apology, and he did.

So I stand with JOE WILSON. Let's get on with the business of this House, and let's start running this country instead of doing cheap political points, which I expect will be coming to the floor of this House sometime about tomorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by Speaker pro tempore VAN HOLLEN on Tuesday, August 25, 2009:

H.R. 3325, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize for 1 year the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance program and the Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security program.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules

on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

RECOMMENDING TEACHING CONSTITUTION TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 686) recommending that the United States Constitution be taught to high school students throughout the Nation in September of their senior year, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 686

Whereas the United States Constitution is the fundamental law of the United States;

Whereas people in the United States of all ages, income levels, and political beliefs fail tests of civic literacy;

Whereas a 1998 survey revealed that more teenagers knew who the "Fresh Prince of Bel-Air" was than the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, more knew the star of the motion picture "Titanic" than who was the vice president of the United States, and more can name the Three Stooges and the 3 American Idol judges than can name the 3 branches of government;

Whereas fewer than half of all people in the United States can name the three branches of the United States Government;

Whereas students at top colleges and universities in the United States scored an average of only 59.4 percent for seniors and 56.6 percent for freshmen on tests of civic literacy;

Whereas people in the United States aged 25 to 34 score an average of 46 percent on a test of civic literacy and people aged 65 and over score the same 46 percent;

Whereas research shows that an increase in civic knowledge, including that of the United States Constitution, almost invariably leads to the beneficial use of that knowledge; and

Whereas research shows that greater civic learning leads to more active citizenship, and people in the United States who fulfill their civic obligations beyond voting are more knowledgeable about their country's history and institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) all high school seniors across the country should spend at least one week learning about the United States Constitution in September of their senior year, as knowledge of this historic document, which constitutes the very foundation of our country, is critical to being an effective citizen; and

(2) upon reaching voting age, high school seniors should engage in civic learning activities on an issue of importance to them to demonstrate their understanding of their rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 686 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 686 and thank Mr. GRAYSON, the sponsor of this resolution, for his leadership.

Almost 222 years ago, on Thursday, September 17, 1787, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia for the last time to sign the document they created, a living and breathing document that stands as the world's longest surviving written charter government.

This resolution brings attention to the importance of this document by calling for all high school students to learn about the Constitution. Many students today have little exposure to this rich document and its history. And without a basic understanding of the Constitution and the benefits it provides, it is less likely that these same students will vote or engage in active citizenship.

One program that combats this lack of knowledge is, "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution." The program encourages civic awareness and responsibility in middle school and high school students through hands-on activities. Students discover firsthand how the Constitution and the Bill of Rights impact their everyday lives and participate in simulated congressional hearings. At the national level, students utilize higher-order thinking skills as they demonstrate their knowledge of constitutional theory by defending a historical or contemporary issue.

Programs like "We the People" make the Constitution come alive and help students connect what they are learning to contemporary issues and events. This type of learning is important not only for its academic aspects, but also for the way in which it improves our democracy. Learning about the Constitution promotes positive civic attitudes and fosters involvement in our democracy.

This Thursday, September 17, is Constitution Day, because on September 17, 1787, the Constitution was signed and history was made. One way students and teachers can observe this important day and celebrate the legacy of our Founding Fathers is by learning more about the timeless document signed 222 years ago and finding ways to actively participate in our democracy.

I want to express my support for this resolution and encourage young people to learn about how the Constitution affects their everyday lives. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 686, recommending that the United States Constitution be taught to high school students throughout the Nation in September of their senior year. It has been reported that just over half of all Americans can correctly identify the three branches of government. In fact, a recent poll indicated we have more people in America who can identify The Three Stooges than they can the three branches of government.

More than one in five believe that the three branches of government are the Republican, Democrat and independent branches, and only a small percentage of Americans can identify the role of the judiciary in the Federal Government. Yet, if you ask teenagers to name the three judges on "American Idol," they can rattle off their names immediately.

The word "civic" originates from the Latin word "civis," meaning "citizen." At the heart of civic education is the concept that we must understand what it means to be a citizen. The importance of civic education is that without a public informed about their civic duties, the rights and freedoms promised by our constitutional structure may not be realized.

Our young people in future generations must understand that it is our constitutional framework and the freedom and liberty it provides which forms the glue that holds our society together. The Constitution is a blueprint for connecting our large and diverse society in a peaceful coexistence, for the most part.

Passing on an understanding of our country's history and the constitutional framework upon which it was founded is the duty of one generation to the next. As my friend from the Northern Mariana Islands mentioned, September 17, 2009, will mark the 222nd anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution.

□ 1415

I think it is appropriate that teachers and parents across the country use this anniversary as an opportunity to discuss the importance of our Constitution and the principles it embodies with all students, but especially high school seniors, who are preparing for the next chapter of their lives, and many of them to vote for the first time.

It is also important to note that when the Founders came together and finally agreed on this Constitution, it was born out of a distrust for government. So they put this document together, and it was a long process. In fact, Benjamin Franklin, after 5 weeks, said, We've been going 5 weeks. We have more noes than ayes. And then he went on to say, Of course, We know that a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without God's notice. And, How can an empire rise without his aid?

He went on to say, It's written in the sacred writing that unless the Lord

build a house, they labor in vain that build it.

He went on to point out and make a motion that they should begin each day with prayer, just as we have from 1787 until now. But then they went on to finally create a document they could agree on with a House of Representatives. But they were concerned. There was all this debate. One House still wouldn't be strong enough to have all the checks and balances to control a government that might try to run away and take away their liberty.

So they didn't feel good about just one House. They wanted two houses. But they didn't want one House, maybe a House of Lords and a House of Commons, where one is more powerful than the other. They wanted both Houses to be able to completely veto what the other is doing to stop the other House from moving forward with the law.

So they got two Houses, where they could do that. And that wasn't good enough. They said, We need an executive, but we don't want to have this thing where a legislative body then elects one of their own. We want somebody elected outside that, and then he can veto what those two Houses did.

You know, that is still not good enough, because we really don't trust government. Let's have another branch outside that, called the judiciary, and we will give them a veto over laws that are made, too. That way, we can control runaway government.

And it was ferocious argument and debate coming around to this final document that my friend from the Mariana Islands has pointed out has been such a tremendous asset for the history of mankind. And it was so moving that at the conclusion they agreed on the Constitution, they agreed to come forward with a Bill of Rights thereafter, that it's reported that Benjamin Franklin said, as he was recognized at the end, looking at the chair behind President George Washington as he stood there—and, by the way, this massive painting can be seen right outside this House—he said, Mr. President, I have been looking at the half of the sun carved in the back of your chair, wondering throughout this process if that were a rising sun or a setting sun. He said, I now believe that is a rising sun.

I agree with him, and I agree so wholeheartedly with my friend that this is an excellent proposal, a resolution to encourage this kind of thing, to recommend this to the State, not to ram it down anybody's throat; but young people need to know this, especially before they vote, know the three branches as well as the three judges from American Idol.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, again, I encourage my colleagues in the House to please support House Resolution 686.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 686, which recommends that the United States Constitution be taught to high school students throughout the Nation in September of their senior

year. Understanding the Constitution and fundamentals of the government of the United States is essential to being a contributing member of our society. By recommending that the U.S. Constitution be taught to high school seniors, this measure will help prepare people of voting age to participate in the democratic process.

The state of public awareness and understanding of the U.S. system of government requires action to improve civic education. Americans from all walks of life—rich and poor, young and old, and Republican and Democrat—fail civic literacy tests. Moreover, many institutions of learning of all calibers and at all levels do not adequately prepare students to be knowledgeable citizens. Nearly half of the States do not require that U.S. civics and American history be taught in school. Education is vital to improving the vitality of our democracy.

In Texas, teaching of the constitution is part of our social studies curriculum and 91 percent of our students passed our exit exams in the 2007–2008 school year. This shows an effort on our part to educate our students on the governing doctrine of our great nation and the retention by our students of this information. Instituting such requirements helps develop responsible adults who understand their responsibilities as a citizen of this great nation.

I believe that all citizens need to have a strong understanding of the U.S. Constitution and the institutions of U.S. government. Individuals must understand the basic tenets of our Constitution in order to protect their rights and fully participate in the democratic process. Furthermore, civic Recommending to the States that they teach the United States Constitution as a part of the senior year curriculum will send a clear message that civics is an important part of a high school education. Increasing knowledge of the U.S. Constitution and our government will also lead to increased civic engagement among our students. Teaching the basic tenets of government to those students who will then become voters will increase voter participation rates and create a more active citizenry.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 686, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 737) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week should be established.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 737

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions play an important role in educating many

underprivileged students and helping them attain their full potential through higher education;

Whereas there are currently about 268 Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are actively involved in stabilizing and improving their communities;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-Serving Institutions contributes to the strength and culture of our Nation;

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions are deserving of national recognition; and

Whereas the week of September 20th would be an appropriate week for such recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the country;

(2) supports the designation of an appropriate week as “National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week”;

(3) requests the President to issue a proclamation designating such week; and

(4) calling on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 737 into the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 737, which encourages the establishment of the week of September 20 as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week. Hispanic-Serving Institutions are degree-granting institutions with full-time equivalent enrollment that are at least 25 percent Hispanic. In 1990, there were only 137 recognized Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Today, there are 268 such institutions, educating more than half of all Hispanic college and university students in the Nation.

Hispanic Americans face multiple obstacles in access and completion of higher education. While Hispanic high-school graduates are more likely than their white peers to go on to college, they are less likely to complete their bachelor's degrees because of issues linked to poverty, immigration, and enrollment status.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions play a crucial role in addressing these issues and obstacles while remaining committed to educating underserved students across the country.

Working to increase enrollment and retention, Hispanic-Serving Institu-

tions have created many innovative programs. At El Camino College in California, their “First Year Experience” class has rates 10 to 30 percent higher than the rest of the student body. The program provides a learning community through linked classes and a team of instructors and counselors who work together to increase student success.

At the University of Texas, El Paso, deep relationships with the surrounding K–12 community schools have helped bridge a path for students to obtain a higher education and be prepared for college-level work.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions continue to produce extremely accomplished members of our society. Their alumni include Members of Congress and some of the President's closest advisors in his Cabinet.

Lastly, it is important to note that September is Hispanic Heritage Month. This month celebrates the accomplishments and contributions of Hispanics in the United States while honoring the Hispanic culture in our country. It is appropriate that we include Hispanic-Serving Institutions in this honor.

I thank Representative GRIJALVA for his leadership in bringing this important resolution forward. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this important resolution and join me in my commendation of our country's Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 737, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week should be established.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, for introducing this resolution. Mr. GRIJALVA recognizes the important role that HSIs play for all postsecondary students, especially minority students.

HSIs and their student body are very diverse. The community of HSIs includes 2-year and 4-year institutions and public and private institutions. In 2007, 46 percent of students enrolled in HSIs were Hispanics, and the remaining 44 percent were a diverse mix of students from various ethnicities and backgrounds. Even with this diversity of the student body, geographical location and population served, the principal missions of all of these institutions is to provide a quality education.

HSIs deserve recognition for the contribution they make to the education community and the Nation. While comprising less than 10 percent of the Nation's institutions of higher education, HSIs educate over two-thirds of Hispanic students enrolled in colleges and universities. Most HSIs do not have access to the resources or endowment income that other institutions can draw

on. However, they are still successful in their effort to provide a high-quality education, often to some of our most disadvantaged students.

We have consistently worked to improve the Nation's support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Just last Congress, the Higher Education Opportunity Act, the reauthorization bill for the Higher Education Act, included a provision that created a new program designed to allow these institutions to improve their graduate and professional programs. We also provided more flexibility to HSIs through broadening their uses of Title V funds to include activities like the development of articulation agreements, the development of distance learning technologies, and providing additional financial literacy counseling to students and families.

It is important that we recognize the contributions of HSIs and their graduates by celebrating HSI Week. The number of HSIs increases every year. From 2006 to 2007, 13 new institutions qualified as an HSI. These institutions provide an ever-increasing number of students with a high-quality education and leadership skills for the future, and they deserve recognition for such.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, again, I encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 737.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 737.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL COACHES APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 6) recognizing the significant contribution coaches make in the life of children who participate in organized sports and supporting the goals and ideals of National Coaches Appreciation Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 6

Whereas coaches are a vital part of organized youth sports;

Whereas approximately 42 million American children participate in organized sports each year, but more than 20 million children in the United States lack the opportunity to participate in organized sports, in part because of an insufficient number of coaches;

Whereas a national effort to promote coaching is needed to increase the number of adults serving as coaches in youth sports;

Whereas the purpose of the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports is to educate Members of Congress, the media, and the public on the need to restore a child-centered focus in youth sports that will produce immeasurable positive benefits for the well-being and character development of children;

Whereas sports and coaches help children fight obesity, increase their self-esteem, learn leadership skills, and discover how to incorporate the values of sports into other aspects of their daily lives;

Whereas youth sports activity can reduce gang participation and youth violence;

Whereas children need adults who will believe in them and who give children the support they need to be a success;

Whereas coaches can positively impact the physical, emotional, and educational life of children;

Whereas coaches who volunteer their time help educate children, serve as role models, and, in some situations, are parental surrogates; and

Whereas the designation of the week of September 13 through 19, 2009, as National Coach Appreciation Week would raise awareness and leverage resources to engage millions of children in organized sports that promote health, nutrition, and fitness, as well as other youth development outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the significant contribution coaches make in the life of children who participate in organized sports;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Coach Appreciation Week; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Coach Appreciation Week with appropriate recognition, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of sports and coaches in the life of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 6 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 6, which recognizes the immeasurable contributions coaches make in the lives of children who participate in organized sports. This week, our Nation will honor adults who volunteer their time to coach our Nation's young with National Coaches Appreciation Week.

Approximately 42 million American children participate in organized sports each year. Youth sports, along with coaches, help fight childhood obesity, increase player self-esteem, develop leadership skills, and create opportunities for children to explore their passion. Participation in sports also devel-

ops discipline and fosters positive peer bonding, which helps keep students engaged in school. Because of their involvement with sports, many young athletes develop a lifelong commitment to exercise and well-being.

The benefits of sports participation cannot be overstated. High school students who participate in athletics are more likely to have a healthy mind and body.

□ 1430

Specifically, girls who play sports have better grades and are more likely to graduate compared to girls who do not participate in athletic activities. The risk of breast cancer, osteoporosis and obesity are also reduced with as few as 4 hours of exercise a week.

In addition to the many physical benefits of youth sports, coaches help athletes overcome personal challenges. The presence of a coach helps keep students engaged and provides alternative support systems that can help children stay away from mischief.

To acknowledge some of the dedication and hard work our youth sports coaches offer to children, the National Alliance for Youth Sports created a Coach of the Year award. This is a very prestigious national award that is given to an individual who is committed to the development of children. Last year's winner, Clarence McQueen, demonstrated his commitment to children by coaching basketball, baseball and flag football while teaching the benefits of teamwork, trust and hard work.

Today, more than 20 million children in the United States lack the opportunity to participate in organized sports due, in part, to the lack of available coaches. We must continue to encourage adults to volunteer and commit time to youth sports, as this resolution suggests.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to express my support for this resolution, and I thank Representative MCINTYRE for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 6, recognizing the significant contributions that coaches make in the lives of children who participate in organized sports and supporting the goals and the ideals of National Coaches Appreciation Week.

Coaches make a lasting impression on America's young people. I bet that almost every Member in this Chamber could name at least one coach that has had a profound impact on their lives and encouraged them to become the person that they are today. This resolution brings national attention to the contributions of coaches and recognizes the time and energy that they dedicate to the athletic and moral development of children. In addition, National

Coaches Week aims to encourage more adults to give their time to coaching, enabling more children to benefit from participation in organized sports.

It is widely accepted that children can benefit in numerous ways from participation in organized sports. Research has found that children who play sports, especially girls, are more often likely to have a positive body image and a higher self-esteem. They also are less likely to be overweight. Children involved in sports are less likely to take drugs or smoke, and statistics show that students who are involved in sports while in high school are more likely to experience academic success and graduate from high school.

The role of a coach can vary from a high-intensity, full-time college football coach to a parent who volunteers to coach his 4-year-old daughter's community soccer team every week. Many coaches in high school are primarily teachers of academic subjects, and many volunteer coaches have other full-time careers in addition to their coaching duties.

Approximately 42 million American children participate in organized sports every year. Each one of these children is influenced in some way by the coach or coaches who lead their team. Along with refining athletes' individual skills, coaches are responsible for instilling good sportsmanship, a competitive spirit and teamwork.

I stand in support of this resolution, recognizing the roles and contributions of America's coaches and recognizing National Coaches Appreciation Week, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill that I introduced on the very first day of this session of Congress, House Resolution 6, a resolution which recognizes this week, September 13 through 19, as National Coaches Appreciation Week.

The narrative of the American coach is a powerful testament to the role that volunteerism has played in shaping our country. The passage of H. Res. 6 will build upon this and add another layer of support to those countless individuals and families who give of their time voluntarily to encourage, work with and support our Nation and its young people, as well as time to hold practices, organize games and rally interests within their communities.

I started the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports in 2006 in order to shift the focus of our youth sports culture. There had been a report card done on the attitudes of many toward youth sports and toward the umpires, the referees and the coaches, and the bad language and the ugly fights that were occurring and the way people were put-

ting down those who took time to work with our young people.

This is a chance for us to emphasize powerful values that we all want for our families and our communities; opportunities not only to emphasize things like sportsmanship, but also what goes along with sportsmanship, those concepts of teamwork, of civility, of respect, of discipline, of loyalty and of learning how to graciously accept the victories and the defeats that we all may face in life from time to time.

As a result, I've also had the benefit of meeting with other youth sports organizations from all over this country that are doing wonderful work, trying not to start another government program but to work with the programs that are already working in our communities across this Nation.

Every afternoon, including this afternoon, there will be young people after school, hurrying out to football fields, soccer fields, tennis courts and other venues to get ready, to practice for their games this weekend. There will be all kinds of recreational activities going on, and we need to be supporting those parents, those families and those volunteer coaches who are out there giving of their time to help support our young people.

This isn't about reform or reinventing the wheel. It's about simply recognizing these contributions, honoring them, and then providing the tools and the resources to help them do well what they're already doing and for which we are grateful.

I would also like to thank our caucus cochairman, JIM JORDAN from Ohio, for his work on this, and a fellow Congressman from North Carolina, HEATH SHULER, who chairs the Professional Sports Caucus, because they too have been supportive of this effort.

I remember, as many of you probably do, having the influence of sports in my life. My father, Dr. Douglas McIntyre of Lumberton, North Carolina, coached me growing up, and I've had the same privilege to coach my sons Joshua and Stephen and, in fact, over 130 other young people in three different sports over 7 years who only knew me as Coach MCINTYRE.

I had the opportunity to work with them, to encourage them, to build their self-esteem as well as the other practical benefits of sports not only in character but physical fitness and fighting obesity and a healthier lifestyle. And by working with three all-American, drug-free teams that I coached, they also learned the dangers of getting involved in activities that can only hurt and not help your self-image and your physical well-being.

We all know of coaches who have helped a player make a tough decision, pushed a player to achieve things they never thought possible, and shaped their sense of integrity, character and discipline that now propels them to the successes that they can accomplish today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 6 and honor National Coaches Appreciation Week; and in doing so, colleagues, you are supporting and recognizing a vital part of our country's culture and ensuring that our Nation's youth have access to role models who can put them on the path to achievement.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to again express my support for this resolution, and I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 6 to recognize the significant contribution coaches make in the life of children who participate in organized sports and to support the goals and ideals of National Coaches Appreciation Week. Our coaches deserve to be honored for the work they put forth in developing the young minds of tomorrow's leaders. Coaches have long served as the backbone of youth sports, nurturing generations of minds, bodies and souls.

H. Res. 6 applauds the ongoing effort of our coaches who put in extra time and effort to make the difference in the lives of our children; coaches are a vital part of organized youth sports. Their efforts welcome approximately 42 million American children to participate in organized sports each year. However, 20 million children here in the United States are unable to participate in organized sports, in part due to an insufficient number of coaches. A national effort to promote coaching is needed to increase the number of adults serving as coaches in organized sports.

The Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports will educate Members of Congress, the Media, and the Public on the need to restore a child-centered focus in youth sports that will produce immeasurable positive benefits for the well-being and character development of children. Sports and coaches help children fight obesity, increase their self-esteem, learn leadership skills, and discover how to incorporate the values of sports into other aspects of their daily lives. Children need adults who will believe in them and leaders who give children the support they need to be a success. Coaches can positively impact the physical, emotional, and educational life of children. According to Paul Caccamo, President of Up2Us, a national coalition that seeks to increase the impact of and access to youth sports as a tool for positive youth development, "Young people who play sports are higher achievers." He also said that "They are more likely to attend college, land jobs with more responsibility and greater pay, and less apt to fall to drug and alcohol abuse. With dropout rates and gang activity on the rise in our urban cities, we cannot afford to stand by when we know there's an alternative. National Coach Appreciation Week recognizes the men and women who have dedicated their time to give our children better, brighter futures."

Not only will National Coach Appreciation Week recognize the men and women who have dedicated their time to give our children better and brighter futures, it will put forth a great effort to recruit more adults to do this admirable work. As stated by the Up2Us coalition "National Coach Appreciation Week would

raise awareness and leverage resources to engage millions of children in organized sports that promote health, nutrition, and fitness, as well as other youth development outcomes.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 6.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SAFETY MONTH

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 459) expressing support for designation of “National Safety Month”.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 459

Whereas, after years of decline, the rate of unintentional injuries and deaths in the United States has reversed and has reached unacceptably high levels in recent years;

Whereas deaths from motor vehicle collisions, poisonings from unintentional overdoses, and falls remain as the three leading causes of preventable death in the United States;

Whereas the cost of unintentional injuries to people in the United States exceeds \$684,400,000 each year and causes great suffering among individuals and their families;

Whereas the cost of unintentional injuries to workers and their employers is \$175,300,000 each year, including the value of 114,000,000 days of lost productivity;

Whereas preventing unintentional injury and death requires the cooperation of all levels of government, the Nation's employers, and the general public;

Whereas the National Safety Council, founded in 1913, was congressionally chartered in 1953 to lead this Nation in injury prevention through safety and health education, training, and advocacy in the United States;

Whereas the National Safety Council educates the workforce about policies, practices, and procedures leading to increased safety, protection, and health in business and industry, as well as in schools and colleges, on roads and highways, and in homes and communities;

Whereas since the summer season is a time of increased rates of preventable injuries and death, it is an appropriate time to focus the attention of our workforce and community leaders on injury risks and preventions by celebrating June 2009 as “National Safety Month”; and

Whereas the National Safety Council in 2009 as part of its public education about

safety and health will provide this Nation a monthlong campaign in June: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of “National Safety Month”;

(2) recognizes the contributions of the National Safety Council and its ongoing commitment to raising awareness about the need for the implementation of safe practices in our schools and jobs; and

(3) encourages citizens to observe the “National Safety Month” with appropriate ceremonies and educate themselves about the importance of implementing safe practices in our schools and on our jobs to prevent unintentional injury and death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 459 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of House Resolution 459 which recognizes the month of June as National Safety Month and commends the National Safety Council for its ongoing commitment to educating the public on the prevention of accidental injury and death.

The National Safety Council was established in 1912 by a small group of midwestern industrial leaders concerned about safety in the workplace. Since then, the council has broadened its scope to include the home, transportation and the community. Its membership has grown to over 18,000 companies with more than 33,000 locations. All together, the council represents 8.3 million employees across the Nation.

In 1953, a congressional charter was granted to the National Safety Council to lead the country in injury prevention through safety education and training. The council has had a great impact at the local level by providing a variety of community-based programs and services, including workshops, training and conferences, as well as by providing a local voice for safety and health education. Through the efforts of the National Safety Council, more than 8.5 million rescuers have been trained and more than 60 million people have taken one of the NSC defensive driving courses.

The training and information offered by the National Safety Council has helped raise attention to the cost of accidental injuries to this Nation. Each year, accidental injuries cost Ameri-

cans more than \$684 billion. Additionally, unintentional injuries cost workers and their employers \$175 billion each year.

We know that the work of the National Safety Council complements the essential injury prevention and emergency response training efforts by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Mine Safety and Health Administration and the many excellent State worker safety and health agencies. While National Safety Month is over, the health and safety of our workers and families should be a top priority year round.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support for National Safety Month, and I want to thank Congressman ROSKAM for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 459, expressing support for the designation of National Safety Month. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois, for introducing this resolution. This resolution recognizes the work of the National Safety Council to educate our citizens about accident and injury prevention.

The National Safety Council works tirelessly through its nationwide networks to prevent accidents in the workplace, in our homes and on our roads. Founded in 1913 and congressionally chartered in 1953, the National Safety Council conducts workshops and training opportunities to help prevent both injuries and illness. These include a diverse range of issues from preventing the spread of H1N1 to making drivers more aware of the dangers of distracted driving.

This week, the council is encouraging parents to ensure proper child safety seat installation. According to the NSC's statistics, motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for children 2 to 12. And as adults are buckling in children, the council reminds them to use their seat belts as well.

Many injuries are preventable and constant vigilance in our daily activity will go a long way to reduce the risk. I rise today to commend the National Safety Council for its dedication to the important task of raising awareness of accident and injury prevention, and I urge the passage of H. Res. 459, commending the council's service to the Nation. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Having no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support for National Safety Month, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 459, which expresses support for the designation of June as National Safety Month. Promoting safety awareness will help to reduce thousands of preventable injury and deaths in the United

States in the workplace, on roads and highways, and in our homes and neighborhoods.

Each week of National Safety Month focuses on a different aspect of safety: traffic, workplace, home, and community. This year's National Safety Month themes are teen driving, fall prevention, overexertion, and distracted driving. The statistics on the types of safety that comprise this year's National Safety Month are jarring.

According to the National Safety Council, NSC, traffic crashes are the number one cause of teen fatalities, accounting for 38 percent of all teen deaths. In 2007, 20,600 people died from falls in U.S. homes and communities. Moreover, the U.S. Department of Labor documented that 8 percent of all occupational fatalities from trauma were caused by falling. Overexertion, particularly in the form of back injuries, affects over 1 million workers. Lastly, 80 percent of automobile crashes are the result of distracted driving. Given these drastic statistics, I believe that National Safety Month is an important effort to improve the well being of our country.

Injuries and loss of life due to preventable accidents are tragedies that traumatize workplaces, families, and communities. In addition to the suffering of the victims and their families, accidents in the home and on the road created over \$600 billion in costs to Americans. Accidents in the workplace created over \$175 billion in costs for workers and employers. I believe that National Safety Month will help to improve our national economy as we climb out of the economic downturn.

In my home State, the Texas Chapter of the National Safety Council is working hard to educate and influence the public in order to prevent accidental injury and death. The Texas Chapter contributes to Texas' public safety through events such as National Seat Check Saturday, National Child Passenger Safety Week, National Preparedness Month, and the Texas Safety Conference & Expo. I am proud of the work that the Texas Chapter of the NSC does to train safety professionals, reach out to the public for safety education, and raise awareness of safety.

By raising awareness and educating the public on safety, National Safety Month honors the work of safety experts and professionals. Safety experts research, analyze, and publish information on improving safety in many aspects of our daily lives. Safety professionals provide training in schools and colleges, workplaces, and communities, as well as to drivers across the country. The work of these men and women save countless lives each year, and through this resolution, we honor their contribution to society.

In addition to supporting National Safety Month, we must also recognize the achievements of the National Safety Council, NSC. The NSC was established in Illinois in 1913 to promote industrial safety. Since then, their mandate has expanded to include traffic safety, home safety, community safety, and workplace safety at large. In 1953, the NSC received a Congressional Charter. Today, over 51,000 labor organizations, businesses, schools, public agencies, private organizations, and individuals comprise the NSC. The NSC and its 40 member local chapters coordinate safety events, educate the public, analyze safety research, and raise awareness about safety issues. The NSC inaugurated the first National Safety Month in June 1996. In

addition to National Safety Month, the NSC holds an annual Congress & Expo to exchange information among safety experts, safety professionals, and the safety industry. Their work is an invaluable contribution to the well-being of our country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 459.

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. SABLAN. 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.

□ 1445

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SENIOR CAREGIVING

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 59) supporting the goals and ideals of senior caregiving and affordability, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 59

Whereas 8,000 people in the United States turn 60 years old every day;

Whereas an estimated 35,900,000 people, 12.4 percent of the population, are 65 years of age and older;

Whereas the United States population age 65 and older is expected to more than double in the next 50 years to 86,700,000 in 2050;

Whereas the 85 and older population is projected to reach 9,600,000 in 2030 and double again to 20,900,000 in 2050;

Whereas it is estimated that 4,500,000 people in the United States have Alzheimer's disease today;

Whereas it is estimated that number will increase to between 11,300,000 and 16,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas 70 percent of people with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias live at home, and these individuals are examples of individuals who need assistance in their homes with their "activities of daily living";

Whereas currently over 25 percent of all seniors need some level of assistance with their "activities of daily living";

Whereas in order to address the surging population of seniors who have significant needs for in-home care, the field of senior caregiving will continue to grow;

Whereas there are an estimated 44,000,000 adults in the United States providing care to adult relatives or friends and an estimated 725,000 nonfamily private paid senior caregivers;

Whereas both unpaid family caregivers and paid caregivers work together to serve the daily living needs of seniors who live in their own homes;

Whereas the Department of Labor estimated that paid caregivers for the year 2006

worked a total of 835,000,000 hours, and the projected hours of paid senior caregivers are estimated to increase to 4,350,000,000 hours by 2025; and

Whereas the longer a senior is able to provide for his or her own care, the less burden is placed on public payment systems in State and Federal governments: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes caregiving as a profession;

(2) supports the private home care industry and the efforts of family caregivers nationwide by encouraging individuals to provide care to family, friends, and neighbors;

(3) encourages accessible and affordable care for seniors;

(4) reviews Federal policies and supports current Federal programs which address the needs of seniors and their family caregivers; and

(5) encourages the Secretary of Health and Human Services to continue working to educate people in the United States on the impact of aging and the importance of knowing the options available to seniors when they need care to meet their personal needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 59 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 59, which is a bill that supports the ideals of senior caregiving and addresses the important issue of affordability.

Research professionals tell us that our seniors are living longer than any previous generation. The number of people over the age of 65 will double in the next 50 years, and the demand for senior care will rise to unprecedented levels. Currently, 25 percent of all seniors need some level of assistance with their daily living activities. Families, neighbors, and private care serve this role for many seniors. As demand increases, so does the need for affordable and quality care.

There are between 30 and 38 million adult caregivers age 18 and older. They are our friends, family members, partners, and neighbors. On average, they work 21 hours per week. Not only do these unpaid caregivers provide long-term services to persons of all ages, but they contribute to the economy. In 2006, the AARP estimated that caregiving services have an annual economic value of \$350 billion.

Many caregivers put their own health at risk while caring for others. Caregivers are more likely to report chronic illnesses at twice the rate as non-caregivers. Though they save the country billions of dollars, caregivers report having higher medical bill expenses than noncaregivers.

Providing better support for caregivers is essential to the well-being of our health care system, our long-term care system, and our economy.

I want to express my support for this resolution and thank Congressman TERRY for bringing this resolution forward. I urge my colleagues to support me on this resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and am proud to do so in support of House Concurrent Resolution 59, supporting the goals and ideals of senior caregiving. I also want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for introducing this resolution.

According to the Administration on Aging, the number of people age 65 and older was 37.9 million in 2007, an increase of 3.8 million since 1997. The population of those 65 and older is projected to increase from 40 million in 2010 to 55 million in 2020. The number of those 85 and older is projected to increase from 4.2 million in the year 2000 to 6.6 million in the year 2020.

In the United States today, it's estimated that 4.5 million people have Alzheimer's disease, and this number is expected to increase to between 11.3 million and 16 million by 2050. Seventy percent of people with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias live at home and need assistance to perform normal daily activities.

Today, a quarter of all seniors need some level of assistance with their daily activities, and according to the Administration on Aging, persons reaching age 65 have an average life expectancy of an additional 19 years.

Caregiving for these individuals takes many forms. Caregivers may be full- or part time, live with their loved one, or provide care from a distance. Caregiving ranges from simple help such as shopping to conducting medical procedures.

There are an estimated 44 million adults in the United States providing care to adult relatives or friends. The longer a senior is able to provide for his or her own care, the less burden is placed on our public systems. Caregivers keep individuals out of institutions and help them live out their lives in familiar surroundings and with dignity. It is appropriate that we take a few minutes today to honor these individuals who give so much of themselves to provide care for our aging population.

I stand in support of this resolution recognizing the profession of senior

caregiving and supporting the private home care industry, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H. Con. Res. 59—supporting the goals and ideals of senior caregiving and affordability. Our national population of seniors is growing at unprecedented rates. National statistics reveal that 8,000 people turn 60 each day. Moreover, an estimated 44 million adults in the United States currently provide care to their senior relatives and friends. In light of these trends, it is our responsibility to ensure that senior citizens, especially those suffering from Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia, have access to the quality and professional care they need to live their lives to the fullest. I commend Rep. LEE TERRY for bringing this measure before the floor.

This resolution demonstrates that Congress is concerned about our senior citizens and we are actively engaging and learning more about the senior caregiving industry. Today, 35.9 million people, roughly 12.4 percent of the U.S. population, are aged 65 years and older. Moreover, 25 percent of all seniors require some level of assistance with their daily life activities. At this rate, the population of seniors is expected to increase each year and is in danger of exceeding the availability of qualified professionals and trained caregivers. Therefore, it is important that we now begin to take the necessary steps to effectively manage the needs of our aging population.

We can accomplish this objective by providing some much needed support to family caregivers across the country. Family caregivers expend a lot of time, energy, and resources caring for their senior relatives. And many families that do not provide care within their homes rely on non-family private caregivers. In this regard, Congress must help to foster a private home care industry environment that supports enterprises that provide accessible and affordable caregiving services to seniors. This must also include standardized training to paid caregivers with the opportunity for their ongoing professional development. Additionally, Congress must examine and continue to fund current federal programs that address the affordability and accessibility challenges our seniors and their family caregivers face.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my voice of support for H. Con. Res. 59—supporting the goals and ideals of senior caregiving and affordability. And I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure we continue to provide the necessary resources toward senior caregiving and improve affordability so that all our senior citizens will have access to quality caregiving when they need it.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, thank you for conducting this debate on H. Con. Res. 59. This important concurrent resolution supports the goals and ideals of senior caregiving. I would like to thank the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Education and Labor Committee as well as the Chairwoman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Healthy Families and Communities for their role in bringing this concurrent resolution to the House Floor. Furthermore, I would like to particularly thank the 42 cosponsors of this important resolution.

Seniors are one of our most precious resources. In order to take care of our seniors, we need a nation of caregivers.

On March 30, 2009, I introduced H. Con. Res. 59 in order to help promote the goals and ideals of senior caregiving. The idea for this concurrent resolution was brought to me by the world's large senior care provider, Home Instead Senior Care, which is located in my congressional district in Omaha, Nebraska. Home Instead understands first hand the importance of senior caregiving. Its over 800 franchises worldwide provide care to over 60,000 seniors. Home Instead is just one of hundreds of companies who provide care to seniors. In addition to these paid caregivers, you have millions of individuals who provide care to their elderly parents, siblings, friends etc.

To illustrate the need for senior caregivers, today in the United States, there are more than 38 million people who are 65 years of age or older and this number is expected to more than double by 2050. For this reason, it is critical that we as a nation are prepared to meet and manage the needs of our aging population. We must work to educate people in the United States on the impact of aging and the importance of knowing the options available to seniors when they need assistance to meet their personal needs.

In 2006, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported a total of 767,000 paid personal and home care aides providing more than 835 million hours of care to a senior population of 38 million. These statistics speak to the point that seniors prefer to remain in their homes if their needs are met with affordable and safe homecare. I firmly believe the longer a senior is able to provide for his or her own care, the less burden is placed on public payment systems in state and federal governments.

This important concurrent resolution pledges to study the needs of an aging population and seeks alternatives which can make caregiving more affordable. Moreover, this resolution importantly recognizes the caregivers who provide these homecare services. This resolution will draw attention to our everyday heroes who enhance the lives of our senior population. This resolution also focuses on those caregivers who are excited to have an employment opportunity to work with our seniors.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the three national associations who are supportive of this legislation: National Family Caregivers Association; the National Association for Home Care and Hospice; and the National Private Duty Association. These three groups illustrate the widespread support for this resolution amongst the caregiver community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 59 is an important step in recognizing the important work of caregivers. I encourage my colleagues to support this important concurrent resolution.

NATIONAL PRIVATE DUTY ASSOCIATION,
Indianapolis, IN, July 1, 2008.

The National Private Duty Association formally endorses the Concurrent Resolution which Home Instead Senior Care has circulated. This Resolution does an excellent job of promoting the goals and ideals of senior caregiving and affordability.

The National Private Duty Association is supportive of the intent of this Resolution which is to increase the visibility of senior caregivers in a positive manner. Moreover, the National Private Duty Association believes the six recommendations listed in the Resolution are important steps forward in our effort to educate the public on senior caregiving.

We encourage other associations to support this Resolution effort and we look forward to becoming a part of the coalition in support of this. I would be happy to discuss the merits of this Resolution at any time.

Sincerely,

SHEILA McMACKIN,
President,
National Private Duty Association.

NATIONAL FAMILY
CAREGIVERS ASSOCIATION,
Kensington, MD, September 1, 2008.

PHYLLIS HEGSTROM,
Secretary of Industry Affairs, Home Instead,
Omaha, NE.

DEAR PHYLLIS: The National Family Caregivers Association supports your resolution to bring attention to the work of the private pay homecare industry. Although family caregivers provide 80% of all longterm care services, we can't do it alone. We need a healthy homecare industry that we can turn to for help on a regular or intermittent basis.

As the country continues to age, and as the number of people 85 and older increases, the ability of our nation to support caregiving in the home will increase exponentially. Given that services to assist people with activities of daily living and instrumental activities of daily living are not covered by Medicare, and long-term care insurance is not a realistic solution for many Americans, it is incumbent on all of us to work together to find solutions to the problems that face us individually and as a nation.

Thank you for making this effort on behalf of families, homecare providers, and the caregivers who are the lifeblood of your industry.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE MINTZ,
President/Co-founder.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
HOME CARE & HOSPICE,
Washington, DC, December 1, 2008.

PHYLLIS HEGSTROM,
Secretary of Industry Affairs, Home Instead
Senior Care, Omaha, NE.

DEAR PHYLLIS: The National Association for Home Care & Hospice is the nation's largest organization that advocates on behalf of providers of home care and hospice services, their employees, and their clients. We congratulate you and heartily endorse your efforts to secure enactment of a Congressional resolution that supports family and professional caregivers, calls for continued funding for programs that provide vital community-based services, and recommends broader education of the public and policymakers on the needs of our growing senior population.

In recent years our nation's health care needs have changed considerably, and one of our greatest challenges at this time is the development of more effective means of caring for individuals with multiple chronic conditions. This challenge can only be effectively met by greater emphasis on the services and supports that allow our population to enjoy maximum functioning in the least restrictive environment possible. For most individuals, that environment is the home. We strongly support any efforts that help to raise awareness and expand access to home and community-based services, as well as to ease the burden on informal caregivers.

Many thanks for your commitment to the disabled and infirm citizens of our nation. Please feel free to call upon us if we can be of any assistance to you.

Sincerely,

VAL J. HALAMANDARIS,
President.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests

for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for this concurrent resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 59, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO REDUCE INFANT MORTALITY

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 260) supporting efforts to reduce infant mortality in the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 260

Whereas the infant mortality rate of a nation is an important indicator of that nation's overall health;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have found that the United States ranked 29th in the world in infant mortality in 2004, falling from 12th in 1960;

Whereas there are more than 28,000 deaths to children under 1 year of age each year in the United States;

Whereas preterm birth has a considerable impact on the United States infant mortality rate, in 2005, 68.6 percent of all infant deaths occurred to preterm infants, up from 65.6 percent in 2000;

Whereas the United States infant mortality rate for non-Hispanic Black women was 2.4 times the rate for non-Hispanic White women in 2005;

Whereas in 2005, the United States infant mortality rates were above average for non-Hispanic Black women at 13.63 deaths per 1,000 live births, for Puerto Rican women at 8.30 deaths per 1,000 live births, and for American Indian or Alaska Native women at 8.06 deaths per 1,000 live births;

Whereas in Memphis, Tennessee, the infant mortality rate is three times higher than that of the United States (higher than any other city in the country), and the 2005 infant mortality rate in the 38108 zip code of Memphis was deadlier for babies than that of the countries of Vietnam, Iran, and El Salvador with 31 deaths per 1,000 live births, 5 times that of the 2005 national average of 6.86 deaths per 1,000 live births;

Whereas adequate prenatal care has a studied, positive effect on the health of the baby;

Whereas prenatal care is one of the most important interventions for ensuring the health of pregnant women and their infants;

Whereas 29 percent of mothers 15 to 19 years of age received no early prenatal care

in 2004 according to the Department of Health and Human Services;

Whereas non-Hispanic Black mothers were 2.6 times more likely than non-Hispanic White mothers to begin prenatal care in the third trimester, or not receive prenatal care at all;

Whereas babies born to mothers who received no prenatal care are three times more likely to be born at low birth weight, and five times more likely to die, than those whose mothers received prenatal care, as stated by the Department of Health and Human Services;

Whereas the United States' high infant mortality rate reflects in part racial disparities in premature and low birthweight babies; and

Whereas the racial disparities in infant mortality may relate to socioeconomic status, access to medical care, and the education level of the mother: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports efforts to understand racial disparities and the rate of infant mortality in order to lower the rate of infant mortality in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 260, a resolution that supports efforts to reduce infant mortality in the United States.

The United States amazingly enough ranks 29th in the world in the incidence of infant mortality. That is a shocking figure. And while there are a lot of reasons for infant mortality—there's education, there's health care, there are certain other issues that may be existent—health care is the primary one. And as we discuss health care in this Congress, it is hard to submit looking at the United States being 29th in the world in infant mortality, that we don't have a problem somewhere with our health care system.

The extremely high incidence of infant death in the African American community is particularly troubling. In Shelby County, Tennessee, the county which I represent, African American babies die at three times the Nation's infant mortality rate. Prematurity is the number one cause of infant death in the United States, accounting for at least 60 percent of those deaths. Poor women are much more likely to deliver a premature or a low-weight baby as they cannot afford prenatal care or are simply not educated about what is required for women during pregnancy or have access to health clinics or inner-

city doctors, general practitioners, which might be provided if we can pass a health care bill here.

We must work together to lower our country's infant mortality rate, and that starts with lowering our rate of premature births and educating people and providing access to health care.

I was spurred to introduce H. Res. 260 by the devastating rate of infant mortality in Memphis, in Shelby County. And I represent part of Shelby County; the honorable gentlewoman from Brentwood, Tennessee, represents a part of Shelby County, as well, on the Republican side.

In 2007 the 38108 ZIP code in north Memphis, which is a predominantly low-income neighborhood, had an infant mortality rate of 31 deaths per 1,000 live births. That's almost five times the Nation's rate of 6.78 deaths per 1,000 live births; and that ranks the 38108 area worse than the developing nations of Iran, Indonesia, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Syria, and Vietnam in infant mortality.

In my own family, there was an incident of infant mortality. My mother and father's first child, Rosemary, died at 1 month of age in 1945. She was buried with some other family members, not direct family, in 1945. When my father passed in 1992, we buried him at Elmwood Cemetery, a different cemetery than where my sister was buried. But my mother was so touched and always was by the loss of her child that she had her name put on the stone with my father even though her remains were at another cemetery where her name was also.

That taught me something about infant mortality: a mother never forgets the loss of a child, and it affects that mother forever. So it's a problem that affects people of all races and stays with us for all time.

I recently had the opportunity to visit Africa, several countries there, one of which was Liberia, which has a very high rate of infant mortality as well. They have very few doctors there. They don't have good health care. And that has got to be a problem that we need to deal with and we try to with our foreign aid, and I commend President Bush as well as President Obama for extending aid to Africa and so many humanitarian efforts, particularly PEPFAR, but also others.

This month Nicholas Kristof and his wife, Sheryl WuDunn, authored a book, published it, entitled "Half the Sky," which is about women in the world and how they have had difficulties rising to the level that they could and that we could empower women and have a tremendous economic advantage, particularly in disadvantaged countries, by giving women the opportunity to participate in the workforce and be educated. Much of the book is dedicated to the enslavement of women but also to maternal mortality and infant mortality as well. I encourage everybody to consider reading the book and taking up this cause.

This September is Infant Mortality Awareness Month; so I am especially proud that we are considering this important resolution today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of House Resolution 260, which supports efforts to address this important public health problem and a moral problem, and understand racial disparities that persist in infant mortality and try to make America better than 29th in the world.

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

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

I rise today to support H. Res. 260, supporting efforts to reduce infant mortality in the United States.

I want to thank my colleague Congressman COHEN for his work on this resolution. It has been exemplary, and we thank him for his leadership. I also want to recognize other members of our delegation who have stood with him and with me in this work to address infant mortality, Congressman TANNER and Congressman GORDON, both of whom are original cosponsors, as is Congressman WAMP; and we thank them for their participation.

Congressman COHEN has championed the cause of prenatal care since he and I served together in the Tennessee Senate, and I am honored to stand and work on this resolution with him now. I stand in support of the legislation, and I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in this effort. It is an important issue for Memphis, Tennessee, which, as Mr. COHEN said, is a community we both represent. And I hope that our conversation on the floor today will be just one more step in a unified effort to end the staggering rates of infant mortality that plague many of our communities.

In this conversation, I am reminded of the Healthy Start program that was reauthorized and signed into law by President George W. Bush on September 3, 2008. Healthy Start provides services tailored to the needs of high-risk pregnant women, infants, and mothers in geographically, racially, ethnically, linguistically diverse communities with exceptionally high rates of infant mortality. The goal of the program has been to reduce the factors that contribute to infant mortality, particularly among minority groups, and remains a very important program to help reduce the deaths of children each year.

□ 1500

Congressman COHEN's work certainly builds on this goal. Adequate prenatal care should be available to all mothers in Tennessee and certainly in this country to ensure healthy infants and pregnant women.

The Department of Health and Human Services has stated that children of mothers who receive no prenatal care, and this is a staggering statistic to me, those children born to

mothers who receive no prenatal care are three times more likely to be born at low birth weight and five times more likely to die than those born to mothers who receive prenatal care. Again, that is three times more likely to be born at a low birth weight which makes that first year very difficult, and five times more likely to die. This is an area where working together, we can do something.

It is important that our communities and also young mothers get the care that they need in early pregnancy. Memphis, Tennessee, has one of the highest infant mortality rates of any city in the U.S. That isn't a statistic that only impacts the neighborhoods in Memphis where infant mortality is a daily reality, it is a tragedy that all of Tennessee mourns.

By stating today that the rate of infant mortality in Memphis, Tennessee, and in America is unacceptable, we are making another important step toward solving the problem.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for her remarks which are so appropriate; and I would like to add that there are efforts in Shelby County, the Blues Project and the ABC Project that the county has, to combat infant mortality and work with pregnant women and new mothers.

If a child is born premature, it costs at least 20 times as much money to keep that child alive for the first year. So if their efforts could be successful to eliminate and reduce infant mortality, and some of that comes through programs such as the county and others have—Blue Cross/Blue Shield has the Blues Project—we could save money in the health system because we won't spend so much keeping premature babies alive at the trauma center. It is an example where if we have preventive care and wellness programs, by investing money, we can save money. And we can save so much with infant mortality.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, just to add to the gentleman's comments and to talk a little bit about the efforts that we have participated in in our State, as you look at Shelby County and Memphis, you see there has been a wonderful partnership between your local, State, and Federal entities to address this. Also between the community and the not-for-profit sector, individuals who have said this is a problem. These children deserve to have a healthy start in life. They deserve to have a good solid first year.

Recognizing that you have a problem is the first important step in solving that problem. Certainly we have all worked together for many years to make certain that education is an enormous component of the step forward to address low birth weights, to address infant mortality, and to make certain that our children get that healthy start that they need in life.

I commend those who have worked with us at the local, State and Federal level, as well as the community partners in Shelby County and across the State of Tennessee, who have made this a priority. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the issue.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 260, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING THE PERSISTENTLY HIGH RATES OF DROWNING FATALITIES AMONG CHILDREN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 57) expressing the importance of swimming lessons and recognizing the danger of drowning in the United States, especially among minority children, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 738

Whereas in recognition of the severity of the crimes associated with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, on September 13, 1994, President Bill Clinton signed the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA") as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994;

Whereas subsequent reauthorizations of VAWA include the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA 2000"), signed by President Bill Clinton, and the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "VAWA 2005"), signed by President George W. Bush;

Whereas VAWA was the first comprehensive legislative package designed to end violence against women;

Whereas the protections and provisions afforded by VAWA were subsequently expanded and improved by VAWA 2000, which created a legal assistance program for victims and expanded the definition of domestic violence crimes to include dating violence and stalking;

Whereas VAWA and interventions funded by that Act have reduced the incidence of domestic violence, have lowered sexual assault rates, and have averted societal costs by reducing the need for emergency and medical responses;

Whereas VAWA has succeeded in bringing communities together to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and

stalking, including combined efforts by law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, victim services, and community-based programs to develop long-term plans for addressing such crimes locally and statewide;

Whereas VAWA has provided crucial Federal support to Indian tribes to combat the problems of sexual and domestic violence in Indian country;

Whereas VAWA brings innovative practices to the field by funding demonstration projects and training, and supporting the development of specialized courts and police teams;

Whereas the Sexual Assault Services program, authorized by VAWA 2005, enabled the 1,300 rape crisis centers in the United States to reduce waiting lists, reach out to underserved communities, and provide more comprehensive services to survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas VAWA provides a means for many victims of domestic violence who were dependent on their batterers for immigration status to self-petition and obtain legal immigration status on their own, and to access legal services to flee violence and recover from trauma;

Whereas organizations throughout the United States have received grants under VAWA to provide legal assistance to young victims of dating violence;

Whereas VAWA has provided crucial Federal support for efforts by criminal justice officials and victim service providers to hold offenders accountable and to keep stalking victims safe;

Whereas the continued support of VAWA and subsequent Acts combating violence against women is essential to best serve the 3,400,000 individuals in the United States who are stalked each year; and

Whereas September 13, 2009, marked the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994;

(2) continues to support the goals and ideals of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and its subsequent reauthorization Acts; and

(3) recognizes the need to continue vigorous enforcement of the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and similar Acts and programs to deter and prosecute crimes of violence against women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 57, a resolution recognizing the persistently high rates of drowning fatalities among children.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were

3,582 unintentional and fatal drownings in the United States in 2005. This figure represents an average of 10 drowning deaths a day.

Children are the most susceptible to fatal drowning incidents. In fact, drowning is the second most common cause of unintentional death among children ages 1 to 14.

On top of this startling statistic, for every child who fatally drowns in the United States, there are four near-drowning incidents that require emergency care. These accidents can lead to brain damage and result in permanent disabilities ranging from loss of memory to the loss of all basic functions.

Drowning rates among minority children greatly exceed those of their non-minority counterparts. The fatal drowning rate for African-American children is over three times that for Caucasian children. American Indian and Alaskan Native children have rates over two times as high as Caucasian children.

Contributing to these disparities is limited access to swimming lessons. African Americans and Latinos are more likely to live below the poverty line, putting lessons that can cost hundreds of dollars per course out of reach.

House Resolution 57 not only condemns the persistently high rates of drowning among children, but it also recognizes the hard work of organizations that promote access to swimming education and teach skills that will help save lives.

I urge my colleagues to help bring awareness to this serious issue, and join me in supporting final passage of House Resolution 57.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 57 expressing the importance of swimming lessons and recognizing the danger of drowning in the United States. With almost 10 unintentional and fatal drowning deaths each day in our country, it is important to recognize those most vulnerable to drowning, and it is usually our precious children under the age of 14 who have not yet learned to swim. Swimming education programs in communities and swimming lessons for those as young as 4 years old could help lower the number of fatal drownings each and every year.

The Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act, which was signed into law in December 2007 by President Bush, has led to increased pool and spa safety requirements and education.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida who has joined us on the floor for her excellent leadership and outstanding work on that issue. It is one that was important to all of us in dealing with the FTC and the regulations. We commend you, and we thank you for your work.

Effective prevention strategies like the Pool and Spa Safety Act and non-profit initiatives like the U.S.A. Swimming Foundation's "Make a Splash"

program have been successful in teaming up with local communities to offer all children access to swimming education and lessons.

I want to thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative ALBIO SIRES from the Garden State of New Jersey, for his work on this resolution. I stand in support of the legislation, and I hope that my colleagues will join me.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), as long as she doesn't mention anything about the Tennessee-Florida game on Saturday.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve that option until later on in the week as the stakes get higher.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I rise today in support of House Resolution 57, and thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for her kind words. We are in support of this legislation today to express our support for the importance of swimming lessons and recognizing the persistently high rates of drowning fatalities among children.

Drowning is, as you have heard, the leading cause of unintentional deaths in America to children ages 1 to 4. Last year alone, 13 children in Broward and Miami-Dade counties, which are in my congressional district, died as a result of accidental drowning in swimming pools and spas.

In fact, a recent report issued in May by the Consumer Product Safety Commission indicates that the average number of drowning deaths involving children younger than 5 in pools and spas has actually increased from a yearly average of 267 from 2002 to 2004 to 283 from 2003 to 2005.

I have been involved in the issue of pool safety throughout my career, and worked hard with many of my colleagues in this body and in the Florida legislature to pass swimming pool safety legislation and drowning prevention legislation. The passage of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act which was signed into law by President Bush on December 19, 2007, was a milestone in our efforts. The goal of that law is to improve the safety of all pools and spas by increasing the use of layers of protection and promoting uninterrupted supervision to prevent child drowning and entrapments.

Although I have been pleased to see public pools around the Nation come into compliance with the new regulations, it is clear that we must continue to raise awareness about the necessity of swimming lessons for all of our children.

Unfortunately, African Americans, Latinos, and other minority groups are more likely to live below the poverty line, putting expensive swimming lessons out of reach for too many kids. That is why we must encourage communities around the country to provide

free lessons to low-income children as part of an overall child safety program.

I want to commend the organization Swim Central in my home county of Broward for the exceptional example that they provide in doing just that, providing swimming lessons for more than 30,000 children, to kids in Broward County since the year 2000.

House Resolution 57 not only condemns the persistently high rates of drowning among children, but it celebrates the hard work of organizations that are offering access to swimming education and are teaching skills that will help save lives.

I thank my friend and colleague, Congressman SIRES, for introducing this important resolution and urge my colleagues to help bring awareness to this serious issue by joining me in support of its passage.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to discuss a serious issue that affects all children: unintentional drowning.

This summer millions of children took to the water as the weather warmed and pools opened all over the United States, but not all children receive the proper, life saving education that can play a critical role in drowning prevention. Minority children, more often than other children, do not participate in swimming lessons or do not have access to swimming lessons.

Roughly 3,500 people fatally drown each year in the United States—that is about 10 people a day—and more than 25 percent of these victims are children 14 and under. In fact, drowning is the second most common cause of accidental death among children. Alarming, fatal drowning rates are 2 to 3 times higher among minority children. According to a study by the University of Memphis, almost 60 percent of African-American and Latino children do not know how to swim as compared to roughly 30 percent of nonminority children. These statistics are not just shocking; they are shameful.

In order to help spread awareness about these startling statistics and how we can better protect our children, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I introduced H. Res. 57, a resolution recognizing the persistently high rates of drowning fatalities among children. The resolution expresses the danger of fatal unintentional drowning in the United States, and condemns the high rates of fatal drowning among all children.

This resolution also celebrates the hard work of initiatives that currently provide swimming lessons to underprivileged communities as well as other efforts that help educate children, parents and caregivers about drowning prevention.

The ability to swim is an important and essential skill, and according to Safe Kids USA, in order to help prevent drowning, children should be enrolled in swimming lessons as early as age 4 to learn how to float, tread water, and enter and exit the pool.

The USA Swimming's Make A Splash Program has partnered with organizations in 31 states and has reached out to over 90,000 children to provide access to swimming education.

Together with these organizations, we must promote access to the type of education that can not only improve children's health, but

help save their lives. I urge my colleagues to help bring awareness to this serious issue, and support final passage of H. Res. 57.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 57, which expresses the importance of swimming lessons and recognizes the danger of drowning in the United States, especially among minority children. Though interest in swimming throughout the United States has increased due to national attention to sporting events like the success of the U.S. Olympic Swim Team, drowning is still amongst the leading causes of death of American children. A study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that in 2005 there were 3,582 unintentional drownings in the United States, and average of 10 per day!

According to an article in the NY Times, an even more daunting statistic is that African children and teens ages 5 to 19, are 2.3 times more likely to drown than Caucasian children in this age group. For children 10 to 14, the rate is five times higher. Nearly 6 out of 10 African-American and Hispanic children are unable to swim, nearly twice as many as their Caucasian counterparts, a concern often highlighted by U.S. Olympian Cullen Jones, who is African-American and swam the third leg of the winning men's relay this week. This unprecedented statistic is unacceptable as it is fairly easily preventable, steps such as adult supervision, regularly using life jackets, learning CPR, and fencing of backyard swimming pools can help save the lives of many of our youth according to the Centers for Disease Control.

Some alarming statistics as stated by my very own district of Houston, TX declare that from May of 2005 to May of 2007:

HFD responded to more than 50 drownings, resulting in at least 8 deaths.

Traditionally, apartment pools account for most of the submersions.

60 percent of the pool incidents occurred at apartments.

We also had several bathtub drowning incidents and several in lakes or bayous.

Most of the children involved submersions involved 4 years old and infants (0–1 year old). Although, all age groups had submersions.

Incidents occurred every hour of the day, though 1–2 p.m. and 4 p.m.–7 p.m. had the higher number of incidents.

In 2006, The New York Times story "Everyone Into the Water" reported on why the barriers to swimming for black children are so high. The report stated that "studies have shown that many Africans were avid swimmers when they were brought over as slaves, most slaves born in the United States were not allowed to learn to swim because it was a means of escape. That created generations of non-swimmers and spawned the myth that African-Americans could not swim. Though widely discredited, a 1969 study titled "The Negro and Learning to Swim: The Buoyancy Problem Related to Reported Biological Difference," was printed in The Journal of Negro Education and fed the stereotype. The problem was compounded by segregation, which kept blacks out of many pools and beaches. The USA Swimming Foundation is trying to address the problem through its Make a Splash program, which is working to educate parents and increase swimming rates among all children. Donors who want to help can sponsor swimming lessons for children.

The passing of H. Res. 57 expresses the importance of providing access to swimming lessons for all communities in the United States as an integral part of drowning prevention. This Resolution celebrates the work of initiatives like USA Swimming Foundation's "Make A Splash" and Safe Kids USA to educate parents and caregivers on water safety and drowning prevention messages. H. Res. 57 also encourages the public and private funding to support current and future initiatives that provide all children access to swimming education.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Congressman SIREs for their hard work on this, and my counterpart from Tennessee for her excellent work.

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 Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 57, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution recognizing the persistently high rates of drowning fatalities among children."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 738) recognizing the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 57

Whereas the success of the United States Olympic swim team, including the record-breaking eight gold medals won by Michael Phelps, has brought great attention to swimming;

Whereas a New York Times article entitled "Despite Olympic Gold, Swimming Statistics Are Grim", highlighted the irony of the United States Olympic glory in light of a shocking number of drownings in the United States;

Whereas the New York Times has also highlighted the discrepancies in swimming education between African-American children and White children in the article "Everyone Into the Water";

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), there were 3,582 unintentional and fatal drownings in the United States in 2005 representing an average of 10 drowning deaths each day;

Whereas for every child who fatally drowns in the United States, there are four near-drowning incidents that require emergency

care and can lead to brain damage resulting in permanent disabilities ranging from loss of memory to the loss of all basic functions;

Whereas children are the most susceptible to fatal drowning incidents with one out of four victims being 14 years old or younger;

Whereas drowning is the second most common unintentional cause of death among children ages 1 to 14;

Whereas minority drowning rates greatly exceed the rates of White children;

Whereas according to the CDC, the fatal drowning rate for African-American children between the ages of 5 and 14 is over three times higher than the rate for White children, and the rate for American Indian and Alaska Native children is over two times higher;

Whereas according to a study by the University of Memphis, almost 60 percent of African-American and Latino children do not know how to swim as compared to roughly 30 percent of White children;

Whereas long-existing stigmas regarding minorities and swimming have contributed to the lack of swimming education in minority communities, and nonswimming minority families are far less likely than nonswimming White families to enroll in swimming lessons;

Whereas according to the United States Census Bureau, in 2007, 33.7 percent of African-Americans, 28.6 percent of Latinos, and 12.5 percent of Asian-Americans lived below the poverty line as compared to 10.1 percent of Whites, and swimming lessons can cost hundreds of dollars per course;

Whereas the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act was signed into law in December 2007 addressing the pressing need for increased pool and spa safety requirements and education to prevent accidental deaths by drowning;

Whereas effective drowning prevention strategies require several approaches such as supervision, fully gated pools, CPR training, and swimming skills;

Whereas the ability to swim is an important and essential skill, and according to Safe Kids USA, in order to help prevent drowning, children should be enrolled in swimming lessons as early as age 4 to learn how to float, tread water, and enter and exit the pool; and

Whereas nonprofit initiatives, like the USA Swimming Foundation's program "Make A Splash", are working hard to meet the need for swimming lessons by partnering with local communities to offer all children access to swimming education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses the importance of access to swimming lessons for all communities in the United States as an integral part of drowning prevention;

(2) recognizes the danger of fatal unintentional drowning in the United States;

(3) condemns the persistently high rates of fatal drowning among all children, and the particularly high rates of fatal drowning among minority children;

(4) celebrates the passage of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act;

(5) celebrates the work of initiatives like USA Swimming Foundation's "Make A Splash" and Safe Kids USA to educate parents and caregivers on water safety and drowning prevention messages; and

(6) encourages public and private funding to support current and future initiatives that provide all children access to swimming education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and

the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 738 recognizes the 15th anniversary of the passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

Signed into law on September 13, 1994, by President Bill Clinton, the Violence Against Women Act, also known as VAWA, recognizes the severity of crimes associated with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

This historic legislation was the first comprehensive policy package designed to dramatically reduce violence against women. Its protections and provisions were subsequently expanded and improved in the Violence Against Women Acts of 2000 and 2005.

When VAWA was reauthorized in 2000, it improved the foundation established in VAWA 1994 by creating a legal assistance program for victims and by expanding the definition of domestic violence crimes to include dating violence and stalking. I could not be more proud of these accomplishments, and I am honored to be here today to help recognize this significant program's 15th year of success.

VAWA-funded interventions have lowered both domestic violence and sexual assault rates. Not unimportantly, since the 1994 passage of VAWA it is estimated that more than \$14 billion in societal costs have been averted by reducing the need for emergency and medical responses.

This important legislation has also succeeded in bringing communities together to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Currently, law enforcement, prosecution, the courts, victim services, and community-based programs work together on the grassroots and State-wide levels to develop long-term plans for addressing the four categories of crime.

VAWA funding of demonstration projects, trainings, and development of specialized courts and police teams has led to the creation of new techniques to successfully prevent violence against women. For example, the Sexual Assault Services program created in VAWA 2005 enabled our Nation's 1,300 rape crisis centers to reduce waiting lists, reach out to underserved

communities and provide more comprehensive services to survivors of sexual assault. But that's not all this monumental legislation has done to help eradicate violence against women. In addition, VAWA 2000 created T and U visas to allow victims of human and sexual trafficking and violent crimes such as sexual assault to come forward and seek law enforcement assistance without the fear of deportation.

Over 1,300 victims of human trafficking have received T visas. The National Center for Victims of Crime has also witnessed dramatic improvement during the past 15 years in the way our Nation responds to stalking cases. This progress, too, is attributed to the Violence Against Women Act.

Undoubtedly, VAWA has provided crucial Federal support for criminal justice officials and victim service providers who work so hard each day to hold offenders accountable and keep stalking victims safe.

The holistic approach to addressing violence against women that VAWA promotes is inextricably linked to the improved safety and security of victims of domestic and sexual violence and their families. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

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

I rise today in support of this House resolution, which, as the gentlelady from Florida said, recognizes the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, or VAWA.

One out of every three people in the United States has been a victim of domestic violence, and that is according to Department of Justice statistics. Legislation proposing a Federal response to this violence against women was first introduced in 1990, although such violence was identified as a serious problem as early as the 1970s. So in 1994, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act to protect women against violent crime, including domestic abuse. The act created grant programs to be administered by the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services.

Funding under the bill recognized enforcement as well as educational and social programs to combat violent crime targeted against women. VAWA grants provide funding for the investigation and the prosecution of violent crimes perpetrated against women and support increased pretrial detention of defendants. VAWA also imposes automatic and mandatory restitution on those convicted.

In 2000, Congress reauthorized many VAWA programs, set new funding levels, and created new grant programs to address sexual assaults on campuses and assist victims of domestic abuse. These programs continue the essential work begun by the earlier act and add

important services for immigrant, rural, disabled and older women.

The VAWA Reauthorization Act of 2000 also created new stalking offenses by creating penalties for a person who travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to kill, injure, harass or intimidate a spouse or intimate partner.

VAWA was reauthorized for an additional 5 years when President Bush signed the act in 2005. The legislation expanded VAWA to include initiatives to help children who have been exposed to violence and to train health care providers to support victims of abuse.

The 2005 reauthorization also provided funding for crisis services for victims of rape and sexual assault. The act also improved support services, such as transitional housing, to women and children who have been forced to leave their homes because of this violence.

As the resolution notes, over the last 15 years VAWA has provided Federal support for efforts by law enforcement officials and victim service providers to hold offenders accountable and to keep those victims safe.

I join my colleagues in recognizing the 15th anniversary of the enactment of VAWA and urge continued support of the goals and the ideals of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. Speaker, in yielding back the balance of my time, I would thank so many of the volunteers in our communities who have been instrumental in working with many of us in starting rape and sexual abuse centers and supporting those victims, especially the children that we've been able to reach out and provide additional help and support for over the last few years. I know many of my colleagues have served in local and State legislative bodies, and we have had this as a very important focus of much of our work to make certain that women and children were protected from this strike of violence, and so I commend all of them.

I thank the gentlelady from Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur and associate myself with the remarks of the gentlelady from Tennessee as we celebrate 15 years since the first passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

I remember back in my early days in the Florida Legislature when we were struggling—and I'm sure that you went through the same thing in Tennessee—just to get domestic violence recognized as a serious crime. And we fought to pass laws like this one around the country, fought subsequently to get a crime like stalking declared as a crime and not just get sort of brushed aside as something trivial that women shouldn't worry their pretty little heads over. These kind of crimes, domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, are taken seriously now by law enforcement. They have the resources behind them as a result of the Violence Against Women Act.

We look forward to the reauthorization, the discussions that will occur next year, and celebrate the 15th year since VAWA's first introduction and passage.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to introduce H. Res. 738 to recognize the accomplishments we have made in the fight to end violence against women in the United States in the fifteen years since President Clinton signed the Violence Against Women Act into law on September 13, 1994 as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. This recognized the severity of the crimes associated with domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking, we have made great progress.

In 1993, a woman was raped every six seconds in the United States and a female was beaten every 15 seconds.

In July 1994, there were three times as many animal shelters in the United States as battered women shelters.

No doubt about it—the Violence Against Women Act has vastly improved access to support and care to women and families who are victims of domestic violence and stalking.

During a time, when women were still considered secondary to men, my colleagues of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues and I battled to explain the importance of protecting women from the horrors of violence and abuse.

In the House, I worked with former Representatives Patricia Schroeder, Constance Morella and now Senators OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, and BARBARA BOXER and CHUCK SCHUMER to author the Violence Against Women Act. In the Senate, Vice President BIDEN, then the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, championed the Senate version of VAWA.

The 1994 bill was a watershed, marking the first comprehensive legislative package designed to end violence against women. The protections and provisions afforded by the 1994 law were subsequently expanded and improved in the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 and they Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005.

VAWA has led to the reduction of domestic violence incidents reported. By reducing the need for emergency and medical responses, VAWA has averted more than \$14 billion dollars in societal costs as VAWA-funded interventions have lowered domestic violence frequency and sexual assault rates.

VAWA has succeeded in bringing communities together to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Prior to VAWA, few helping systems in a community addressed these crimes. Now law enforcement, prosecution, the courts, victim services and community based programs work together on the grassroots and statewide levels to develop long-term plans for addressing the crimes. VAWA has brought innovative practices to the field by funding demonstration projects, trainings, and supporting the development of specialized courts and police teams.

The Sexual Assault Services Program, created in VAWA 2005, enabled the country's 1300 rape crisis centers to reduce waiting lists, reach out to underserved communities, and provide more comprehensive services to survivors of sexual assault across the nation.

Since 1997, VAWA has funded the Sexual Assault Coalition Resource Sharing Project

(RSP) to develop and strengthen state and territorial sexual assault coalitions. In 1997, there were only 26 states with either no coalition or a coalition with no paid staff. Through VAWA and the efforts of the RSP in 2009 all 50 states and 5 territories have sexual assault or dual issue sexual assault/domestic violence coalitions in place.

During the last fifteen years, the National Center for Victims of Crime has witnessed dramatic improvement in the way our nation responds to stalking cases, progress greatly owed to the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). By including stalking in the original landmark bill, Congress elevated this crime in our nation's consciousness and highlighted it as a serious offense requiring heightened attention.

With VAWA funding, the National Center for Victims of Crime created the Stalking Resource Center raise national awareness of stalking and to encourage the development and implementation of multidisciplinary responses to stalking in local communities across the country. VAWA has also provided crucial federal support for efforts by criminal justice officials and victim service providers to hold offenders accountable and to keep stalking victims safe.

VAWA has supported the Stalking Resource Centers work to create a model stalking code that will serve as a guide for lawmakers' initiatives to update their states' stalking laws to keep pace with an ever-changing, and has enabled the SRC to train over 30,000 multidisciplinary professionals across the country who work with and respond to stalking victims, better equipping them to respond to the crime of stalking.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of VAWA which took place on September 13, 1994 while recognizing the accomplishments we have made and the continuing commitment in the fight to end violence against women.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 738, Recognizing the 15th Anniversary of the Enactment of the Violence Against Women Act, offered by my friend and colleague Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York.

The 15th anniversary of President Clinton signing this landmark legislation into law offers us the opportunity both to see how far we have come and to recognize that there is still much ground to be covered as we continue to protect vulnerable women and work on behalf of abused women across this nation.

What is so important about VAWA, just as much today as it was 15 years ago, is that it specifically identifies women as an at-risk population because of violence perpetrated against them. Violence against women ranges from rape to physical and mental abuse to stalking to other forms of domestic violence. It was appropriate to pass legislation specifically geared toward identifying different forms of violence, who was affected by this violence, and what judicial and social services were available for victims and potential victims. Our current Vice President JOE BIDEN played a leading role in shaping and forwarding this legislation when he was in the Senate, and we should acknowledge him for championing the bill and being instrumental in its final passage.

Since the enactment of VAWA into law, there has been a proliferation of community and advocacy organizations, shelters, health

clinics, and law enforcement divisions and programs dedicated to protecting women from abuse and to giving them time to heal and piece their lives back together.

VAWA funding has made it possible for women—and often times their children—to be able to leave their batterers and seek the help they need to begin life anew, more so than at any other time in our Nation's history. And given the unprecedented rate at which state and local budgets have been slashed during the recent economic downturn, VAWA funding is more crucial than ever: to date the Office of Violence Against Women, created under the Department of Justice to implement VAWA, has issued \$3.5 billion in grants and cooperative agreements.

I have long strived to be a voice for those who have difficulty being heard. Despite the significant inroads that VAWA has made in the lives of countless women throughout this country, we continue to see alarming trends in the rates of abuse, rape, and murder of women. Under the auspices of VAWA and other initiatives meant to protect women, I will continue to champion women and to offer and sponsor legislation to protect and empower them.

I was proud to vote for the passage of VAWA 15 years ago. So let today mark an important milestone to commemorate the work that has been done over the last 15 years. But let it also force all of us to redouble our efforts to continue legislating and advocating on behalf of women who find themselves in abusive and dangerous relationships and situations.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H. Res. 738 and I commend Representative SLAUGHTER for offering it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for H. Res. 738, Recognizing the 15th Anniversary of the Enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. I express my gratitude to Ms. SLAUGHTER for her leadership in introducing this important bill. This is legislation that I have worked on since becoming a member of the House Judiciary Committee in 1995 and I have worked with my colleagues through the years to improve the legislation.

The need for such legislation is punctuated by the tragic murder of Yale graduate student Annie Le. While an investigation into this matter is still ongoing, Ms. Le's death appears to have been related to her wedding scheduled for today. As a Yale alumnae, I'm particularly grieved by this tragedy, and my heart and sympathies go out to Ms. Le, her family, and her mourning fiancée, on what would have been their wedding day.

Ms. Le's murder in a Yale research building shows that domestic violence has no barriers, and crosses racial, ethnic, and economic boundaries. It is in this backdrop that we celebrated legislation proposing a federal response to the problem of violence against women.

A review of history shows that the first legislative action on this matter was introduced in 1990, although such violence was first identified as a serious problem by Congress in the 1970s. In 1994, this legislative action culminated by the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Funding under the bill emphasized enforcement as well as educational and social programs to prevent crime. The focus of the funding was on local government programs, an approach that the

sponsors of the bill believed was the most promising technique for reducing crime and violence. They also cautioned that, because of the variety of programs funded through the states, the impact of the bill may be difficult to quantify. Funding through FY2000 was authorized through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF). Authorization for VCRTF expired at the end of FY2000. Nonetheless, most of the programs in VAWA received appropriations for FY2001.

On October 28, 2000, President Clinton signed into law the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, which included the Violence Against Women Act of 2000. The Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (VAWA 2000) continued to support VAWA by reauthorizing existing programs and adding new initiatives, including grants to assist victims of dating violence, transitional housing for victims of violence, a pilot program aimed at protecting children during visits with a parent who has been accused of domestic violence, and protections from violence for elderly and disabled women. It also made technical amendments, and required grant recipients to submit reports on the effectiveness of programs funded by the grants to aid with the dissemination of information on successful programs. The bill amended the Public Health Service Act to require that certain funds be used exclusively for rape prevention and education programs. Moreover, the bill made it easier for battered immigrant women to leave and to help prosecute their abusers.

This last element is important to note. Under the old law, battered immigrant women could be deported if they left abusers who are their sponsors for residency and citizenship in the United States. VAWA 2000 created special rules for alien battered spouses and children to allow them to remain in the United States.

The original VAWA, established within DOJ and HHS discretionary grant programs for state, local, and Indian tribal governments. VAWA 2000 reauthorized many VAWA programs, set new funding levels, and created new grant programs to address sexual assaults on campuses and assist victims of domestic abuse.

VAWA 2000 also authorized the Attorney General to award grants to private nonprofit entities, Indian tribal governments, and publicly funded organizations to increase the availability of legal assistance to victims of domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault in legal matters, such as immigration, housing matters, and protection orders, at minimum or no cost to the victim. These grants may be used to establish or expand cooperative efforts between victim services organizations and legal assistance providers, by providing training, technical assistance, and data collection.

VAWA 2000 included grants to be administered by HHS for short-term transitional housing assistance and support services for victims of domestic abuse. The Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003 and the PROTECT Act authorized funding of both HHS and DOJ transitional housing assistance programs for victims of domestic violence.

VAWA 2000 amended the language of the existing STOP grants and "Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies" to provide funds to increase protection of older individuals and individuals with disabilities from domestic violence and sexual assault through policies and training for police, prosecutors, and the judiciary. It

also created new grants, administered by the Attorney General, for training programs to assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and court officials in addressing, investigating and prosecuting instances of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and violence against individuals with disabilities, including domestic violence and sexual assault.

VAWA 2000 authorized the Attorney General to award grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments to provide supervised visitation and safe visitation exchange for children involved in situations of domestic violence, child abuse, or sexual assault.

Several studies were authorized in VAWA 2000. These included studies of (1) insurance discrimination against victims of domestic violence; (2) workplace effects of violence against women; (3) unemployment compensation for women who are victims of violence; and (4) parental kidnapping. VAWA 2000 also required the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to develop a research agenda and plans to implement the agenda based on the National Academy of Sciences' recommendations in the report *Understanding Violence Against Women*.

VAWA 2000 contains the Battered Immigrant Women Protection Act of 2000, which provides for increased protection of immigrant women who are victims of domestic abuse, and creates special rules for alien battered spouses and children to allow them to remain in the United States. VAWA 2000 also established a task force to coordinate research on domestic violence.

VAWA 2000 established a definition for "dating violence" and amended the existing law so that STOP grants, Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies, and Rural Domestic Violence grants can be awarded for programs to combat dating violence, defined as violence committed by a person (A) who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim; and (B) where the existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on a consideration of the following factors: (i) the length of the relationship; (ii) the type of relationship; and (iii) the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship.

In 2005, Congress reauthorized VAWA, through the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005). VAWA 2005 reauthorized many existing programs for FY2007 through FY2011, and authorized a number of new programs for victims of domestic and dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The act emphasized collaboration among law enforcement, health and housing professionals, and women, men, and youth alliances, and encouraged community initiatives to address these issues.

VAWA 2005 advanced the ball to protect battered women and children. Specifically, VAWA 2005 programs sought to focus on young victims of violence; improve the health care system's response to violence; inform the public and employers about domestic and dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; protect the privacy of victims of violence; provide housing assistance, including public housing, for battered women and children; and support outreach efforts to underserved populations such as ethnic, immigrant, and racial populations.

In an effort to more closely monitor the status and performance of some of these pro-

grams, VAWA 2005 provided for some grant recipients to submit reports on policies and procedures they followed. The act also provided funding for studies and research on effective interventions that prevent both acts and effects of domestic and dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Over the past 15 years, the federal government, with the use of the public treasury has funded interventions which have lowered assault rates. This intervention is estimated to have saved over \$14 billion in public safety resources that would have been required had VAWA programs not prevented or addressed cases of domestic violence in each of the fifty states and all of the U.S. territories.

I have worked with formidable organizations such as Texans Against Sexual Assault, who work to bring voices to women who have been victims of sexual crimes, and helping them along an emotional recovery. Also, the Texas Council on Family Violence, which has connected more than 15,000 Texas victims of domestic violence with emergency shelter and protection.

In 2005, I offered an Amendment to the VAWA to provide \$2 million for the Office on Violence Against Women, the Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs account for "child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners." This allocation would be offset by the Edward Byrnes Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program and transferring the funds to the Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Program. Instead, I proposed that this money be channeled to a program that has been significantly under-funded for many years, the Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Program's account for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act. Domestic Violence is of the utmost concern, to me and my constituents. However, in the past, the chronic lack of funding and resources has left a number of child victims in the cold to cope with the horrible and immense physical and psychological effects of the abuse that they have endured.

As we look down the road for future VAWA reauthorizations, I urge my colleagues to focus on how we can take a more comprehensive look at domestic violence. Indeed, violence between family members and others related by special relations requires a dedication of resources to address problems that could be addressed by conflict management counseling and other mental health treatment. Indeed, juvenile justice data shows that families who are separated as a result of VAWA programs may also have an unintended consequence of contributing to juvenile delinquency, particularly amongst children of color, young boys in particular.

Together we must take a stand and work together for Women's rights, as well as the rights for families. We must work on building a brighter future, and make gender based and family based violence a thing of the past. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 738.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HIMES) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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:

H. Res. 6, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 459, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 59, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 260 will resume later in the week.

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

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL COACHES APPRECIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 6, 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 the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 6.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 696]

YEAS—388

Abercrombie	Bachmann	Berkley
Aderholt	Bachus	Berman
Adler (NJ)	Baird	Berry
Akin	Baldwin	Biggert
Altmire	Barrow	Bilbray
Andrews	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Arcuri	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Austria	Bean	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Becerra	Bishop (UT)

Souder	Tiaht	Watson	Brown-Waite,	Halvorson	Melancon	Slaughter	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Space	Tiberi	Watt	Ginny	Hare	Mica	Smith (NE)	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Speier	Tierney	Waxman	Buchanan	Harman	Michaud	Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Watson
Spratt	Titus	Weiner	Burton (IN)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Tiaht	Watt
Stark	Tonko	Welch	Burtonfield	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Snyder	Tiberi	Waxman
Stearns	Tsongas	Westmoreland	Calvert	Heinrich	Miller (NC)	Souder	Tierney	Weiner
Stupak	Turner	Wexler	Camp	Heller	Miller, Gary	Space	Titus	Welch
Sullivan	Upton	Whitfield	Campbell	Hensarling	Miller, George	Speier	Tonko	Westmoreland
Sutton	Van Hollen	Wilson (OH)	Cantor	Herger	Minnick	Spratt	Tsongas	Wexler
Taylor	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)	Cao	Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell	Stark	Turner	Whitfield
Teague	Visclosky	Wittman	Capito	Higgins	Moore (KS)	Stearns	Upton	Wilson (OH)
Terry	Walden	Wolf	Capps	Hill	Moore (WI)	Stupak	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (CA)	Walz	Wu	Cardoza	Himes	Moran (VA)	Sullivan	Velázquez	Wittman
Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Yarmuth	Carnahan	Hinchee	Murphy (CT)	Sutton	Visclosky	Wolf
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	Young (AK)	Carney	Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)	Taylor	Walden	Wu
Thornberry	Schultz		Carson (IN)	Hirono	Murphy, Patrick	Teague	Walz	Yarmuth
			Cassidy	Hodes	Murphy, Tim	Terry	Wamp	Young (AK)
			Castle	Holden	Murtha	Thompson (CA)		
			Castor (FL)	Holt	Myrick			

NOT VOTING—47

Abercrombie	Frelinghuysen	McMahon
Ackerman	Gerlach	Mollohan
Alexander	Grijalva	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Harper	Neal (MA)
Blumenauer	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Blunt	Hoyer	Rohrabacher
Boren	Israel	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Issa	Ryan (OH)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Buyer	Kennedy	Smith (WA)
Capuano	Kirk	Tanner
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Towns
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Waters
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Woolsey
DeGette	Markey (MA)	Young (FL)
Dicks	McHugh	

□ 1906

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 697, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SENIOR CAREGIVING

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. 59, as amended, 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 the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 59, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]
YEAS—387

Abercrombie	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Aderholt	Bean	Bono Mack
Adler (NJ)	Becerra	Boozman
Akin	Berkley	Boren
Altmire	Berman	Boswell
Andrews	Berry	Boucher
Arcuri	Biggett	Boustany
Austria	Bilbray	Boyd
Baca	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Bright
Baldwin	Blackburn	Broun (GA)
Barrow	Bocchieri	Brown (SC)
Bartlett	Boehner	

Castro (FL)	Chaffetz	Chandler	Childers	Chu	Clarke	Clay	Cleaver	Clyburn	Coble	Coffman (CO)	Cohen	Cole	Conaway	Connolly (VA)	Conyers	Cooper	Costa	Costello	Courtney	Crowley	Cuellar	Culberson	Cummings	Dahlkemper	Davis (AL)	Davis (CA)	Davis (KY)	Davis (TN)	DeFazio	Delahunt	DeLauro	Dent	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Dingell	Doggett	Donnelly (IN)	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)	Fudge	Gallegly	Garrett (NJ)	Giffords	Gingrey (GA)	Gohmert	Gonzalez	Goodlatte	Gordon (TN)	Granger	Graves	Grayson	Green, Al	Green, Gene	Griffith	Guthrie	Gutiérrez	Hall (NY)	Hall (TX)
-------------	----------	----------	----------	-----	--------	------	---------	---------	-------	--------------	-------	------	---------	---------------	---------	--------	-------	----------	----------	---------	---------	-----------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	---------	----------	---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	---------	---------	---------------	--------	----------	--------	--------------	--------------	--------	---------	-----------	---------	-------	-------	-----------	--------	------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------	-------------	--------	-----	------------	-------------	-------	----------	--------------	----------	--------------	---------	----------	-----------	-------------	---------	--------	---------	-----------	-------------	----------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Holden	Holt	Honda	Hunter	Inglis	Inslee	Jackson (IL)	Jackson-Lee	(TX)	Jenkins	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	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	LoBiondo	Loeb	Loeb	Lofgren, Zoe	Lowe	Lucas	Luetkemeyer	Lujan	Lummis	Lungren, Daniel	E.	Mack	Maffei	Maloney	Manzullo	Markey (CO)	Marshall	Massa	Matheson	Matsui	McCarthy (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	McCaul	McClintock	McCollum	McCotter	McDermott	McGovern	McHenry	McIntyre	McKeon	McMorris	Rodgers	McNerney	Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)
--------	------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------------	-------------	------	---------	--------------	--------------	----------------	-------	-------------	-------	-----------	--------	---------	--------	-----------------	--------	------	-----------	-----------	----------	------------------	---------	------------	------------	--------	----------	----------	---------	-------	----------	-------------	-------------	--------	------------	-------	----------	----------	-------	------------	------------	--------	----------	------	------	--------------	------	-------	-------------	-------	--------	-----------------	----	------	--------	---------	----------	-------------	----------	-------	----------	--------	---------------	---------------	--------	------------	----------	----------	-----------	----------	---------	----------	--------	----------	---------	----------	-----------	------------

Murphy (NY)	Murphy, Patrick	Murphy, Tim	Murtha	Myrick	Nadler (NY)	Napolitano	Neugebauer	Nunes	Nye	Oberstar	Obey	Olson	Olver	Ortiz	Pallone	Pascrell	Pastor (AZ)	Paul	Paulsen	Payne	Pence	Perlmutter	Perriello	Peters	Peterson	Petri	Pingree (ME)	Pitts	Platts	Poe (TX)	Polis (CO)	Pomeroy	Posey	Price (GA)	Price (NC)	Putnam	Quigley	Radanovich	Rahall	Rangel	Rehberg	Reichert	Reyes	Richardson	Rodriguez	Roe (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (MD)	Rooney	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam	Ross	Rothman (NJ)	Roybal-Allard	Royce	Ruppersberger	Ryan (WI)	Salazar	Sánchez, Linda	T.	Sanchez, Loretta	Sarbanes	Scalise	Schakowsky	Schauer	Schiff	Schmidt	Schock	Schrader	Schwartz	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Sessions	Sestak	Shadegg	Shea-Porter	Sherman	Shuler	Shuster	Simpson	Sires	Skelton
-------------	-----------------	-------------	--------	--------	-------------	------------	------------	-------	-----	----------	------	-------	-------	-------	---------	----------	-------------	------	---------	-------	-------	------------	-----------	--------	----------	-------	--------------	-------	--------	----------	------------	---------	-------	------------	------------	--------	---------	------------	--------	--------	---------	----------	-------	------------	-----------	----------	-------------	-------------	--------	--------------	--------	------	--------------	---------------	-------	---------------	-----------	---------	----------------	----	------------------	----------	---------	------------	---------	--------	---------	--------	----------	----------	------------	------------	---------------	---------	----------	--------	---------	-------------	---------	--------	---------	---------	-------	---------

NOT VOTING—46

Ackerman	Frelinghuysen	Mollohan
Alexander	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Blumenauer	Harper	Rogers (KY)
Blunt	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Rush
Burgess	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Buyer	Issa	Shimkus
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)
Carter	Kirk	Tanner
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Towns
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Waters
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Woolsey
DeGette	Markey (MA)	Young (FL)
Dicks	McHugh	
Doyle	McMahon	

□ 1914

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent 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.

ELIMINATE PAY-TO-PLAY CONTRACTS

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 3427, the State Ethics Law Protection Act.

In a day and age where indictments and allegations of wrongdoing have become all too common, in fact, in Illinois, people read the scandal du jour in their newspaper. In this event, many States and local governments have enacted laws to eliminate awarding contracting based on pay-to-play, a practice of trading campaign contributions for lucrative government contracts.

Sadly, a loophole in the Federal Highway Administration's contracting requirements is making it difficult, if not impossible, for States to implement these anti-corruption laws if they want to continue to receive Federal highway support. It is up to us in Washington to make sure that our constituents are best served and their taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely.

By amending the Federal Highway Administration's contracting requirements, we in Washington can ensure that States have every tool at their disposal to encourage and ensure transparency and accountability. Please join me in supporting H.R. 3427, the State Ethics Law Protection Act, to ensure our dollars are being spent efficiently and effectively.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN MONTESSORI SCHOOL

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this month Lincoln Montessori School of Nebraska is celebrating its 40th anniversary. Started in 1969 by Mary and Larry Verschuur, Lincoln Montessori School is one of the first schools in the United States to be custom built to facilitate the Montessori curriculum. The school has served hundreds of families over two generations and is fully a part of Nebraska's diverse educational community.

Forty years later, Mary and Larry are still the school's motivating force. They guide young children daily with beautiful and purposeful materials, offer after-school enrichment classes for older children, conduct classes to help parents understand and implement the Montessori philosophy, and lecture on education in Nebraska and around the world. The result: children who are self-directed and self-disciplined, joyful, and eager to learn. The children are free to discover the world.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the First District of Nebraska and the United States Congress, I thank the Verschuurs, two extraordinary people, for their dedication to the formation of young children and congratulate them on the 40th anniversary of Lincoln Montessori School in Nebraska.

WELCOMING HOME PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN

(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 praise Pennsylvania National Guardsmen who just arrived home after serving 8 months in Iraq. Members of the 56th Stryker Brigade Combat Team's First Battalion 112th Infantry have arrived at Ft. Dix, New Jersey. Some 1,500 U.S. flags will line their route, along with countless yellow ribbons placed by Pennsylvanians who want to show their thanks.

The soldiers come from Crawford County and from the cities of Bradford and Ridgway. Earlier, guardsmen from the 2nd 112th Regiment Infantry Regiment from Bellefonte and Lewistown came home.

The brigade operated in 800 square miles that was home to 900,000 Iraqis. They captured some 80 hidden supply dumps, causing severe shortages and disrupting enemy operations.

As these men and women are reunited with their families, we realize the sacrifices they have made. The child's birth that they missed, the report cards, the joys of a sports milestone, they can't replace those lost moments. But we can pause and stop and

say thank you, and God bless and welcome home.

STOP THE INNOVATION TAX

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue the debate on health care, we must remain cognizant of the impact on both jobs and health care innovation.

That's why I strongly oppose the new \$40 billion innovation tax on the medical device industry that's being proposed in the Senate. Minnesota, and the Third Congressional District in particular, is home to many of the top medical device manufacturers responsible for life-saving technologies. Hundreds of small businesses and entrepreneurs in the medical technology field also call Minnesota home.

I visited and I have met with many of these entrepreneurs. They are hard working. They are employers that provide tens of thousands of good-paying jobs for Minnesotans. Moreover, these medical breakthroughs save money, and they improve the quality of care.

A massive new tax increase will stifle job growth. It will stifle innovation, and it will ultimately harm quality health care. I strongly urge the Senate, the President, and my colleagues to oppose this misguided new tax.

THE PEOPLE'S RESISTANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, freedom's bell has sounded across this Nation. It is loud; it is clear. The people's resistance to big, bloated government has begun in the hearts and minds of the American people.

It was shown in their actions over the weekend. Over a million Americans took time off from work, gathered up their families, made their signs, brought their flags and came to D.C. with the cry for government to listen. Their message to Congress and the administration: We have had enough.

They have watched in stunned horror as this Congress has made government bigger and less accountable. Congress has lavishly spent trillions of their tax dollars, money that does not belong to the government, but to the people.

Now the threat of a government takeover of their health care has made it personal to them. It doesn't matter how many times it's said otherwise, the American people understand what government-run health care looks like, and they don't like it.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." But the tide is turning, Mr. Speaker. The American resistance is awake and on its feet and on the move. People are not happy, and we ignore them at our own risk.

And that's just the way it is.

CZARS IN THIS ADMINISTRATION

(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, as I have been in my own district and spoken with many individuals who have attended my townhall meetings, they have exercised their right to bring their grievances before this Member of Congress.

And one of the issues they have talked about is the question of the constitutional importance of these so-called czars. We now have over 30 czars in this administration, those that have not been subject to the scrutiny of consideration by the United States Senate, those who apparently have decision-making responsibility in areas, who have traditionally been in Cabinet level officers, and others who have in fact been vetted by the Senate. It seems the longer I am here the more it appears that political life in Washington seems to follow art.

Now, you might say we have come to a situation in Washington, D.C. in which we now have a new show. It's called "Dancing with the Czars." It could last more than a full TV season because we have more than 30 of them. It can continue on into the summer. It's not a joke, it's serious, and the American people deserve answers.

PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY WANT TO CUT SPENDING

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this weekend on national television, Mr. Axelrod, who works for the President at the White House, said that the big meeting on the Mall really didn't amount to much, and it really didn't represent what the American people think.

I don't know what that guy is smoking down at the White House, but I think it might be illegal.

The people in this country at the TEA parties and on the Mall this weekend are telling every Member of Congress and in the Senate they want to cut spending. They don't want more government intrusion into their lives, and they want just to be left alone.

But this body here, and my colleagues on the Democrat side, continue to come up with new proposals, new spending, and we are spending trillions and trillions of dollars that we simply don't have. And our kids are going to bear the responsibility for that because we are not doing our job.

And, secondly, I just wanted to say one more thing. This ACORN group needs to be investigated. They are getting access to almost \$10 billion, and we know there are an awful lot of

crooked things going on. It needs to be investigated by this body. My colleagues on the Democrat side, who are the chairmen of the committees, need to listen.

We need to investigate ACORN.

LEHMAN BROTHERS COLLAPSE

(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, it was 1 year ago today that Lehman Brothers collapsed. And as we mark this 1-year anniversary, it is also with trepidation that we remark that the Federal Government today is the leading insurer, the leading lender, and the leading carmaker in the United States, the Federal Government.

Since the inception of Bailout Nation less than 1 year ago today, an economist from Arizona State University has documented, today the Federal Government owns or controls 30 percent of private business profits. That's right, 30 percent. And if President Obama gets his way and nationalizes an additional 18 percent of private wealth in the health care industry, that would be nearly 50 percent of private business profits.

Think of that, 50 percent of private business profits nationalized in less than 1 year's time. We can do better. Let's enjoy freedom. Let's embrace freedom and let's say no to Bailout Nation and to the Federal Government taking over the private economy.

And let's investigate ACORN.

HONORING NASA

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago we celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Apollo mission for NASA, and we are excited as a Nation to think of the brightness and the genius of our country.

Tomorrow, before the Science and Technology Committee, the author of the "Augustine Report" will present his findings regarding NASA. As a representative from the Houston area, where the Johnson Space Center is, I encourage America to be that same genius.

Let's continue manned space flight and continue our exploration in space, as well as our support for the international space station. Out of those efforts come new inventions, new cures for diseases, and new opportunities for the genius of America to be seen around the world. We must continue manned space flight.

Supporting the space centers in Florida and Alabama, California, Mississippi and Texas, I know America can achieve for the future.

□ 1930

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.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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, a few days ago, there was a townhall meeting not too far from here in Reston, Virginia. Over 3,000 people were inside and about that many outside who could not get into the school. Now this townhall event was held at South Lakes High School, and one of the security officers there, a Wesley Cheeks, Jr., did not like one of the signs that the protesters were carrying and holding up. The sign apparently was not to the officer's political liking.

So the security officer demanded that out of the thousands of signs at the event, the one he didn't like was going to come down, and he ordered the person to take it down because it was obviously critical of the administration. Note, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing illegal about the sign.

This officer told the man with the sign to put his sign away or he would be arrested. Yes, arrested for freedom of speech and the right to protest. The protester said, This used to be America. Officer Weeks said in response, Well, it isn't any more, okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not "okay." Not by a long shot. This is still America, the land of the free—the land where we can disagree with government, whether government likes it or not—the land paid for in blood by bold men of noble character and heart and noble action, who understood that free speech undergirds liberty and freedom. They understood that the right to speak the truth to authoritarian power is granted by the Almighty to those bold enough to stand and claim that right. No king, no government, no dictator, and no high school security officer has the right to abuse their authority and suppress freedom of speech.

One of the founding principles of this Nation is freedom of speech. It is so fundamentally important that our Founding Fathers put it first in our Constitution's Bill of Rights, made it the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights, because it is the most important. Without the First Amendment, the rest are meaningless.

The First Amendment simply says, Congress—that's us, folks—shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of the people to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

It is the tendency of all governments to encroach upon the rights of people in this Nation, and other nations. And while many Americans are going about their daily business of work, taking their kids to school, to football practice, to Boy Scouts, grocery shopping, and going to dinner, mowing the grass, and living their lives, don't underestimate that these people are paying attention to what government is doing to them.

Freedom of speech is crucial for folks to get the attention of fellow Americans when the size of government no longer fits the Constitution. Freedom of speech is sacrosanct, and not just for those who agree with government, but it is a holy right, especially for those who disagree with government oppression.

It is the right of a free people to speak truth when the government is wrong. It is the right of the people to gather and stand in the face of their elected officials and speak what they see—tyranny of a government gone amok.

It is the right of a self-governing people to come together in cities around the Nation to speak out and to hold the government accountable when those who seek to rule over us have stepped out of their constitutional bounds.

There can be no more fundamental display of our God-given right to freedom of speech than what we're seeing from the American Resistance Movement today. From townhalls to city streets, the right of free speech is one of the very guardians of the freedom and liberty that make this Nation the greatest in history. And it is the government that would do well to listen, be silent, and then act in the interest of the American people.

And that's just the way it is.

START OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 1-year anniversary of the fall of Lehman Brothers. Just prior to that, former Treasury Secretary and former Goldman Sachs executive Hank Paulson; Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke; and then-President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and now Treasury Secretary, Tim Geithner, bailed out Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and orchestrated the first of multiple tranches of taxpayer money to AIG.

Some mark the fall of Lehman as the start of our financial crisis, but it started long before. It started on Wall Street, the very place that President Obama gave his financial regulatory reform speech today. The President stated, Restoring a willingness to take responsibility—even when it is hard—is at the heart of what we must do. Very carefully worded, Mr. President. But what real reform will assure it?

Willing to take responsibility. Mr. President, Wall Street has responsibility for the greed they bred, for ripping off American taxpayers and taking exorbitant profits, destroying anything and anyone in its path, and then taking more bonuses and continuing to live their high life.

Wall Street will never willingly and openly accept its responsibility for their role in our financial system's downfall. It's our responsibility to hold them accountable.

It is too late to ask Wall Street to play nice and make reforms. They had their chance, and they blew it. You can be sure they are going to pay millions to lobbyists and PACs to protect their bonuses, loopholes, their safety nets, and the current structure of banking in this country.

It's time to face down Wall Street and stand up for Main Street. The time spent waiting for Wall Street's willingness to change is over. The results of the taxpayer bailout are clear: More profits for Wall Street, plus massive bonuses, while foreclosures skyrocket across this country.

Wall Street had its chance to open credit lines to business, as well as to direct funds they got from the taxpayers to help millions of families facing foreclosure work out those loans, but instead they took the money for themselves and racked up huge profits in the last quarter.

Wall Street had its chance to be responsible as stewards of the tax dollars they got. They failed. They didn't even try. Wall Street banks cannot even tell us where the TARP dollars, that is, the taxpayer dollars, went.

The arms of their businesses which service loans are moving at a snail's pace to help people find ways to work out their mortgages. Why? Because they can make more money when loans are delinquent. The pace of loaning to businesses and people is almost stuck. What are fast and furious are the payouts of bonuses and profits.

Wall Street executives like Lloyd Blankfein of Goldman Sachs are waltzing around the changes they should make around compensation and bonuses, but talk is cheap because it costs them nothing. It's a good press release. Name me one Wall Street money-center bank that has restructured its compensation structures. Wall Street is fighting to have custom credit default swaps and other derivative instruments remain unregulated in the coming reforms.

This moment in history marks the time for each Member of Congress and public servants at the FDIC, the SEC, the Federal Reserve, the Treasury, and associated regulators to act and create the kind of reform that creates a credit system which stands strong for generations and contains moral hazard.

Will America allow itself once again to be bought out by Wall Street? Or will we stand together thoughtfully, deliberately to empower regulators and to reform this system with a new bank-

ing system that respects communities, encourages savings, assures sound credit? Will we break up the megabank trusts or continue to allow the concentration of financial power in the few greedy hands that are holding it today? Will we move forward with a stronger, more creative, more prudent, more sound community-oriented financial system again?

It's time to work on a bipartisan basis to do this. We can't race. We have to debate real financial reform here, not cosmetic bills that are brought up on this floor. We must share the rationale behind reform and make it real. And we must shift the balance of credit power from Wall Street back to Main Street and the American people.

The challenge is crystal clear. The question is: Do we have the will to do it here—to create a financial regulatory system again for the betterment of all people in our Nation, to strengthen community lending and sound and prudent credit practices at the local level and, in turn, the world's financial system? The jury is out.

THE URGENCY OF PREVENTING IRAN FROM ACQUIRING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week we commemorated a sad anniversary of the September 11th attacks on our Nation. On that fateful day 8 years ago, we realized that protecting our homeland and defeating our enemies would require innovative approaches and an unconventional view of the threats that we face. However, when looking at the Iranian nuclear threat, it would appear that some have forgotten the lessons of 9/11.

Many believe that because Iran has not yet mastered all of the elements needed for an operational nuclear weapon, we have the luxury of time. Mr. Speaker, that is not so. Iran has already produced 1,400 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, which can easily be used for a "dirty nuke."

As former President Clinton noted in the year 2005, if you have basically a cookie's worth of fissile material and you put it into a traditional bomb, you can amplify the destruction power by hundreds-fold or more.

So the nuclear threat from Iran already exists in a radiological form. Yet, the U.S. and the U.N. Security Council have actually lowered the requirements imposed on the Iranian regime with respect to its nuclear activities. The initial U.S. position with respect to Iran's nuclear program was to demand its complete, verifiable, irreversible dismantlement. Then it went down to a mere temporary suspension of uranium enrichment. And now, reportedly, only a commitment from the Iranian regime that they will not use growing supplies of enriched uranium to make nuclear weapons.

This, as a U.S. government official was quoted as saying just last week, "Iran is now either very near or in possession already of sufficient low-enriched uranium to produce one nuclear weapon" and is closer "to a dangerous and destabilizing possible breakout capacity." And this means a breakout capacity for producing not a dirty nuke but a conventional nuclear weapon.

Iran is pouring enormous resources into its nuclear program. Its missiles can already strike U.S. forces, can strike Israel and our allies in the Middle East and Europe, and it is only a matter of time until it has the capability to hit us here at home.

Inexcusably, one administration after another has not fully implemented the range of sanctions that are called for in current U.S. law, nor have we leveraged our resources to secure cooperation from our allies, particularly those on the U.N. Security Council. And this year we have filed another bill for another range of sanctions on Iran, and we have yet to get that bill out of committee, in spite of over 300 sponsors for that bill.

Next week at the United Nations in New York, for the first time a President of the United States will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council. The Council will be holding a special summit on the general issue of nuclear nonproliferation, but will ignore the actions of specific countries such as Iran.

The U.S. will also not use its presidency on the Security Council this month to pursue further sanctions targeting the Iranian regime. In fact, rather than using our platform at the U.N. to urge immediate action against the regime, the U.S. has again succumbed to Iranian manipulation.

Joined by France, Germany, Britain, Russia, and China, we will meet with the regime in Brussels on October 1 to resolve the disputes over Tehran's nuclear program.

Let's get this straight. As the threat posed by the Iranian regime increases, as the Iranian regime inches closer to weaponizing its nuclear program, the response from the so-called international community is to schedule more talks—legitimizing the regime by engaging them directly.

By its own statements, the regime is committed to the destruction of Israel and the U.S. as well. Ahmadinejad has repeatedly denied the existence of the Holocaust, called for Israel be wiped off the map, spoken of achieving "a world without America and Zionism."

□ 1945

Iran is also the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, assisted the attacks on our soldiers and continues to this day in Iraq and Afghanistan, and poses a growing threat to the Persian Gulf, a major source of the world's oil. This threat is becoming global, as Tehran expands its presence and influence throughout the Middle East and South and Central Asia and right here

in Latin America as well as Africa. But right here in our own hemisphere, one need look no further than the 1994 bombing of the Jewish community center in Argentina, Buenos Aires, to demonstrate Iran's willingness and ability to attack targets half a world away.

In July, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called for even stricter sanctions on Iran to try to change the behavior of the regime. I couldn't agree more, but we need them now. Let's act now.

TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS ABOUT THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor the United States Constitution. Earlier today, the House unanimously passed my bill, House Resolution 686, the Teach the Constitution Week resolution. Congressman RON PAUL and I combined our efforts on this important legislation because society is losing its knowledge of our Nation's most fundamental principles. The Constitution lays out the tenets of our Republic, and House Resolution 686 specifically proposes that seniors in high school across the Nation be taught about the Constitution at the start of their senior year in high school for 1 week.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is the highest law of the land. If we're not teaching our children about a document so fundamental to our Nation's past, present and future, then what are we teaching them? Too many Americans have no real understanding of the principles of this historic document. More teenagers can name the judges of American Idol and more teenagers can name the Three Stooges than can name the three branches of our government. This is a true disservice to our Nation and its citizens, and this is the reason why we should promote a better understanding of the Constitution on the part of our Nation's youth.

The resolution also encourages seniors to petition the government on an issue of personal importance to them to demonstrate their understanding of their rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States. They can write letters, organize a trip to Washington, D.C., to see Congress in action, or call their Representatives to voice their opinions about bills and laws in which they have an interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to say that earlier this afternoon, the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 686, just 3 days before we celebrate Constitution Day, which marks the 222nd anniversary of the original signing of the U.S. Constitution by members of the Constitutional Convention on September 17, 1787.

I want to thank the 222 Representatives who signed on as cosponsors of this bipartisan bill. I hope that it will

help to reinforce the great importance of the U.S. Constitution to our Nation.

THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS' VIEWS ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, like many Members in the House, I spent a good part of August visiting with people in the 19th Congressional District that sent me here. I had several coffees all across my district. One of the things that they spoke loud and clear of is that they are very concerned about the direction of their country. And as I listened to the President's speech and I listened to some of his advisers, they think these people are not Main Street America, that they are somehow disillusioned. Well, they are disillusioned. They are disillusioned with our government. They see their government bailing out banks. They see their government bailing out car companies. They see their government taking over every aspect of their lives and now wants to take over our health care. I want to read you some of the comments from the people of the 19th Congressional District.

Janie from Lubbock, Texas: "I am self-employed and pay my taxes. I firmly believe we currently have way too much government in our business and daily lives."

Jennifer from Wolfforth, Texas: "Keep the government out of our health care. Remind them of our broken systems, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. We don't need another one."

Bobby from Lubbock: "I do not want the government to run my health care. America does not need any more debt."

Rick from Lubbock asked this question: "Why can't government cut back on its spending like the rest of us have to?"

Nelma from Lubbock: "My husband and I were born into very poor families. We were able to realize the American Dream. I want this opportunity for the upcoming generations."

Michael from Lubbock: "Reform is definitely necessary, but not the kind that has been proposed."

James from Lubbock: "Read, understand and apply the Constitution." A novel idea, James.

Mandy from Lubbock: "We want to keep our great insurance that we pay premiums for. We don't want to have our tax dollars fund another fiasco and become another Canada."

Holly from Wolfforth: "Stop the spending. When I was deeply in debt, I stopped buying, worked hard and paid for things slowly but surely. I am out of debt now. I did not ask anyone to print money for me or pay for me."

John from Lubbock: "Promise us that you will sign yourself, your family on the same plan that you force us into."

Grace from Lubbock: "I hope you have listened to the many people here in Lubbock who do not have health insurance and who cannot afford it."

James from Lubbock: "The U.S. Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government, in particular, should limit their reach to what is allowed by our Founding Fathers' documents."

Robert from Lubbock: "We must stop this crazy deficit spending and borrowing."

Marilyn from Lubbock: "I hope that you will find a way to use the programs already available to cover all Americans."

Rosalie from Lubbock: "Government is spending too much money. Back off."

Larry from Lubbock: "In the bill there is language limiting the growth of physician-owned hospitals. These hospitals are able to supply health care services more efficiently than other community-based larger hospitals. I am against this bill."

Sandra from Lubbock: "We need to slow things down and people need to read all of the bill before doing any voting."

Kayla from Lubbock, who attended with her grandmother: "I am 9 years old, and I am wondering why the heck you're spending my future. Thank you for listening."

Ron from Lubbock: "When my kids were in college, my friends called me the ATM. I don't know the President. I don't want to be his ATM."

George from Lubbock: "As Big Government continues to expand, there is a commensurate loss of individual freedom, accompanied by excessive spending and an amassing of a ridiculous deficit."

Michelle from Lubbock: "I am a RN in a local emergency room. I am personally against the health care bill. How do we fix overcrowding of ERs? ER nurses are working twice as hard and seeing twice as many patients compared to the past."

Jack from Lubbock, "Say 'no' to the government health care and protect our borders."

Joel from Lubbock: "Please say 'no' to all excessive spending. Some of it does not fit with our Constitution."

Susan from Lubbock: "I have been an RN for 34 years. I am tired of seeing patients turned away due to lack of insurance. This takes such a toll on families and health care providers."

Mary from Lubbock: "Please do all that you can to keep health care in our hands, not the government."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, these are not people that are off on some tangent. These are people that are concerned about their country. They are concerned that the government is taking over every aspect of their lives. They're concerned that we are mortgaging the future of their children and their grandchildren. They're concerned that their personal liberties and freedoms are at risk.

Mr. President and Madam Speaker, it's time to listen to the American people and quit giving speeches.

CORRUPTION IN ACORN

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. You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that concerns me is that the more liberal media seems to ignore some of the things that are extremely important to the people of this country and to the freedoms we enjoy and the money that's being spent by the Congress.

This weekend and today I watched a number of these shows that I watch on a regular basis because those of us in this body, we follow the news very, very closely. Mr. Glenn Beck, Sean Hannity and Mr. O'Reilly, who are all on FOX, focused attention over the past few weeks on this ACORN organization. It's really interesting to find out that ACORN, which helped the President get elected, was such a strong force for him and whom he congratulated on the support they gave him, and he told them he wanted to work with them and he wanted to have their advice on issues of major concern. So he's very close to ACORN.

ACORN, which received \$53 million from 1993 until now—that's 16 years. They received \$53 million over 16 years. This year, they now have access to \$8.5 billion. Now, I mean, that's a heck of a reward, it seems like to me, for being supportive of the administration. Then Mr. FRANK, on the Banking Committee, puts legislation through, which has passed the House, that would give them access to an additional \$1.5 billion. That's \$10 billion ACORN has access to.

If you were watching any of these television shows in the last week, you'll see that some people went in and they posed as a prostitute and a man who was soliciting for a prostitute. I think they call him a pimp. They asked the advice of ACORN, and ACORN gave them advice on how to circumvent the law, how to hide what they were doing from the law, how they could make money and not report it to the Government of the United States.

Then these people asked, Well, we want to bring some young people in from South America. They're underage, and we want them to work for us in this prostitution ring. The people at ACORN said—and there were two or three of them—they said, Well, here's how you do it. And they explained to them how they could claim them as children or dependents and expand their ring of prostitution. This is all documented. It's on television, and it's in the papers—some papers, very few. Yet ACORN is going to get almost \$10 billion.

They have been involved in other nefarious activities, and they were supposed to work on the Census. Can you imagine? The way the States get

money from the Federal Government is based, in large part, on the Census that's taken—how many people live in a congressional district, how many people live in a State—and the money that comes from the Federal Government is divvied up, in large part, on the basis of the Census.

So ACORN was going to have a major role in working to count the number of people throughout the country and, in effect, decide where this money is going to be going. This is an organization that has a tremendous amount of corruption. They're finding more and more corruption every single day, and the taxpayers of this country are allowing them, through the Congress, to have access to almost \$10 billion of our taxpayers' dollars. That is insane.

We've asked the Congress and leaders of the Democrat Party, the chairmen of these various committees, to hold hearings on this, to have an investigation, and we have yet to have any investigation whatsoever, not one. So today I wrote a letter to Chairman TOWNS of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, who is a very good friend of mine and a very fair man. I have asked Chairman TOWNS to have an investigation into ACORN.

When you're talking about \$10 billion of the taxpayers' money going to an organization that we know has been involved in various nefarious activities and that we know has been involved in corruption, we certainly should at least look into what they're doing and stop them from using taxpayers' dollars to do these things.

This is something that we shouldn't allow anybody to shovel under the rug. The administration should take responsibility for conducting an investigation and pushing for it, and the Members of Congress on the majority side that has the chairmanships in both the House and the Senate need to push very hard for an investigation, and we need to do it now. We need not to give them one dime until that investigation is completed.

CAREFULLY CRAFTING HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we're having a debate on the issue of health care and a lot of different ideas and different things are being passed around, I think it's really important that we look at the real reason why we need to make reforms to our health care system in America.

Clearly there are problems with health care, but there are very narrow problems with people who don't have the ability and the access to get health care at an affordable price. What we need to do is focus on fixing the problems in the system that don't work, but at the same time, we need to be very careful not to destroy the things

that make medical care in the United States the best medical care in the world.

I think what concerns many of us is this proposal of a government takeover of our health care system where the government would come in all under the guise of competing against private companies. Of course anybody that understands what competition really means and who looks at the concept of the Federal Government, with taxpayer backing, coming in as your competitor when they write the rules that both of you have to play by—they've got this health care czar that they're creating in their bill, which, by the way, I think the count is up to over 30 czars now created in this administration.

We need to sunset these czars. We need to get rid of these czars. We shouldn't have people with these unbridled powers that have absolutely no accountability to the public, did not go through the scrutiny of the normal process that a cabinet secretary or high-ranking official would have to go through with Senate confirmation, testifying before committees and being answerable to the American people. Yet you've got these czars with these powers, and now they're trying to create a health care czar that would literally have the ability to make major decisions over individual families' health care.

□ 2000

I think it's very important to go through and talk about some of these claims that are being made because they are claims that are being made that completely are contradicted by the bills that we have before us in the Congress that are brought by and supported by this President and this administration.

One of the first claims that's been made a whole lot is if you like the health care you have, you can keep it. Now, personally I think that's a very important claim. I think that's one of the sacred parts of health care that we should maintain. If people like the health care they have, they should keep it. The problem is in the bill that President Obama supports in the House, the only bill this administration, Speaker PELOSI, and others are promoting, is H.R. 3200. In that bill, in fact, on page 15 of that bill, they give the power to the health care czar, again an unappointed bureaucrat, a person who did not go through any confirmation process, who was just appointed by the President, who is wholly unaccountable to Congress, this health care czar would have the power to decertify private plans.

That's right. That means if you have a health care policy you like, the health care czar, in their bill, has the power to take away your health care plan even if you do like it. It's in their bill. We actually tried to take that out in committee.

Another claim that's been made a whole lot that was made here on this

House floor deals with the issue of illegal immigration and do illegal aliens have access to health care. Now, many have claimed that illegal aliens wouldn't be able to get health care in their bill. The problem is, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's bill allows 8 million illegal aliens to have access to his government-run health care plan. That testimony was given by the Congressional Budget Office. That's not a Republican or a Democrat who said that. That's the bipartisan group that we actually have to follow who scores these bills, who makes a determination whether or not these statements are accurate. The Congressional Budget Office has said 8 million illegal aliens would have access to this government plan that the President is supporting, H.R. 3200.

And there are a lot of other claims that are similar to those that are just not accurate. One of the ones that's thrown around a lot by the President and others is this straw man that we've got to fix health care and if we don't pass his bill, then everybody else is for the status quo if they're not for his bill, if they don't want the government to take it over.

That's not true. If you look at the bills that are out there, there are many bills that I and others support that are very different approaches than the bill that the President and Speaker PELOSI support. One good one is H.R. 3400. H.R. 3400 has nearly 40 Members of Congress that are cosponsors, including four medical doctors, people that really understand the problems in health care. In our bill we actually address the problems that exist. We address the problems with preexisting conditions. I don't think it's fair or right that somebody can be denied health care coverage because they're battling maybe a disease like cancer or some other tragic disease that in the current system they are currently discriminated against. We fix that problem in our bill. We invoke real competition, but it's not by bringing in the government; it's by allowing people to buy across State lines and have competition.

So we need to address these problems in a real, honest way.

THE NATION'S CURRENT FINANCIAL SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, the context of my remarks is engaging the issue of the current financial situation that the United States finds itself in.

Mr. Speaker, it was less than 1 year ago that the government began Bailout Nation, which was \$700 billion in tax money that was given to the United States Treasury Secretary for the purpose of stabilizing America's financial situation. Let's take just a brief history of what has happened in the United States in just less than 1 year's time.

This Congress appropriated essentially a blank check to the Treasury Secretary of \$700 billion, a blank check. The Treasury Secretary literally could do anything he wanted to do with that \$700 billion. That \$700 billion went to the Treasury Secretary. It's gone to bail out banks. It's gone to bail out an insurance company, and it has gone to set up the automobile task force.

In that time we have seen \$700 billion go not only for that bailout; we also saw \$29 billion go to Bear Stearns to shore up that investment banking house. We also saw \$200 billion go for Fannie and Freddie, the secondary mortgage company, because, remember, all of this began with a meltdown in the housing industry. So we thought, first of all, money needed to go to bail out the secondary mortgage provider.

Almost all loans today in the United States are now backed up by the Federal Government. This is amazing what has happened to our country in less than 1 year's time. We saw over \$100 billion of our tax money go to bail out the largest insurance company in the United States, AIG. Still the United States taxpayer has yet to be repaid the money for AIG. We have yet to be made whole.

We have yet to be made whole for the money that was extended to General Motors and Chrysler. That's tens of billions of dollars that were given to the car companies. We were told that we had to give them tens of billions so they wouldn't go into bankruptcy. Well, lo and behold, what happened? Both GM and Chrysler went into bankruptcy.

We were told that we had to give all of this money to Freddie and Fannie so that they won't go into bankruptcy, and we continue to pour taxpayer money into Freddie and Fannie. Not only that, the American taxpayer was told to give another \$75 billion in mortgage bailout money.

At what point do we say enough is enough? Two hundred billion dollars for the secondary mortgage company, another \$75 billion for mortgage bailout. But that wasn't enough because the American taxpayers were told we needed to give a trillion dollars in stimulus programs. A trillion dollars. That money hasn't been completely let out, thank God. Every penny that hasn't let out at this point should be reeled back in, and we shouldn't be committing any more of that money.

We also agreed in this body to spend another \$400 billion in an end-of-the-year budget gap that we were able to shore up.

At this point we know the Congressional Budget Office has said that our country will be in deficit \$1.6 trillion this year, and it may get worse. How do we know that? Unemployment is at 9.7 percent, and President Obama's own economic adviser has said if we pass his version of the government takeover of health care, we will lose 5.5 million

more jobs. We have lost 4 million jobs. If we pass President Obama's health care reform, by his numbers, we will lose another 5.5 million jobs. And if we pass his national energy tax, the cap-and-trade bill, this energy tax, by President Obama's own numbers, will cost our economy an additional 2.5 million jobs lost every year going forward. This doesn't seem to be working for us as we look at this 1-year anniversary of Lehman Brothers collapsing.

So now the Federal Government owns or controls 30 percent of all private business profits. And if President Obama gets his way and takes over another 18 percent of our economy in health care, that means the Federal Government will own or control 48 percent of private business profits. Just think, a year ago 100 percent of private business profits were private. Today we're looking at the specter of 48 percent of private business profits owned or controlled by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, that's why the American people are nervous. That's why they don't want government to own or control any more of our economy.

GOSPEL MUSIC, FOREIGN POLICY, AND HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have some joyous moments in this body, and I am delighted to say that we will have that tomorrow.

Gospel music is part of America's culture, and I was very pleased to pass the legislation, House Joint Resolution 12, to acknowledge gospel music as part of the great culture of America.

Tomorrow here in this House, we will celebrate the gospel music heritage legislation that was passed in this House and in the Senate by my colleague and friend Senator BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN. And we will celebrate it with the wonderful sound of Richard Smallwood.

We have the privilege and honor of celebrating this cultural aspect of America reaching from the East to the West, from the North to the South, in places like Nashville, Tennessee; to Iowa; to Atlanta, Georgia; to Houston, Texas; to New York, New York; and places in California and around this Nation. We had the pleasure of celebrating it at the Kennedy Center. Bryon Cage and the Ebenezer Choir, AME Church, was there on Saturday evening celebrating gospel music heritage.

We're excited about it. And we thank our House leadership for helping us pass this honoring of those wonderful gospel musicians that all of us have enjoyed over the years and decades: some starting out or gaining their rock and roll status like Elvis Presley from their original origins of gospel music

or Al Green, the gospel singer, or Mahalia Jackson or Marian Anderson or Yolanda Adams. So many great gospel singers have given all of us joy no matter from whence we have come.

So I would like to thank the House leadership. I would like to thank the majority leader and his staff and Chairman TOWNS and the ranking member of the Government Oversight Committee, all of whom helped this day come to fruition.

As we move into issues that require our attention, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly on our position in Afghanistan. Tomorrow I will have the opportunity to join in listening to Ambassador Holbrooke, who has just returned back from Afghanistan, and I would like to offer these thoughts.

I do believe that Afghanistan is very important to the United States, and after 9/11 it was important to respond to the attack on this Nation. But now I think it is important to emphasize a diplomatic surge and the stand-down of the military soldiers, all who are valiantly working there. I believe it is important to allow the Afghan people, through the building of schools and roads and through the building of the Afghan Army, to take control of their own security. We cannot allow this to be a 20-year war as it was with Russia, and the Afghan people must stand up.

Some may say it is not the time, that it is a difficult time. And they are right, because instead of pursuing the cause in Afghanistan, over the last 8 years we failed and detoured into Iraq, Iraq that took thousands of American lives and still unfortunately and tragically struggles today with democracy and leadership in their own country. But I do believe it is time for a surge of diplomacy in Afghanistan, and I am going to work with my colleagues to see this happen.

I wish to mention Iran, as well, as the General Assembly gathers in the United Nations and particularly to focus on Camp Ashraf that has displaced Iranians. These individuals are in Iraq and they are subject to abuse. I'm calling upon the administration to demand for the people that are displaced that happen to be Iranians who are in Iraq to be treated with human dignity and for that camp to be protected and for the Iraqi military to protect that camp and not allow the intrusion into that camp and the rampage that's going on and the attack on women and children. Enough is enough. If Iraq claims itself to be a democracy, it is important.

I also call upon the General Assembly to comment on the abuses in Iran, the human rights abuse, the press abuse, the lack of freedom of press. Even as we debate this question of nuclear proliferation, we should not allow the kinds of abuses that are going on in Iran.

As I move to the domestic issue, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we clarify that health care is some-

thing that America wants. Sixty percent of the American people want health care. And as I was coming here to Washington, I met someone, Mrs. Wallace, in the airport who indicated that her son will have to have surgery costing a million dollars, and she pleaded that we get our job done. I said I would take her message to Washington, D.C. She was sending off her sister going to New Zealand. They have not been hampered by a program that is, in essence, underwritten by the government, but we're not asking for a program to be underwritten by the government; we are asking for people to have choice. But more importantly, we are asking to have an option, a public option, that will provide for the competitiveness that is so very important in providing health care for all Americans.

Let's stop all the myths and the attacks, and let's have an evenhanded debate to recognize that a public option provides for competition.

□ 2015

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying we have celebrated this 1 year with the Lehman Brothers, but I will say to you that we have to have a recovery that makes sense, and this administration is working on it.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 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 Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as some people might know and some of my col-

leagues know, I have been appearing before this House for the leadership hour now for approximately 12 weeks, and I have been talking about this House of hypocrisy that we seem to be thriving in here as we have all of these issues that involve multiple people concerning ethical issues, and in some instances maybe even criminal issues that need to be addressed. I have raised the issue because I want to remind the leadership of this House that if we don't address these issues, we are failing in our duty as Members of Congress.

As we sit here with the Democrat majority blasting JOE WILSON for a very inadvertent outcry in the House of Representatives, we seem to have forgotten what I have been talking about for the last 12 weeks which is Chairman CHARLIE RANGEL's decades of tax evasion and ethics violations that have been raised over and over on the floor of this House. This is the ultimate of hypocrisy. So I am going to talk about it again tonight. I think it is important that we listen.

It is important to also know this has not just started in the last few months. Today is a very important day. This is September 15, I believe. Close to it anyway. On September 15, 2008, the New York Times, certainly not one of the more conservative newspapers, and I don't think anyone would consider them a Republican newspaper, called for the resignation of Chairman RANGEL as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee because of the allegations that he himself had pointed out to this House on the floor of this House of his failure to report certain items of value and failure to pay taxes on about \$75,000 worth of income that he realized in the Dominican Republic on a vacation home that he owned there and rented out. He rightfully said he was going to correct that by paying the taxes and amending his return and that he felt bad about it, and that he had turned himself in to the Ethics Committee.

Well, this turning yourself in to the Ethics Committee is almost the hypocrite's dream because you say I want you to judge me. Well, are they? They have had a year now. This was turned in to the Ethics Committee a year ago. We were promised when this new Congress started, we were promised in the fall of last year by the Speaker of this House, NANCY PELOSI, that she was sure that all of the Rangel issues would be resolved by the first or second week of January of this year. And yet they are still not resolved.

The Ethics Committee's job is to be the charging body in this Congress, and they are to look into these allegations and they are to make decisions. It is our method of policing ourselves. Quite frankly, when you find your method of policing yourself has failed, and I would argue 1 year on one person is pretty close to failure, then maybe we need to come up with a new system. Maybe we need to come up with a new

way. Maybe we are not capable of policing ourselves.

There have been bodies like bar associations and medical associations that have historically policed up their own members; and other associations, certified public accountants, architects, and others have boards that police up their members. If they do a good job, they should be commended. And if they fail, they should be condemned. There is an old adage in the law, and having spent the vast majority of my life in the trial court in Texas, serving 20 years on a trial bench as a district judge, for 20 years prior to my coming to Congress 8 years ago, I can tell you we have an adage that justice delayed is justice denied. That is why we have things like speedy trial acts in the courts of America where a defendant can say I want this case brought to trial within a set time period because justice delayed is justice denied.

That's why we have multiple terms of grand juries and we promote the grand jury process to move cases along through the system so we can deal with felony criminal cases in an opportune way so justice is not delayed. Therefore, justice is not denied. That is why we come up with alternative forms of resolution of disputes in the courthouse because our civil dockets and our family law dockets get so bogged down in numbers that justice becomes delayed; and, therefore, justice is denied.

Well, I would argue that when one man stands at that microphone and for about an hour confesses his transgressions to this House, defended by the speech and debate clause of the Constitution, and states in no uncertain terms that he had made some serious errors and he was going to correct them and that he was turning it over to the Ethics Committee to get it resolved, then he has not been fairly treated by the Ethics Committee not resolving this. That is one of the things that I want to point out. I am about resolution of disputes. I am about solving these types of things that put an evil light upon this House of Representatives.

We have enough trouble with the public right now. Our poll numbers are terrible. But the reality is that the history of this place calls upon us to be honorable people. We address each other as honorable people. And if you are going to be an honorable person, then we have to have a means of recourse when honor is challenged even if you challenge it yourself. And I would argue that our methods that we are using right now in the Ethics Committee are failing this House of Representatives and the leadership whose committee it is is failing this House of Representatives. This needs to be resolved.

When we talked about this 1 year ago, we heard about Mr. RANGEL's issues concerning the rent that he failed to report as income, and he announced to us that he was paying the taxes and would pay any penalties and

interest that may be assessed against him. Later we learned that he paid taxes but he didn't pay any penalties and interest because they weren't assessed against him. That looked to me like the IRS was giving special privileges to Mr. RANGEL. Why would they do that? Could it be because he is the chairman of the committee that oversees the IRS and the chairman of the committee that writes the tax laws of this Nation? It could be, but that is not right. That is not the way it ought to be. Just because 652,000 Americans decide to send one of us to Congress, does that mean that we have special rights that others in this country do not have? No, it does not. And we need to stand up and say so. We go through that same line everybody else does at the airport. We get our pockets emptied at the airport, and we go through the magnetometer just like everybody else at the airport, and we should. We are not different than anybody else in the United States.

And yet I think it is totally, totally inappropriate for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who has admitted that he failed for years to pay taxes on income that he received in the Dominican Republic, that he should not be assessed penalties and interest. For 10 years I practiced law in Texas, and I represented a lot of people who had trouble with the IRS. And I always saw when we finished it up and resolved their issues, penalties and interest. In many instances, the penalties and interest were more than the taxes. And Mr. RANGEL, and I don't have exact numbers, but it was for a period of 10 or 15 years that he didn't pay on this income. Why shouldn't he pay penalties and interest?

So I wrote him a letter. I said very respectfully, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you do not want to be treated any differently than any other American. I would request that you speak to the IRS and ask them to assess the appropriate penalties and interest, and that you pay them. I received no reply to that.

So I introduced a bill that I call the Rangel rule. The Rangel rule says very simply if you owe penalties and interest on income that you fail to pay, when you pay that tax, write on your tax form "exercising the Rangel rule" and you as an American citizen will be treated the same as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

I thought that was fair. I thought that was just. It is still in the hopper. I am perfectly willing, if the leadership of this House will bring it up, to put it to a vote of my colleagues, and we might be surprised; the Rangel rule might actually become law. But we should at least have that find of fair treatment for Americans, the same kind of fair treatment we expect to have. We don't expect people in this Congress to get different treatment.

That is what I have been talking about, failing to report. We have to file a report every year. It is required by

law. It is like an oath, and if you violate that oath, there are consequences of violating that oath. You basically swear this is what I owe, this is what I made. This is dividend income or interest income, or whatever. We sign and swear to that. That would at least make it subject to perjury. And we file it every year.

Now the complaint that we give ranges is true. You can report that I own property that is worth between \$250,000 and \$500,000, and you don't know exactly what end of that rainbow you are talking about, that that is the range. I didn't write the forms; those are the forms. But if you fail to report it, you are given a certain amount of time to amend it. That is fair. People can miss something. And many of the things that Mr. RANGEL talked to us about when he talked on the floor of this House was the things that he didn't report. That is good. He was being honest with the American people and with the Members of this House. He turned that over to the Ethics Committee, too. I assume that he filed the amended reports. And that is sort of what we have been trying to get resolved before the Ethics Committee, is this something that should be sanctionable by the House? The Ethics Committee's job is to tell us that. We have certain sanctions that this House can have. They are set out in our rules. Those rules were given to us by Thomas Jefferson, a fairly famous scholar and famous Democrat. We have got these rules, we have these sanctions, and that committee is supposed to function to start the process.

□ 2030

Today is the first anniversary of the process starting for that, just what I told you so far.

But since then, since that time other things have come forward. In fact, recently, other things have come forward. Mr. RANGEL has been found, in many newspaper articles that have been coming out about this, in a potential additional violation of under-reporting income and assets in 2007 by more than half, including the failure again to report the income from his Caribbean resort property. He has aides that work for him that also failed to file these reports and failed to disclose this information.

His lease of a multi rent-controlled apartment was part of the discussions that took place at that time. He is using his House parking space as a storage place for a car he didn't want to pay to be stored. His failure to report or pay taxes on his rental income in the Dominican Republic, the alleged quid pro quo trading legislation action in exchange for the new Rangel Center and College and New York College. All of these things are part of previous accusations. But now we have new properties, brand new retirement accounts, brand new investment accounts, five different investment accounts that, oops, we just discovered those. And

we've just discovered rental properties over in Brooklyn, New York, and over in New Jersey, just discovered and have just come out in the newspapers. And there's article after article after article.

As we celebrate this anniversary, here are some of the things that are out there. We just talked about some of them, the parking spot and all those things. There is also a trip taken by Mr. RANGEL and others to the Caribbean; it was paid for by lobbyists when we had a firm promise by the Speaker and the leadership of this House, the Democrat leadership, that this was a new Congress, they were draining the swamp. Well, the swamp is not drained; in fact, we're knee deep in alligators right now. But the draining of the swamp was there would be no more lobbyists paying for trips, when we have multiple Members of this House, including Mr. RANGEL, who went on a lobbyist-paid trip where they are on film thanking the individual lobbyists for their contributions to the trip.

People say, why isn't this working? Why isn't this Ethics Committee working? And of course the newspapers, who like to speculate, have pointed out that three of the five Democrat members on the Ethics Committee have received major campaign donations from CHARLIE RANGEL. We asked why Speaker PELOSI hasn't taken a hand in this and we found out 119 Democrats have been given money by Mr. RANGEL for their next campaign. And so he's a source of funds for the majority party here in this House, and that may be it, but we don't know.

But you know what? What this is all about is I am sick and tired of everybody being lumped together as evil people in this House. And therefore, justice delayed is justice denied, and it's time we address some of these issues.

I am joined by my friend, who is a classmate of mine, from Iowa. He is one of the stars of this floor because when he speaks, he speaks from the heart. Brother KING, tell us what you've got to say. I will yield you what time you may need.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman and the judge from Texas. I thank you, Judge CARTER, for your leadership on this issue. And I know that it's hard for a lot of Members to come down to the floor and raise an issue that has to do with the ethics of any other Member. Whatever party they might be, if they're a Democrat or if they're a Republican, there's a certain restraint that exists in this House Chamber. And sometimes it's because Members are afraid that they or their agenda will be punished by a powerful committee Chair who holds a gavel.

There are some, though—as you have done for 12 or 13 or more weeks—that have stepped up here and stood on principle and talked about real ethics and talked about the standards of this House and the standards that we need to hold the other Members to—and our-

selves to for that matter—regardless of the consequences that might come along within this circle of people that work together every day. We've got to be the ones that raise the standard of this House and hold it up.

Now, if you have someone who is in charge of the IRS who doesn't pay their taxes, immediately they lose the moral authority to claim anyone else's tax money. That's the case with Tim Geithner. And it's a point that I think has been alluded to at least by the gentleman from Texas. And if you have the chairman of the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives, the Ways and Means Committee, and the lists of these questions, the ethical questions and the problems with his own taxes gets longer and longer after this—happy birthday, Chairman RANGEL—a year since The New York Times called for the chairman to step down, CHARLIE RANGEL to step down as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

And I can remember the exhortation that took place when Republicans were in the majority and Democrats were looking for anything that they could fabricate to allege against the people in power on this side. I remember constant attacks on Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, who had something like 74 charges brought against him; every one of them specious, none of them substantive, and none of them stuck during all that period of time. But it was designed to focus on the person that held the most power here in the House of Representatives.

And so that taints this. And people think that it's purely a political battle that's going on. Well, it's political in a lot of ways. Judge CARTER talked about how political it is with 119 Members of the Democrat Caucus in the House of Representatives having received a campaign check from CHARLIE RANGEL. When you have a majority—close to it anyway—near the majority of your own caucus that you've contributed to their campaign, somehow they just magically, over time, lose their conviction to stand up for pure ethics.

And it's a shame, but the reality of the political world today is that it isn't just a matter of altruism, it isn't just people that come here—and many do come here to do the right thing; many come here because they want to help America; many come because they believe—they're either liberals or conservatives or someplace in between, but they believe in what they do and they stand up and speak out about it. That sense of conviction, that sense of altruism is something that should be applauded and honored and respected whatever that judgment is, whether they're liberals or whether they're conservatives.

I think a lot of America believes that that's what drives this House. I'd like to think it is, it's part of what drives this House. But another part that drives this House is political power, political patronage, campaign contribu-

tions. The influence that comes from being able to direct policy as chairman of a committee is a powerful thing, it's an influential thing. And why does Chairman RANGEL have all that money to give to 119 Members of his own caucus? Because he controls the tax-writing committee. He controls a lot of the regulations that control the economy of the United States of America—at least the free market economy and what's left of it.

And so there are those who disagree with the philosophy and the policy that CHARLIE RANGEL drives as the man who holds the gavel chairing the Ways and Means Committee. And there are many people in this country, many companies, many corporations, many entities that will find a way to get checks into that campaign fund because they don't want to be punished. And that money gets delved out to Members of their own caucus. And the chairman forgets to pay his taxes and underestimates his liabilities and assets by more than half, including forgetting to report the income off of his villa property in the Dominican Republic and forgetting to report that he is receiving rent subsidy on apartment houses for years in New York City.

The failure to report and pay taxes on rental income from the villa in the Dominican Republic is as clear as it can be. And was it an attack of conscience that Chairman RANGEL had when he finally amended the statement? I think not, because to falsify those statements is a felony. But when the issue was raised by Judge CARTER, by The New York Times, by a number of others, then the chairman stepped forward and amended his returns, and then amended them again—I actually don't know how many rounds it's been that those ethics reports or financial reports have been amended.

But they're not, I can't envision, being amended because of an attack of conscience; they're being amended because the news media, JOHN CARTER, other Members have stepped forward and laid the facts out before the American people. They're being amended to avoid the embarrassment and perhaps the prosecution in order to comply with and hopefully avoid an Ethics ruling when it comes out of the dysfunctional Ethics Committee in the House of Representatives.

So I think it's pretty interesting that there is an alleged—this is one of the list of things that have emerged in the last year—an alleged quid pro quo of trading legislative action in exchange for donations to a center named for CHARLIE RANGEL at City College of New York. I remember one of our Members, JOHN CAMPBELL from California, in particular, came down to the floor and offered an amendment to strike \$1 million out that was earmarked for a center that was named after CHARLIE RANGEL. And he asked Mr. RANGEL, would you really ask that they name a center after you? And the answer was, essentially, I wouldn't want it to be named

after you, Mr. CAMPBELL, but yes, I've been here a long time, it's okay, I think we're allowed to do that.

House Members don't do that. There are posthumous names for Federal buildings for Members of Congress, but it's very rare to find a Member of the House of Representatives to ask for real estate to be named after them; kind of a self-glorification. *Quid pro quo*? Possibly. It certainly raises a question.

But trips to the Caribbean, this is something that's fairly astonishing. The gift rule violation, the trips to the Caribbean that were sponsored by the Carib News Foundation in 2007 and 2008, raised all kinds of questions. Now the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—which, by the way, shouldn't be in the business of trying to direct the IRS to examine anybody; he should be worried about national policy and how that affects on a broad perspective, not micromanaging and focusing on an IRS investigation. But he had the audacity to push for a crackdown on U.S. taxpayers who make honest mistakes on their own returns, and then on the heels of Secretary Geithner's crackdown of UBS depositors for failing to pay their own taxes. The timing of this couldn't be worse.

And it goes on. The statement that I thought was really interesting was the Democrats' House of hypocrisy. They made a lot of allegations, but the House of hypocrisy—the IRS should investigate both CHARLIE RANGEL and TIM GEITHNER. And the problem is Tim Geithner controls the IRS. And so if you control an entity, it's pretty unlikely that they're going to do a vigorous job of investigating the people that actually decide what's going to go on within the operation.

The House Committee on Standards hasn't produced anything yet—that's the Ethics Committee. It's been dysfunctional for a long time. It took place that the former ranking member of the Ethics Committee, who is now the chairman of the Justice Appropriations Committee from West Virginia, funny—under investigation himself. And he holds the gavel that controls the appropriations to the people that are investigating him and he controls their purse strings, ALAN MOLLOHAN.

Interesting. House of hypocrisy: Geithner controlling the IRS; CHARLIE RANGEL controlling the Ways and Means and the tax code; the House Committee on Standards can't seem to move; the chairman, CHARLIE RANGEL, has given campaign donations to three of the five Democrats on the Ethics Committee. Now, it should be unethical to make contributions from the House to Members on the Ethics Committee because, after all, especially if you're under investigation, surely that would turn the focus on him.

And the other interesting thing—this is one that really stands out—we had a little investigation going on on these Caribbean trips that are in question that Mr. RANGEL was on. Well, it turns

out that the chairman of the investigation of the Caribbean trips was also along on the trip, so he knows what was going on there. If he would have thought there was a problem, he would have blown the whistle at that time, one would think.

This isn't the America that the people in this country pay for, that they want to have. It's not the America that the people I know deserve. This country is full of hardworking, honest, decent people, white collar and blue collar people, people that get their hands dirty every day, people that keep their hands clean and use their brain and their fingers and their computers or calculators, their telephones and their steering wheels, people that are down in the trenches, people that are in the meatpacking plants, people that are producing a product every single day, and they give up time away from their families and their homes and they pay their taxes and they comply with the regulations. And they fear the IRS coming into their kitchen or their office and doing an audit of them. And they respect the government.

And we have a House of hypocrisy here where the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee can't seem to get his own filings right on his own accounting forms, the rules that he writes, and has the audacity to turn up an IRS investigation on people that may not be.

119 Democrats have received money from CHARLIE RANGEL. Funny, the Ethics Committee can't move. Three of the five Democrats on the Ethics Committee seem to have received money from CHARLIE RANGEL.

□ 2045

So I would just say this: that we've got to clean this House up. We've got to end this House of hypocrisy. If anyone is under investigation, under question, and if the chairman of a committee and if the Speaker of the House can't see fit to bring the right kind of decorum and the right kind of decency and when a liberal newspaper like *The New York Times* is indignant at this House of Representatives—the House of hypocrisy run by Speaker PELOSI—and is thumbing its nose at the people of the United States of America, if *The New York Times* can see it, I guarantee you the people in my district can see it. They know it in Iowa. They know it in Texas. They know it in the heartland of America. They know it across the red zones of America. Everybody who gets up, who goes to work, who punches a time clock, who earns a salary, who pays his taxes, who carries his weight, and who contributes to this country understands that we've got to have a Nation that's a rule of law.

You can't write enough laws to make a decent people out of an indecent people. You can't cure hypocrisy by covering it up. At some place, at some time, somebody has got to dig up that rotting corpse, and it's going to have to have the light of day shine upon it.

When that happens, we'll learn the truth, and there will be a day when the American people rise up again as they did last Saturday, when they came into this city by the hundreds of thousands.

Hundreds of thousands of people came to Washington, D.C., on Saturday and registered their rejection and their contempt for the profligate overspending that has taken place in this Congress, for the corruption that's here and for the House of hypocrisy that it is. They want clean, decent people, like they are, representing them in this Congress. Between them, they have the solutions to everything that's wrong with America. They aren't all good ideas, but among them are all the ideas that we need to solve the problems that we have.

We need to listen to the American people. We need to listen to the Founding Fathers. We need to be re-anchored back to the Declaration and to the Constitution. We have got to reform our fiscal responsibility. We have got to take this IRS out of our lives and get back our freedom. We have got to give people school choice. We have got to make sure that the younger generations learn it right and that they learn about God and country—our true history—and about our Founding Fathers, about personal responsibility and about the price for freedom and what freedom is and about the pillars of American exceptionalism.

This House of hypocrisy is not a pillar of American exceptionalism. It is a corrosive entity that undermines the pillars of American exceptionalism. We must clean it up. It needs to happen now. Why not on the first anniversary of *The New York Times'* calling for the resignation of CHARLIE RANGEL as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee? As my father always said, there is no time like the present.

I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for everything he had to say, and I agree with everything he said.

I want to say something that is concerning me. It has come to my attention, through the rumors that have spread around the Halls of Congress, that some are saying this issue that I have raised about Mr. RANGEL has something to do with his race. I want to make it very clear: I spent 20 years on the bench. I believe in that Lady Justice who stands there with that blindfold. I can tell you in no uncertain terms—and I will leave it up to the people in my district, and you can check with them—that I never gave a sentence to a criminal defendant based upon his race nor did I even see the color of his skin. I based it upon his behavior, and the behavior that needed punishing I certainly punished. It had nothing to do with the race of anybody. When people start accusing someone of being a racist because he raises an issue of right and wrong, there's something wrong in this House of Representatives.

I bring this up now because I would hope this wouldn't happen, but if it does, I stand ready, willing and able to point out that this has absolutely nothing to do with race.

By the way, Mr. RANGEL isn't the only Member of this Congress whom I have spoken against and said that we needed to do something about. I just had to get that off my chest. Before this stuff starts, I want you to know the race card has nothing to do with what I'm trying to do on the floor of the House. I'm trying to see that we get justice at this level.

Mr. KING pointed out the fact that the Chairman of the IRS has got issues of not paying taxes. Who is going to go after him? The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has issues of all sorts, which we've talked about here. Who is going to go after him? Well, I'll tell you who can—the Justice Department.

You know, when there are allegations of improper behavior, if those things rise to the level of criminal behavior, it is the duty and responsibility of the Justice Department to investigate, and I think the Justice Department should. It's supposed to be like that Lady Justice—blind to the political ramifications and going forward based only upon doing justice. That's why it is called the "Justice Department." If there are issues here that people see, the Justice Department ought to do something about it.

This Congress has the ability to hold hearings on these issues, and they have the ability to hold hearings on the other issues that have been talked about here tonight, and it's about time we did it. We have issues of major proportions that are being totally ignored by this House. This has become the House of hypocrisy, as Mr. KING said. There are those who accused others of a culture of corruption just 2 years ago and actually, blatantly, stepped forward on the floor of this House and admitted so. Now, as the corruption is being exposed, all of a sudden, we don't hear anything more about that. It is hypocrisy. I wanted to bring that up because it's important.

I've spent my lifetime trying to be like that Lady Justice—blind as to who you're dealing with. If people will think back, I have said the reason I stand here tonight is because the rule of law is the glue that underpins the very basic foundation of this Republic, and if we let the rule of law be forgotten or to be discarded and if we, as a people, are not bound together by those agreed laws we've agreed to through our legislative process and if political power or influence changes that, then we're no different than a banana republic. Therefore, nothing is more sacred to the basic premises of a Republican form of government and a democracy than that all people, no matter what their statuses, are bound by the law.

Together, we just sent a man who stole in a Ponzi scheme billions of dollars from people around the world. Do

you know what? It speaks to the American system. He is in prison tonight. That's the rule of law, and that's the way it's supposed to be.

So, when we talk about this—and occasionally I do—I smile and have fun with the Rangel rule, but the reality is, if we surrender the rule of law, we surrender our freedom and we surrender our Nation. We just can't do it. With all the political back-and-forth that may go on on the floor of this House, I believe in my heart—and I hope in my heart—that every person who sits in these seats is about standing up for the rule of law. If they are not, they don't belong here, because the rule of law is the glue that holds our society and our Republic together. It's very simple. It's not a complex issue. It's that people, as a people, decide to govern themselves with certain rules and regulations that are required of us as citizens. It's what we promise to do by being good citizens. So we're not going to take a handgun and walk across the street and rob the grocery store, because that is disruptive, and society has decided we're not going to tolerate that. That armed robbery in Texas will put you in prison for life, and believe me, I can tell you several people who know that very fact.

There's a reason we have laws: They hold our society together. It's not a law that says the poor immigrant gets the prison sentence and the rich executive does not. If they both break the law and the punishment is prison, they both ought to go to prison because that's the rule of law.

So, when we have issues that affect the rule of this House and, maybe, the rules of law of this Nation—right now, I'm talking about the rules of the people's House. This is the House of the people. This is the only House of the people. Don't let those Senators fool you, okay? They're not the House of the people. This is the House of the people. If someone dies in this House or is removed or leaves office in the middle of a term, nobody appoints his replacement. It is unlawful to appoint his replacement, because the Constitution of these United States says this is the House that is elected by the people. If we have a Senator die, the States can have a rule which says the Governor—and in fact, my State has that rule. If a Senator dies or leaves office in the middle of the term, our Governor gets to appoint a replacement Senator until such time as an election is held, and most States have something along those lines, which means they're not necessarily placed in that office by the people. That's the difference. When we say this is the House of the people, this is the only House of the people.

If we can't abide by our own rules when we are in charge of making those rules that govern life in America, what kind of example is that? Maybe these folks who've been in the streets for the last couple of weeks, who've been marching and yelling and fussing about Congress, have got something to fuss

about; because the truth is, if we can't govern our own House, how can we be expected to govern our Nation?

I have been pointing out to the Democrat leadership of this House, who has this responsibility—you know, when you're in the majority, you govern. When we were in the majority, we governed. Governing is hard. It's harder than being in the minority. In the minority, you can just vote your conscience, and that's what we all should do anyway, but in the majority, you're responsible for the results just like whoever sits in the White House is responsible for the results.

Well, if we can't even figure out our own little rules and make our own little rules happen, how can we make laws that are responsible for the results that affect the people in Iowa or the people in Texas or the people in Louisiana or the people in Oregon or the people in Maine? How can the people have confidence if we can't even take care of our own business?

By the way, an issue is coming up, I think, in this House. Whether you're for it or against it, Joe Wilson made an outcry the other night, and he knows and has admitted that he should not have done that. In the heat of emotion, he made an outcry while the President was speaking. Joe is a very honorable man, and he immediately apologized to the President of the United States, and he immediately, in writing, apologized to the White House and to the Vice President. Now there's another street rumor that a privileged resolution is going to be filed on the floor of this House to censure Mr. WILSON before this Congress.

Of course, it's kind of interesting that the process is normally done through privileged resolutions, but there's usually some involvement by the Ethics Committee. I don't see any here. The Speaker has already said she didn't think it was appropriate to do this, and she made public statements that we should move on with health care and that he has apologized. I read that in the newspaper. Yet we're going forward on this. Then I'm crying for 12 weeks about really offensive behavior: When you pay your taxes, don't you think the guy who runs the Ways and Means Committee ought to pay his taxes? I don't see anybody jumping up, except the one time I did, and offering a privileged resolution. Mine was tabled on party lines and didn't get addressed, but I find it curious. I think Joe Wilson has apologized. He has acted like a gentleman, and I think that's where it ought to be. I agree with Speaker PELOSI's statements of 3 days ago to the press that we should move on. We'll see, but I hope we don't do that because it's just going to add, I say, to the hypocrisy of what we're talking about.

I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

□ 2100

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas.

And listening to the dialogue here on floor, I have to also rise in defense of the individual that everybody knows here is a true gentleman, a true Southern gentleman, and that's Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina. Anybody that knows JOE knows that he is the consummate officer and a gentleman.

He comes from generations of military personnel. He has four sons that have served in the military. And JOE spends his life and his time respecting others, respecting our military people who serve this country. And I have never known JOE to be anything other than a respectful, polite, gentleman, and, yet, duty, honor, country.

He was offended by what he heard here in the House of Representatives. And, for me, so was I.

The President of the United States came into the House of Representatives, as our guest, and stood here at the podium, here in the well, from the rostrum of the Speaker, and he threw the first stone. And he said, the prominent politicians had lied, and he began to tell how. That's how this was set up.

The President threw the first blow in here as a guest of the House of Representatives. And JOE WILSON, a man of honor, was offended at that, instantaneously. It was an instinctive thing, if you know the man.

And, also, so was the instinct to go to the phone immediately after the speech and call the White House and do what he did. That's enough. There doesn't need to be more, and the people in this House that are seeking to gain a partisan advantage and turn this into a circus over two words that probably were said a lot of other times that night here in the House of Representatives too, but they were covered by the other chatter, that happened to be two words that went into a pause of silence, and the timing of it really was unfortunate.

But I don't think JOE WILSON was unique in his emotion. It just happened to be made clear and embellished by the press. And so I don't make excuses for that and neither does he.

But if the President of the United States accepts an apology, no other person has any grounds to request redress beyond that point. And this House of Representatives shall not be turned into a circus to deal with minutiae because Democrats in this country have decided to run this country over the cliff into socialized medicine. And they can't sell it to the American people, so they want to change the subject. That's what it is.

And, by the way, the President of the United States injected himself into an incident that took place up in Boston when a professor at Harvard was breaking into his own house and the neighbors, out of good will, called the cops and Officer Crowley showed up, and the President himself made intemperate remarks.

They were emotional, they were knee-jerk and they show his bias—no really bias in JOE except duty, honor country, truth, justice in the American

way. That's not a bias; that's an altruistic belief system that's in the gentleman JOE WILSON.

But the President injected himself and injected race into that situation up in Boston with the professor and the police officer, and he invited them out to the White House for a beer. And so it became a global story about how the President's masterful diplomacy brought everybody together at the White House. And we all knew what kind of beer everybody drank sitting there at the picnic table sitting outside—I actually don't know if they drank any. We know that they served it.

Well, so the President has accepted JOE WILSON's apology, and we are watching, through the majority whip, drive a resolution towards the floor tomorrow to try to excoriate a Southern gentleman.

And the President is sitting there now, having accepted the apology, and all he has to do is tell Rahm Emanuel, pick up the phone, call up there and talk to CLYBURN or PELOSI or STENY HOYER, the majority leader, and call off the dogs. We don't need this circus on the floor of the House of Representatives over something that may or may not have offended the President of the United States.

But that's over because he has accepted the apology. So now if we have a circus on the floor of the House, and the President doesn't come in and be a referee—and maybe call for a beer summit, so invite JOE WILSON out to the White House, that's what I would like to see happen—if the President doesn't call for that you have to wonder if he isn't secretly sitting there watching the fight, enjoying it, enjoying the circus that they are staging for tomorrow.

The circus itself will bring disgrace on the House of Representatives, and it's designed to cover this House of hypocrisy that we have. But instead it will illuminate it. And as the judge was saying about the rule of law, when I write rule of law, I capitalize it. Rule of law, R and L, capitalize it, in everything I write. Sometimes the staff slips by, but I get it in there, because I have such reverence for the rule of law.

And if we are going to be a Nation that functions, we all have got to have reverence for the rule of law. And if you look at some of these other countries that have some gifts and some blessings that look like they might be comparable to that of the United States and you wonder what's wrong, why can't Russia get their act together. Why can't Mexico get their act together and go there and look.

I can go almost anywhere in the world and tell you what I think we ought to do at least to fix it. But I can go to those places, and I can't tell what you ought to do. Because I don't know how to fix corruption.

When corruption is endemic in the culture of a country, you cannot have enough law enforcement officers. You cannot clean it up. It's got to be something that is a habit of the heart of the culture of the people.

We have had that throughout these centuries in the United States of America. And the things that threaten it, it isn't just a reflection of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that has this whole list of ethical problems, including tax avoidance, and that's the nicest way I can say that. It isn't just that. It's the culture that supports it.

It's the Speaker of the House that enables it. It's the majority leader that backs it up. It's the fact that we are dealing with this House of hypocrisy while we are trying to set standards for the people of the United States of America and saying be altruistic, pay your taxes, follow through and do your part. And if you do that, we are a greater country.

But if people decide to take the CHARLIE RANGEL/Tim Geithner route, we can't have enough enforcement officers out there working for the IRS to go out and collect enough taxes to go out and run this government. It's got to be because people have great respect and reverence for the rule of law, and it should start here. This should be the highest standard in the House of Representatives.

But if I go to Mexico or if I go to Russia, I see there are natural resources, I see a good labor force, people that are pretty good workers—more so I think in Mexico than Russia from my observations, but they also were used to payola. They are used to payoffs. They don't think they can make a difference. They don't think their voice matters.

And when it gets to that point in the country where people don't believe any longer that their voice matters, and if they don't believe in the people that are making the decisions for them, and if they don't willingly comply with the laws and pay their taxes, then it all becomes a whole nation of gotcha, and who was the victim of enforcement, and who knew how to pay somebody off that had influence so they can avoid doing the right thing. And that might be paying taxes. It might be completely violating it in a violent way, just plain out and out theft.

If they can get by with it, if they have influence, the rule of law. The rule of law is the central pillar of American exceptionalism. Without it, we would have never become the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world.

But we are, because of that central pillar, the rule of law. Now, there are many other pillars, but the central pillar is a rule of law, and we have got to respect it.

And if you don't like the law, we will run for office or support somebody that does and ask them to change it. That's why we have this system. We have amendments to the Constitution. We don't like the Constitution, find a way to amend it.

If the people speak, we are supposed to listen here. Hundreds of thousands

showed up in Washington D.C. over this past weekend. And we need to hear what they have to say.

But they want to respect their elected Representatives. They want the rule of law to adhere to. They don't want to see this country flooded over with the level of corruption that we have seen in places like Mexico and Russia, or I go there and I think, what can be done?

I can prescribe the solutions that I think are very constructive to those countries, but if you could snap your fingers and get rid of the corruption in those countries, that would be the biggest thing that could be done. And then the people would have hope; they would have faith again. They would believe again that their government was responsible and responsive to them.

But the rule of law—and I think about how important it is to comply with the letter and the intent of the law, not just avoid prosecution, not just find a way to skirt around the edge of it, respect and revere the law and comply with the letter and the intent of the law.

And I had this little thought that popped up into my head—I was listening to the judge talk about this—this little phrase recurs back to me: no controlling legal authority. Do you remember that?

The Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, said, well there is no controlling legal authority. So, therefore, if there isn't any way that you can control his activities by enforcing a law that one can point to, therefore, whatever he might do apparently is acceptable or maybe even moral.

In the absence of prohibition, things become moral in this era of morals relativism.

I reject that. We have got to have high standards, high standards of conscience, high standards of morality, and our laws uphold those standards. And the people on the left will constantly argue you can't legislate morality.

Well, but if you de-legislate the morality that others legislated, now you have, now you have lowered the standard. Now you have lowered the bar. And now people believe it's acceptable, and it has happened over and over again. Our legislation is morality. Our legislation, the laws of America, the laws of our States and our local subdivisions uphold the moral standards of the people that pass them.

It's often our faith; our Judeo-Christian values are what shaped this country. The Declaration and the Constitution are infused with Judeo-Christian values. And those values are part of the culture reflected in the documents, not the documents that drove the culture.

And if we lose our culture, the documents will become meaningless to us. That's why we have got to stand up for the rule of law here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and everybody in America has to stand up for the rule of law, the letter and the intent of law, and the moral and ethical

foundation that underpins it, or we lose our way, and we lose our country.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for that impassioned speech. We have about 5 minutes more left.

So I make it very clear, I don't think I made it clear, but Roll Call newspaper reported on August 25 some of these issues with Mr. RANGEL.

I am going to go through them very quickly. He filed an amended return about his 2007 assets and income disclosing more than \$600,000 in assets, tens of thousands of dollars in income, that he had failed to report. He failed to report, for instance, a Congressional Federal Credit Union, which is just right down the hall from us here, account of at least \$250,001; an investment fund account also worth at least \$250,001.

He originally claimed assets of \$516,000 to \$1.316 million. Now he has revised it to \$1.028 million to \$2.5 million.

And once again he failed to report the income on his Dominican Republic account. He failed to report investments that netted him between 29,000 and 81,000 in capital gains dividends and in rental income when he previously claimed between 6,000 and 17,000.

He failed to report his investment in certain stocks, at least 1,001 of Yum brands; 15,001 in PepsiCo; and 250,001 in funds of Allianz Global Investors Consults Diversified Port III, half the limit, number three.

He failed to report rental income, and that's on top of the multiple allegations we have been talking about. It's time for a Member that justice must be swift and justice delayed is justice denied.

I ask the leadership of this House to move this process, reconcile these issues of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and let's resolve this crisis of this House so we can no longer be called the House of hypocrisy.

□ 2115

EXAMINING THE FACTS ON HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to take a little time to examine some of the statements President Obama made when he addressed Congress on the issue of health care. Many of the things he mentioned in his address deserve some clarification or outright rebuttal.

The President said that, Not a dollar of the Medicare trust fund will be used to pay for this plan. That was easy for the President to say, and it is technically correct. It is technically correct only because there is no Medicare trust fund. It is an accounting mirage,

a sham of government IOUs, thanks to decades of government deficit spending.

And, furthermore, among more than \$500 million in proposed savings from Medicare, the Democrat bills also propose redirecting \$23 billion from the Medicare Improvement Fund to fund new health care entitlements. According to current law, the Medicare Improvement Fund is designated specifically "to make improvements under the original Medicare fee-for-service program."

Then there is the issue of taxpayer-funded abortion coverage. President Obama said, Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and Federal conscience laws will remain in place. But independent groups have confirmed that the legislation will result in Federal funds being used to pay for abortions—both through the government-run health plan and through Federal subsidies provided through the exchange, despite various accounting gimmicks created in a so-called Energy and Commerce Committee "compromise."

Republicans offered amendments in all three of the committees to say this money cannot be used for abortions, and they were rebuffed at each turn.

President Obama also went on to claim that, "Reducing the waste and inefficiency in Medicare and Medicaid will pay for most of this plan. Much of the rest will be paid for with revenues from the very same drug and insurance companies that stand to benefit from tens of millions of new customers."

But the Congressional Budget Office had previously found that the cuts to Medicare Advantage plans included in the Democrat legislation would result in millions of seniors, including thousands and thousands in my district in North Carolina, losing their current plan—a direct contradiction of the President's assertion that, Nothing in this plan requires you to change what you have.

The President could have strengthened his statements by quoting sections and lines to back up the statements. We who have presented our alternatives and who have stood to refute the comments have been able, in most cases, to quote the section and the line of the bill to show that what we are saying is the truth.

As you can see from this discussion of the President's speech, when it comes to the debate over health care reform, there are often two sides to the issue, and it is simply not as cut and dried as President Obama has tried to make it out.

Many of us have serious misgivings and disagreements with the proposed legislation and will not allow our disagreements to be mischaracterized and sidelined by lofty rhetoric.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from

Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to enter remarks into the RECORD on this topic.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Certainly I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC, for this Special Order. Currently, the CBC is chaired by the Honorable Barbara Lee from the Ninth Congressional District of California.

My name is Congresswoman Marcia L. Fudge, and I represent the 11th Congressional District of the State of Ohio. CBC members are advocates for the human family nationally and internationally and have played a significant role as local and regional activists. We continue to work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress, but understand all politics are local. Therefore, we provide dedicated and focused service to the citizens of the congressional districts we serve.

The vision of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus, to promote the public welfare through legislation designed to meet the needs of millions of neglected citizens, continues to be a focal point for the legislative work and political activities of the Congressional Black Caucus.

As Members of Congress, CBC members also promote legislation to aid neglected citizens throughout the world. We understand that the United States, as a bellwether, has the ability to positively impact our neighbors abroad.

The United States is a leader in advocating for the underprivileged at home and abroad. Americans understand that if we uplift others, then we, too, will be advanced.

With this in mind, tonight's CBC hour will focus on poverty reduction and the economic, social and political outlook for the continent of Africa. Specifically, I will discuss increasing access to both education and financial services in Africa.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I know well the far-reaching effects of education on individuals' quality of life and a nation's economic competitiveness. In the context of improving developing nations such as many African countries, the basic education offers the hope of a more prosperous world.

The benefits of basic education are innumerable. For instance, we know that when all citizens receive a good education, their nation's economic prosperity is increased, preventable illness is decreased, democratic ideals are spread, violent conflicts are reduced, and women are able to advance further than if they were discouraged from pursuing their studies.

Mr. Speaker, I see we have been joined by our Chair, the Honorable

BARBARA LEE from California. I would now like to yield to the gentlelady, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and also for organizing once again the voice of the Congressional Black Caucus. Thank you so much, Congresswoman FUDGE, for continuing to raise the critical issues that our entire country must address at this moment in our history, and thank you so much for having a focus tonight on the continent of Africa, which is often forgotten.

Africa faces numerous challenges, which you mentioned earlier, but also enormous opportunities, and the promotion and the strengthening of the United States-Africa relationship is really vital to realizing the progress that's being made in addressing enduring crises related to food insecurity, the devastating health pandemic, such as HIV and AIDS, and the growing rates of inequality and poverty. Also, the economic prosperity.

As Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to point out that the Congressional Black Caucus is privileged to draw upon the wisdom and the expertise of our colleague on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman DONALD PAYNE of New Jersey. Congressman PAYNE is more than a member, however; he is a resident expert on Africa. He understands the continent and each country on the continent.

He is the Chair of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee. He is recognized on the continent of Africa as being a person who seeks global peace and security every step of the way. He is also the leader of our Congressional Black Caucus International Affairs Task Force.

The Congressional Black Caucus also is ably represented on the Foreign Affairs Committee by Congressman GREGORY MEEKS of New York; Congresswoman and former ambassador DIANE WATSON of California; Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas; and also Congressman DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

President Obama has likewise demonstrated a clear commitment to turn the corner in Africa, most notably with his announcement of a government-wide United States review of the U.S. Global Development Policy. Also, a renewed \$3.5 billion food security initiative. And also we must remember his very stern and forthright speech in Ghana, where he asserted America's responsibilities to help advance a brighter future in Africa with action, not just with words.

Further, Secretary of State Clinton's recent visit to Africa brought much needed attention to the global fight against HIV and AIDS, violence against women, trade opportunities with the continent, and all of the development and aid issues which the Department of State is responsible for.

Despite such a positive outlook for our administration's strategy, the per-

sistence of health pandemics, chronic food insecurity, a global economic crisis, and a looming threat of climate change continues to threaten the livelihood of millions of individuals across Africa each and every day. There are currently more people going hungry in the world than ever before. According to the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, almost a sixth of the world's population, or 1 billion individuals, are now undernourished.

Encouraging sustainable, long-term development will require a significant contribution from the United States and international partners. Recent estimates indicate that it will cost \$500 billion to \$600 billion for the next 10 years to allow developing nations such as those in Africa to grow, using renewable energy sources rather than relying on dirty fuels.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and its International Affairs Task Force under the leadership of Chairman PAYNE have long been a leading voice in Congress in calling for the United States to provide support for adaptation and sustainable development abroad, as well as assistance to ensure affordable access to emerging clean technologies.

The reality is that any strategy to combat global warming and climate change will need to include meaningful and equitable action on the international level. The scale of these challenges reflects the urgency of our efforts here in Congress.

The goal of the Congressional Black Caucus is to find and fund long-term, sustainable solutions to these threats at the household, community, and national levels.

Despite this great moral imperative, the United States continues to spend a disproportionately small amount of funding on nonmilitary foreign affairs programs. Most people in our country think that we spend a large portion of our budget on foreign affairs, but we just do not do that.

Instead of spending a staggering 52 percent of the Federal discretionary budget on an inflated defense budget for the Pentagon, that continues to invest in Cold War-era weapons systems to the tune of about \$100 billion for, really, an enemy that does not exist, we should be investing in diplomacy and development activities that will help bring stability to nations on the brink of collapse and conflict. That is the essence of how we ensure our own national security.

That's why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 63, a resolution calling for an increase in nonmilitary foreign assistance to an amount equal to no less than 1 percent of GDP. It's hard to imagine we're not even at 1 percent yet.

Foreign assistance programs are essential in promoting national security and improving the credibility and standing of the United States in the world. To that end, our Congressional Black Caucus will continue to work to

develop clear goals and strategies for alleviating poverty, improving global health, and encouraging sustainable development, particularly in Africa. We will also continue to strengthen America's foreign assistance and diplomatic capacities, which is critical to this effort.

In noting the critical role of the United States in Africa, I must also speak out with regard to our responsibility to urgently seek peace for the residents of Darfur and the Sudan. When it comes to Darfur and the Sudan, it's important to recognize that the people of Sudan's desire for a just and longstanding sustainable peace has been crushed repeatedly by one of the most brutal regimes in the world.

More than 2 million South Sudanese have died in the 21-year war, and suffered countless atrocities, mostly committed by the same regime in Khartoum.

□ 2130

That's why it's so important to do the right thing now, which is to support the International Criminal Court in its efforts to hold Sudan's President Bashir accountable for his crimes against humanity. And let me tell you, they are crimes against humanity. I have visited the refugee camps on three occasions and witnessed the effects of genocide that were taking place right in front of my eyes. I tell you, we cannot lift sanctions at this point. We have to keep the pressure on to help make sure that people in the Sudan are protected and that the humanitarian assistance gets to them and gets to them immediately.

The Congressional Black Caucus under Congressman PAYNE's leadership was instrumental. We encouraged President Obama to appoint a special envoy for Sudan who is fully empowered and resourced to focus on Sudan as a whole and with special attention to the ongoing genocide in Darfur, the full implementation of the CPA and the humanitarian crisis.

I have to applaud and thank President Obama for appointing Major General Gration as the special envoy for Sudan because General Gration, who I met the first time I was in Sudan, is really uniquely qualified to undertake this critically important post. I know that I speak for all of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus when I say that we look forward to working with the special envoy to move us past the current stalemate, to end the genocide in Darfur and to bring peace to the long-suffering people of the Sudan. These are just a few—and I mean just a few—of the many critical issues with which the Congressional Black Caucus is taking a leading role.

The continent of Africa is strong. It's resilient. The Congressional Black Caucus is committed to working with our colleagues here in Congress to enact policies which support African nations in their efforts to ensure good governance, to prevent violence and

conflict, and to provide a foundation for future stability, human development and sustainable economic growth.

So thank you again, Congresswoman FUDGE, for this evening and for giving us the chance to, once again, speak our minds and tell the American people what the Congressional Black Caucus not only continues to work on but also to encourage their support for many of the policies and the funding initiatives that we have been long calling for for many, many years. Thank you.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Speaker, I would just very much like to thank our Chair for being here at every Special Order, for the support that she has given to me personally but, more importantly, for the leadership she gives to the CBC. I thank you, Madam Chair, for being here.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I wanted to just talk about the economic prosperity on the African continent. Many African countries do still, indeed, struggle to achieve economic sustainability and growth. This pursuit is undermined in part by the large number of citizens who have not received a basic education. Not a single economically viable nation achieved its prosperity without implementing near universal primary education. Additionally, education increases a Nation's gross domestic product. Adults with a primary school education earn twice as much as adults without any schooling.

In the areas of health, education and behavior changes are also the most effective way to address preventable diseases, including smallpox, tuberculosis, diarrhea and other water-borne illnesses. According to some estimations, if all children completed primary education, 700,000 new cases of AIDS and HIV could be prevented each year.

We also need to improve the political stability and reduce conflict. Education and the free exchange of ideas also encourages democratic styles of government. When citizens are well informed, they are more likely to participate in their democracy. As it relates to violent conflicts, education that teaches tolerance, the value of each individual, and respect for different beliefs is the best method to reduce violence and extremism.

Basic education provides girls and women with expanded employment opportunities, which is important for the overall advancement of families. Women's employability is especially crucial if they are the family's sole support. Children of educated women are in better health and are twice as likely to be enrolled in school.

Mr. Speaker, 75 million children worldwide are not at school; 55 percent of them are girls. Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for nearly one-half of the world's school-age children who are not enrolled in school. Twelve percent of the developing world's primary school-age population is not in school; more than 80 percent of them are in rural

areas, and the vast majority are poor. Globally, 134 countries account for two-thirds of the out-of-school children, and current projections show that those countries will have 29 million out-of-school children by the year 2015.

Among African nations, there are various barriers to basic education. The lack of school buildings, shortage of teachers, prohibitive compulsory fees, and unique challenges faced by girls all limit many Africans' abilities to access formal education. However, these challenges are not insurmountable. Nearly 80 million new places of instruction must be created in order for all school-age African children to be accommodated. This will be a large undertaking, to say the least.

I applaud African governments for making progress towards the goals advanced in the Dakar Framework for Action in 2000. That framework was a statement signed by 164 countries during the 2000 World Education Forum stating that their commitment to universal education was strong. But without diligent support from the international community, these great goals will remain elusive.

In addition to the need for new schools, it is estimated that an additional 3 million teachers are needed in Africa in order for the continent to reach its goal of universal education by the year 2015. In Nigeria, which is the most populous country in Africa, there is a shortage of 1 million teachers.

Not only are workforce shortages caused by the difficulty to obtain thorough education, the availability of teachers on the continent is also impacted by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The disease, itself, has robbed education systems of manpower and knowledge and continues to drive up cost. In a report released by the World Bank in 2002, an estimated 860,000 children in sub-Saharan Africa lost teachers to AIDS in 1999. In some cases where there has been an increase in class enrollment, the loss of one teacher can affect hundreds of students. The cost of replacing these instructors is prohibitive for many countries. If the nation of Swaziland hired and trained enough staff to replace the teachers lost to HIV and AIDS, the estimated cost would be \$233 million, more than half of the government's budget for 2001–2002.

Again, there are too many primary and secondary schools in the developing world that are forced to rely on student fees to supplement government funding. These fees, while modest by American standards, often prevent children from enrolling. Similarly, some families cannot afford the uniforms commonly required by the schools.

In 2003, Kenya eliminated primary school fees in a step towards universal primary education for its entire population. In Kenya alone, 1.5 million students who had not previously attended school then enrolled, increasing the average class size from 40 to 120. Kenya

took a step in the right direction, but these actions must be coupled with greater investment by local governments and donors to address the issues of quality that arise when access to education is increased.

While this statistic represents an improvement in the rate of primary school enrollment during the early nineties of over 10 percent, we should also be aware that the problems still remain. In countries such as Djibouti, Ethiopia, Niger and Mali, less than half of all school-age children go to school, and there is a disparity in enrollment rates between boys and girls. Forty-two percent of girls as opposed to 38 percent of boys are out of school.

As the international community and donors discuss the importance of quality education, we must remember the vast numbers of teachers who will need to be trained and what this means to the international partners who work with African governments and civil society groups. Education is a long-term path to economic viability. Stimulating small businesses through micro-lending is another method of improving the economies of developing nations, which will ultimately lead to expanded trade and business opportunities for all of the world.

I and several Members recently returned from a congressional delegation to Tunisia, Rwanda, Zimbabwe and Senegal. Our goal was to educate Members on the impact that the global financial crisis has had on the continent of Africa. Additionally, we examined the regional impact of multilateral development banks, international financial institutions, and the International Monetary Fund.

The codel spent significant time examining the effect of the global economic crisis on local economies. We were especially interested in how the multilateral development banks and the United States supports, particularly the African Development Bank, are helping countries to obtain grants, loans and technical assistance. We also explored the role and impact of the IMF on the region during this period of economic crisis.

Africa is of increasing strategic interest to the global economy. The continent is expected to soon provide the United States with more petroleum than the Middle East. Again, I will repeat. The continent of Africa is expected to soon provide the United States with more petroleum than we get from the Middle East.

Several reports state that more than half of all Africans are estimated to live on a dollar or less a day. The nations we visited were interested in help up, not a handout. Well-intentioned countries and organizations have poured billions of dollars into improving conditions for Africans, but their efforts have repeatedly failed to stimulate large-scale sustainable growth. This is, in part, because many of these groups do not fully incorporate local traditions, values and attitudes into

their assistance programs. Assistance can only be successful if it is culturally sensitive and adapts to the needs of the local community.

The direct impact of the global crisis on Africa, however, has been relatively contained. Many African nations have not been severely affected by the crisis since African banks generally are not well integrated into the global financial system. Nonetheless, African countries still are at risk of indirect adverse effects, such as reduced worldwide demand for African exports, a dampening of economic growth, a tightening of credit, and reduced remittance flows. Despite these setbacks, Mr. Speaker, African countries can greatly benefit from programs that both encourage productivity and promote economic independence.

Access to formal financial services is a key component of economic development. One method to facilitate development is microfinance. Microfinance is when banking institutions or even individuals grant small loans to other individuals, usually to establish or expand a small or self-sustaining business. When individuals gain access to credit, they can start a business, hire their neighbors, and stimulate local economic growth. For example, a loan made to a woman to buy a sewing machine can yield an income when she offers her sewing and tailoring services. Or if a loan helps a family purchase a cow, the milk produced from the cow can generate both nourishment and income.

The average microfinance loan amount ranges from \$50 to \$5,000, and the repayment cycle can range from 90 days to 18 months. Repayment of microfinance loans is 98 percent compared to regular business loans by traditional lenders. Official microfinance organizations are currently only reaching 5 to 8 percent of the businesses who are in dire need of loans. Access to credit for the poor is in dire need as well. Microfinancing institutions also provide access to savings accounts.

Microfinance has proven to be successful because of its ability to reach the poor, especially women with highly sustainable programs that have a positive impact. As the United Nations Office of Special Adviser on Africa reports, women are a better credit risk than men and more responsible managers of meager resources. Furthermore, women are, and I quote, more committed to using their loans for the benefit of their household rather than self-gratifying consumption, as is common among many African men. Empowering women sets families on the path toward economic independence. This case study demonstrates how microfinance can help alleviate poverty.

In 2007, Absa Bank Group in South Africa established a dedicated microenterprise finance unit to make funding more readily available to businesses that are formally excluded from getting regular bank loans. It has been es-

timated that as many as 97 percent of microentrepreneurs in South Africa had no access to loans prior to receiving funding through the AMEF. Today, more than 4.5 million people on low incomes use Absa Bank services for everything from microloans to saving accounts and transactions, leading the way for microenterprise loans in South Africa.

In addition to providing loans, microfinance institutions can also support individuals by keeping savings in a secure manner and by helping to accumulate interest on deposits.

□ 2145

This allows the poor to lift themselves out of poverty.

Self-reliance, Mr. Speaker, is the key. I've seen both the despair and the resiliency of Africans. In Rwanda I met a woman who was given a cow. Shortly after she received the cow, the cow had a calf, which she was then obligated to give to her neighbor. But based upon the cow she had and the milk that she could harvest from that particular cow, she was able to not only feed her family but to sell enough milk to then buy a bicycle.

She bought a bicycle, Mr. Speaker, so that she could ride the 3 miles it took to get clean water. So instead of walking, now she could ride and send her children to get clean water. She then made enough money to send her children to school and pay the fees. She then took out a loan and bought another cow, and with that cow she is able now to buy food and clothing. She is able to do much more than she was before. She is really quite an entrepreneur. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, this woman has AIDS. But she is raising five children on her own because someone gave her a cow and she had the ability to go from there.

Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, microloans that support small-scale entrepreneurship will improve the lives of Africans and empower them to work their way out of poverty. Microfinance is already proven in India and Bangladesh to be an effective economic development strategy. According to World Vision, one loan, just one loan, can create 40 jobs in a community of approximately 600 to 700 people.

The difficulties faced by African nations should not deter us from providing assistance. Through America's support of expanding basic education and access to financial services, we can assist African leaders and people in creating a more vibrant continent and, in turn, a richer world. My recent experience has confirmed for me that both of these approaches can empower people by providing them with confidence, self-esteem, and the financial means to contribute to their economic advancement. Our leadership and our moral strength is only enhanced when we help others. Truly, Mr. Speaker, we lift as we rise.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is an honor to have the privilege to represent my constituents here on the floor of the House of Representatives and convey the thought process for myself and a good number of my colleagues about the issues of the day. And hopefully we will be able to cap off this evening and send some people to bed with some thoughts that they'll wake up in the morning supporting or else have good reasons to oppose.

A lot has transpired here since the August break began, and we only have 1 week behind us here in the House of Representatives since we have returned. That deep tradition has been that Members of Congress would leave Washington, D.C. in the hot, humid month of August. This tradition began before air conditioning. It's a good tradition, and I think we should keep it because we saw something phenomenal in America this past August, and it seemed like a never-ending series of townhall meetings that took place in community after community. Nearly every congressional district held something. Some held many, many meetings. I don't know the record on the number of the townhall meetings that were had, but I'm sure it fell in the dozens of meetings for a single Member.

For myself I represent 32 counties in western Iowa, the western third of the State, that's sliced from Minnesota down to Missouri, 32 counties, 286 towns. I held a good number of townhall meetings, and it was a very rewarding experience.

The thing that I take away from it, Mr. Speaker, and there are many—I got some ideas on the health care issue that are on my list that I will talk about here in a moment, Mr. Speaker. But the thing that I will remember the most, it isn't a single issue or a single individual or a way an argument was phrased or worded or how compelling they were, and there were many that were compelling arguments, but it was the image of town after town, meeting after meeting, rooms full of people, often people in standing room around the outside, some people standing and looking in the doorway. We always found a way, I think, though, where everybody could hear. If they wanted in, they could get in. We couldn't always hear the comments of everyone because there were just too many.

But the dissenters had their say. And they actually had, I think, a disproportionate amount of voice within the meetings that I had, but that's all right. We got to hear from both sides of the argument. We got to hear from more of those that oppose a national health care plan than those that support it. Those that supported it were a distinct minority in my district, but

they had more than their fair share to say.

So I weighed those issues, and I watched their reaction. But the thing I remember the most were hundreds of attentive people sitting there with focused attention, listening to every word, listening to the words that were spoken by their friends, their neighbors, their family members, listened to the responses that I gave, and weighing this and putting it into their calculator for what America is going to look like.

I will never forget those faces, those eyes looking up to the front of the room, paying attention to every word, taking notes. Some of the questions were so well worded, so carefully phrased, you could tell that there was a deep amount of research that went into the questions. I wondered if some of them didn't stay up nearly all night long to be ready just for their chance, their chance to have that moment to have their say.

And I'm so encouraged by their commitment, and I wish they had more voice. I wish we could hear them now, Mr. Speaker. I wish we could fill this Chamber up with the people that filled up these townhall meetings, and especially the leadership, but the rank and file of all of us that have the privilege here to serve in the House of Representatives could hear those voices again in here.

I hope when we debate a health care bill here on the floor of the House that this gallery is full of people. I hope the C-SPAN camera, Mr. Speaker, represents millions out there that are watching every move, listening to every word, people that are taking notes, people that are tape-recording our actions and our words and carefully analyzing, and I hope we're held accountable for the decisions that are made in committee where generally it doesn't get the press that it gets here on the floor.

But when the day comes, the American people need to know that they have been heard, that we went home, that we traveled our districts, we did our townhall meetings, and that we came back and conferred with each other and arrived at a decision that's the right decision for the long-term best interests of our descendants, our progeny and their descendants as well, Mr. Speaker.

So I hope that's what happens. And I don't know that it will. I don't know that it will because there are forces at play, and some of the people, especially in the majority, have voiced this, that their townhall meetings with their constituents are just one of the places where they get the information to decide. Other places might be the lobby. It might be their coffers. It might be their leadership. And it could be just simply a deeply entrenched philosophy that favors Big Government over freedom.

So for me in my townhall meetings, if there was one position that I took

that I was clear on that had the most support of all, it was I will not support a bill that diminishes the people's freedom in the United States of America. That's my pledge, Mr. Speaker. I will not diminish our freedom. It's my freedom too. And I have taken an oath to uphold this Constitution, and it's our Constitution and it's about freedom. It isn't just about individual freedom. It's about the 10th Amendment. It's about the freedom of the States to control those things which are not specifically designated and enumerated for the Federal Government. This Federal Government has reached across the 10th Amendment and violated at least the spirit and I will say also the letter of the Constitution over and over again.

And if this United States of America passes a health care bill that looks anything like H.R. 3200, it will be a violation of our Constitution consistently in several different ways.

So I'm very concerned about where we go with this: the disregard, the cavalier attitude that many Members of Congress have towards the Constitution, towards their oath to the Constitution, towards its meaning and towards its content.

And this drive to create this single-payer system, you know, you just couldn't drive the wooden stake in the heart of HillaryCare back in 1993 and 1994. When Senator Phil Gramm stood on the floor of the United States Senate right down this hallway where I'm faced right now and he said this health care bill, this national health care bill will pass over my cold, dead political body, a lot of people thought that Senator Phil Gramm was going to become a cold, dead political body and that HillaryCare was going to pass. But it has not. It's been 15 years and more since Phil Gramm made that statement, and he has held off this nationalized health care, this socialized medicine juggernaut. He has and many others have too. It has been a national effort.

Yes, there are people out there that think that they'd be better off if somebody else would take the responsibility for their health care, and they are large in number but small in percentage, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I will make this point that we have constantly heard the words and the statistics that are over 40 million people that are uninsured in America, that we have got to do something about the uninsured. And this number of 40 million usually rounds up to around 44 million. Now it has kind of crept up to 47 million and probably the most reliable number is close to 46 million people uninsured in America. Now, that's a pretty large percentage of our population. We have about 306 million Americans, and if 46 or 47 million are uninsured, that's, let's see, one-sixth or a little bit less of our population.

It's funny that the uninsured is about the same percentage of our population as the GDP is consumed by health care.

But if that number is 47 million, and that's the highest number that's consistently delivered by the other side, and sometimes they stretch it and round it up to 50 million, but if the uninsured in America are 47 million, they would have us believe that these are chronically uninsured people that are stuck on these uninsured rolls year after year after year.

Well, that's not the case, Mr. Speaker. A lot of these people are just temporarily uninsured and they're in transition between policies. So as those policies change, occasionally they find themselves without coverage.

But I began to ask this question a little more carefully, and that is, Who are the people with affordable options? If somebody's uninsured and they're making a million dollars a year, I'm sorry, my heart doesn't bleed for them. They have decided that they don't care to have a health insurance policy and they're willing to take the risk with their equity. So that's not my concern. In fact, the United States Senate Republican conference staff set the bar at \$75,000 a year. If you make \$75,000 or more a year and you don't have health insurance, we are not going to put you in the category where you get a lot of our governmental compassion to extract dollars out of somebody else's labor to provide that person making over \$75,000 a year with health insurance.

Now, the President has decided to do class envy at \$250,000; but let me just say that if you're making more than \$75,000, you can find a way to pay for your own health insurance even if you just buy catastrophic, and you should get a health savings account and grow that health savings account and buy a major medical policy, a catastrophic health insurance policy, take care of your own incidental health care bills. But 47 million uninsured at any given time, the biggest number that we get.

Now, to boil this down, Mr. Speaker, to who are the people without affordable options, you take the 47 million and you subtract from it those that we really don't want to provide health insurance for out of the taxpayers' pocket at least, and that's going to be those that are in the country illegally. Even the President of the United States doesn't insist that we insure illegals under this policy. It was a new position that he took the other night. I'm not sure that he's as serious as we would like, but I was encouraged that right back here a few feet behind me, the President of the United States said, no, we are not going to fund illegals. Well, H.R. 3200 does. The Congressional Budget Office thinks so. The Congressional Research Service thinks so.

□ 2200

The vote that took place in the Ways and Means Committee that voted down the citizenship standard requirements in order to qualify for under H.R. 3200, this health care bill. That partisan vote. Or Democrats voted down the

language that would require proof of citizenship that's tried, tested and true, and used to be part of our Medicaid policy from the beginning, was voted down by a vote of 29-28 in the Ways and Means Committee. Democrats then wanted to leave a door open, at least in committee, so illegals could be funded under that newer policy.

That also was the case in the Ways and Means Committee, right down the party line exactly. They voted down the effort to try to raise the standard and require proof of citizenship. But the President is now taking the position he doesn't want to fund illegals in this. I think he got pushed into that pretty hard.

So 47 million uninsured at a given time minus 5.2 million illegals, this is according to the Republican Conference in the United States Senate. I think there are a lot more than that, Mr. Speaker. They use 5.2 million. I'll use that for the sake of our discussion. Subtract that from 47 million.

We also do not want to—and cannot under current law and should not—fund those who are new immigrants here. They're under the 5-year bar; no welfare until you've been here 5 years, take care of yourself for half a decade, and then you can qualify if you come legally. Under the 5-year bar, another 5 million.

Now we're adding this up. So you have 5.2 million illegals, 5 million new immigrants, but legal, under the 5-year bar, now we're at 10.2 million. Those making \$75,000 a year or more, I mentioned those, there are 9 million of those. Those who qualify for government programs, all part of the 47 million, 9.7 million Americans qualify for government programs but don't sign up, mostly Medicaid, Medicaid eligibles but not enrolled. They don't know that they didn't enroll in anything—and if we take it and hand deliver it to them. So we're adding up some numbers here. Then, those Americans who are eligible with their employer but they've either opted out or not bothered to opt into the employer-offered health insurance.

So those numbers, 5.2 million illegals, 5 million legal here under the 5-year bar, 9 million making more than \$75,000 a year or more, 9.7 million eligible for government programs, mostly Medicaid, but not signed up, and 6 million eligible for employer programs not signed up. That comes to 34.9 million Americans of the 47 million that we don't want to cover with this new policy under H.R. 3200, this health care plan.

There is a consensus out there that says we're not really worried about these categories. The one we're worried about are the Americans without affordable options. That number is not 47 million any longer. If you've done the math, Mr. Speaker, you will have subtracted each of these categories from the 47 million. All these categories add up to 34.9 million. Take that from 47 and you come to 12.1 million Americans without affordable options. That is the universe we're trying to fix.

The President has said we have two problems with health care in America; the first one is the economic crisis that we're in—it's a year long now, still a crisis—well, it's a problem; the stock market was good today, I might say. And he says we can't fix the economy unless we first fix health care. In fact, the cost of health care is the problem with our economy. And he would tell us if we could fix the health care problem, we would fix the economy.

Well, what's the problem with health care? According to the President of the United States—mostly as a candidate, but also as a President—we spend too much money. Health care costs too large a percentage of our gross domestic product. There's a problem. We have to fix it, otherwise we can't fix the economy; the President's position.

The other position that he has, the two points on health care, is that we have too many uninsured. Well, let's deal with the big problem first. We spend about 14.5 percent of our gross domestic product on health care in America. That's premiums and the care and the litigation and all of those things. The average of the industrialized world is about 9.5 percent of their GDP on health care. Well, we spend a high percentage on recreation and a high percentage on other things too. We are a rich nation. One of the reasons we spend that kind of money on health care is because we do have the wealth in order to distribute it to the health care industry, to that one-seventh of the economy that is our health care industry.

So we have wealth, and we decide to spend it on health. It's not the worst thing, but we should examine it objectively. I do think we spend too much, too large a percentage, but by the same token I don't think they get very good health care in those countries that spend a lot less. But we spend about half again on health care in the United States as a percentage of our GDP as they do in other countries, but we produce more per capita than most of those countries too. And I need to pull that back and equate the two, and I haven't done that yet. I hope somebody does and gets me the information, otherwise I will sit up some night and do the doodling, Mr. Speaker.

But we spend too much money on health care. What would you do about that? If you have a problem in your family budget and you are spending too much money, you don't solve the problem by going out and spending a lot more money. The score on this bill is someplace between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion; on the low side it's \$1 trillion. The most consistent number that has been produced, the analysis of it is \$1.6 trillion.

So according to the President, we spend too much money on health care. And I don't necessarily disagree, but his solution is to spend another \$1.6 trillion on it. That's not a solution. It doesn't solve the family budget to spend more money when you're spending too much, and it doesn't solve the

government problem to spend more money when you're spending too much. And so even if the President identifies the problem correctly, he has the erroneous solution to apply to it: Voila, we spend too much money, therefore, the solution is spend more.

This was the approach he brought to this economic crisis to demand more money through the stimulus fund, too, when we came to our conference and said, FDR lost his nerve, he should have spent a lot more money. He convinced us that the President of the United States wasn't going to make that mistake, he was going to spend a lot more money. He was going to be FDR/Keynesian economics on steroids. And that's what we got, Mr. Speaker. And the White House made a \$2 trillion mistake on their projections, \$2 trillion.

I remember when the junior Senator from Iowa, Tom Harkin, made the statement that \$6 billion was just pencil dust. And his opponent here walked around with a man-size pencil to talk about pencil dust. Well, I don't know that \$6 billion was pencil dust—in that context it can be questioned. But I can tell you that \$1.6 trillion is not pencil dust. Getting within \$2 trillion of the target is not pencil dust. That's real, huge money.

But if we're spending too much money on health care, then why wouldn't we address the things that fix the problem? Why don't we come at this in a different way and go after those most obvious things that we can use to fix the problem? Now, for example, how much money does defensive medicine cost? What does it work within the macro economics of the health care equation? And there are some numbers that will rattle on down to around 5.5 percent of overall health care costs. The health insurance underwriters, the top legislative officer gave me a number of 8.5 percent, the cost of medical malpractice premiums and litigation and defensive medicine. Those three things together, 8.5 percent, are overall health care costs.

If you take the 8.5 percent and you apply it to the 14.5 percent of our GDP, you can come up with a number of about \$203 billion a year that's going all for defensive medicine and malpractice premiums and trial lawyers and litigation. In other words, it isn't being spent on good health care; it's money that's being churned up in the system to pay other people to do other things other than deliver a product to people for the benefit of their good health.

Defensive medicine. Some of the providers got together and advised me in one of my meetings that their consensus was between 20 and 28 percent of the tests that they do are for defensive medicine purposes. In other words, get the test, get it on the record to protect them in case somebody files a malpractice lawsuit against them. They can always roll out the test and go to court and say, Well, I did this and this

and this, and I ran this test, and these were all negative, so therefore our medical conclusion was thus. And of course we all know there are anomalies when it comes to health.

Defensive medicine. Twenty to 28 percent of the tests, the unnecessary costs in health care that have to do with malpractice and premiums and in litigation and in defensive medicine, perhaps 8.5 percent, I see numbers to 10 percent, numbers up to 16 percent of the overall health care bill.

□ 2210

I'll settle on that 8½ percent number—perhaps it's slightly less—but if it's the 16 percent, as a number of doctors have pointed out, then you're looking, roughly, in the area of \$400 billion a year. Over 10 years, there's the \$4 trillion, Mr. President.

I remember his speech, and I know there were some folks who saw the humor when the President of the United States said, If you adopt my policy, over time, it will save \$4 trillion.

Over time. How long is "over time"? Is that right before the end of infinity? Is it 1 year? 5 years? 10 years? 20 years? a generation? a half a century or a century? a millennia? Over time, his policy would save \$4 trillion. Now, there is an ambiguous statement. You know, if you'd invest a penny and drop it in your passbook savings account, over time, you'd be worth \$4 trillion, too, Mr. Speaker. I think you wouldn't want to wait that long.

So, as to the high cost of health care, if it needs to be addressed—and I think it does—let's go where we can get the most money, the best results the quickest. Let's do lawsuit abuse reform. Let's adopt the California policy. Let's adopt the Texas policy. We passed it out of the House of Representatives about 4 years ago. We passed it out of the Judiciary Committee, where I sat; brought it to the floor; passed it here; messengered it over to the Senate. The wholly-owned subsidiary of the Trial Lawyers Association decided to kill our malpractice reform, our lawsuit abuse reform, that passed this House under the leadership, at that time, of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JIM SENSENBRENNER. So it's the simplest thing we couldn't do, the most effective thing we couldn't do.

If you do the scoring on this—now, I don't think we're going to get it all. I don't think we'll fix all of those problems, but if we did, it would be around \$203 billion a year, just by my little back-of-the-envelope calculation. Over a decade—we do our calculations here on a 10-year budget—that's \$2 trillion. We could save as much as \$2 trillion from health care just simply by cutting the trial lawyers out, still letting people get whole and letting the doctors do their doctoring without having to do defensive medicine, and it would reduce dramatically their malpractice premiums. As I say, they passed medical malpractice reform in Texas, and

the doctors who had undergone an exodus from Texas began to come back to Texas again. It's interesting.

So, if health care costs too much, why don't we address the problems of costly health care? Why don't we put more competition in it?

In some States, as much as 80 percent of the health insurance that's available to them is offered by one company. One company so dominates the market that it's 80 percent. In my State, one company dominates the market up to 70 percent. Why don't we let the people in New Jersey buy health insurance in Kentucky? Why don't we let the people in New York buy health insurance in Texas? Why don't we let them buy it in Iowa for that matter? We have pretty good policies available in Iowa. If we'd let people buy insurance across State lines, that would solve another allegation of the President of the United States.

He has said that they need to inject competition into the health insurance industry because too few companies dominate the market so much that they can dictate premiums, and that probably is true in localities. In fact, I just won't take issue with that statement. Yet the solution is not to establish a Federal government-run health insurance policy. We know how that goes. Many of us have made the argument:

If you do that, if you set up Federal health insurance, it will swallow up the rest of the private insurance companies in the country. We have 1,300 health insurance companies in the United States today that are selling a possible combination of 100,000 policies. If we get ObamaCare, we're going to get a national health insurance system that will be subsidized by the taxpayers, and all of our private insurance companies will also have to meet new standards written by the new Health Choices Administration, czar-issuener. That's what we'll see happen. The result of that will be the pattern that is out there for us. Here is one pattern:

In 1968, they passed National Flood Insurance. Yes, there were private property and casualty insurers in the business of selling flood insurance to people who lived where they could be flooded. That happened. It wasn't a great big market back in those years, but we didn't have a great big infrastructure to protect either back then. We do now. The Federal Government stepped in and passed the National Flood Insurance Act, and in a short period of time, all property and casualty flood insurance companies dropped the selling of flood insurance, and today, you can only buy one kind of flood insurance. That is the Federal Government's. They have the monopoly now. They dominate the market. They have squeezed everybody else out, and they have destroyed the private market in flood insurance. Well, you don't have to just buy that model. You could think that's an anomaly.

We could look at another situation that's going on. How about the student

loan program in the United States with all of the private companies, the private banks and the lending institutions that manage the student loans and the good competition that we've had? Now we have GEORGE MILLER, who's deciding that he wants to replace it all with Federal. A smaller and smaller percentage of our student loans are provided now through the private sector. They want to eliminate it all. If GEORGE MILLER has his way—and I'm confident the President would sign whatever GEORGE MILLER puts on his desk—you won't be able to go to a bank and borrow money to go to college. It will all be through the Federal Government. The Federal Government will control it all.

Oh, by the way, Federal flood insurance is a monopoly. The only flood insurance you can buy in the United States is from the Federal Government. The owned, operated, managed, marketed premium is set by the Federal Government. Federal flood insurance is \$19.2 billion in the red, and there's no way to get it back. So do we want more of this?

Let me throw another concept out here. Here is another interesting thing that comes out in listening to people at townhall meetings. Mr. Speaker, some proponents of ObamaCare would say, Well, listen. We have Medicaid and we have Medicare and we have Social Security, and they're all government programs. You like those, don't you?

Well, yes. The people who are receiving the benefits like them better than nothing, and some parts of them are pretty good, but there's a big difference between what they're proposing here and Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security. In all three of those categories that I've mentioned, of those government programs that we have, the people receiving the benefits are predominantly not the ones paying for them at the time they receive them. They are the beneficiaries of someone else's labor and largesse. The highest producing people in America are paying the most taxes, and now the President and the liberals in this Congress are determined to tell the freedom-loving, top-producing Americans that not only are they going to have to continue to fund somebody else's Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security, but now they're going to have to fund a whole lot of other people's health care, those who are in the most productive years of their lives, and by the way, you're going to fund everybody else's, but your choices are going to be diminished because the Federal Government has to be able to compete and push out a lot of the private providers. I guarantee you, if they pass this bill, there will not be 1,300 health insurance companies any longer. There will not be 100,000 possible policy combinations any longer. That number will diminish overnight and over time, and we'll see how long it takes before there's the same number of private health insurance companies in America as there

are property and casualty companies that are selling flood insurance.

I see my friend from Minnesota, MICHELE BACHMANN, has arrived at the floor—persistent, relentless and ever on the ball. I would be so happy to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I could never hold a candle to the stunning STEVE KING of Iowa, so I thank you for deferring to me for a few minutes, and I am extremely grateful for the gentleman's comments on the floor so far this evening.

One thing that has been brought to my mind from your comments is you'd recalled that you'd remembered that President Obama came to meet with House Republicans down in the bowels of the Capitol building, just below where we're standing now, and he gave a private speech to us where there were no members of the press. One thing that I recall from that meeting with the President is the President had said to us he would prefer to enact his full agenda and be a one-term President rather than not enact his agenda and be a two-term President.

I think that the American people cannot underscore enough the fact that the President is very determined in his desire to enact this health care legislation, and perhaps never again will one party hold the type of cards that have been dealt in their hands as they hold right now. That's why I think the American people recognize that, with an overpowering one-party domination, we see an intention to enact this government takeover of health care that literally will lead to life-and-death decisions.

You talked about three different areas where the government has gotten involved, and it reminded me of yesterday, when I was meeting with a group of constituents, and a gentleman told me this story. He said he'd just purchased from what is now known as "government motors" in our country—because the Federal Government has taken over not one but two car companies. The United States Government is now the largest car manufacturer in the United States. Well, government motors—and again, this is nothing derogatory against our dealerships. Our dealerships, through no fault of their own, are in the current situation that they're in. We know 3,500 car dealerships have received pink slips from our government, putting out of work about 150,000 good American-paying jobs.

□ 2220

Well, in the midst of this, a gentleman told me yesterday he went to what's now called Government Motors, fondly. He purchased a top-of-the-line vehicle, brand new. His dashboard split, so he has a brand-new dashboard in this top-of-the-line vehicle from Government Motors.

He went down to the good dealership, excellent dealership that he purchased

the car from. Dealership said, sure, it's under warranty, we will take care of that for you. The gentleman waited. He didn't hear back. He said, hey what's up with my dashboard, brand-new car, top of the line, Government Motors? It's under warranty, what gives?

I am calling all around the country. This wonderful local dealer turned over every stone that he could. And do you know what he discovered? In the entire country, in the United States, there isn't one single dashboard available to replace this brand-new top-of-the-line dashboard in the car he just purchased.

What am I going to do?, he said. Well, since the Federal Government took over GM, suppliers have been let go. No new suppliers are in place.

So here this gentleman purchased a car. It's the last of its series. How many suppliers are going to be out there bidding for a car that will never be built again?

That's part of the problem when government takes over. Because does government really have to worry about customer satisfaction the same way that a private business has to worry about government satisfaction? I think that's what the American people in their innate genius understand in the middle of this health care debate.

They understand that when government is in charge, government doesn't necessarily have to worry about customer satisfaction unless you are an elected official. Then you know you have to go back to your constituency. You have to answer for the votes that you cast and the decisions that you make.

But if you are government and you own the company and you dominate the company, what do you worry about customer satisfaction, especially if you are not only the car maker, but you also control the contracts with the dealerships and you are the lender? Because, let's face it, now the Federal Government is also the lender when it comes to car sales.

And the Federal Government is backing a lot of the credit card loans that are out there now. So where is the public going to go, and who does the Federal Government have to answer to?

And this is what people know, because now it's about my health care and my child's health care, and my elderly mother's health care. And I really care about my mother, but will a bureaucrat, a nameless, faceless bureaucrat give a rip if my mother can't get her hip replacement or she can't get the pacemaker?

Remember, that question was asked of President Obama. He held a townhall meeting in the White House, and, recall, there was a woman who stood up and said, President Obama, my mother was 100 years old. I couldn't get one doctor to give her the pacemaker she needed until finally I found a doctor who said your mother has a lot of spirit. I will get her a pacemaker. He did, and her mother was still living 5 years later, doing very well with her pacemaker.

President Obama's response? He said, Well, you know, maybe a pill would be the better answer than surgery.

Well, the woman didn't need a pain pill. What she needed was the surgery. And this is exactly the point.

Will we have bureaucrats and politicians looking at their bottom lines in their constituencies rather than having a doctor who, really, his best interest is to make sure that patient is healed and becomes well? Who will make the decisions in this upcoming scenario? That's really what the American people want to know.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

I was just listening to the General Motors part of this discussion, and I am thinking about the components of General Motors, Government Motors, and how this all transpired. And it first came about with the first little dialogue going on. And some of us said put them through chapter 11. We are not going to be without cars. Somebody will take up those assets and turn them into a competitive company.

Speaker PELOSI said, I am not going to get the unions—I am not going to let the car makers get bargaining leverage over the unions. So you had the bond holders, the secured creditors involved in this.

And then the President effectively fired the CEO of General Motors.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And hand-picked his own guy to go in there as the CEO of General Motors and over, close, near that period of time, picked, hand-picked all but two members of the board of directors on General Motors. And the Federal Government ended up with 61 percent of General Motors. That's the U.S., the Federal Government, the Canadian Government, 12.5 percent, the unions, 17.5 percent. Now I didn't do the math on what's left. It's not much.

And then on top of that you have Cash for Clunkers that goes out and buys these cars or puts the down payment down. And the Federal Government guaranteeing some of the loans for the cars, it is the perfect circle of socialized economy. It's astonishing to me.

Now what do you do if you are out here making a car that you can't sell, and you need to pay the scale for the workers that didn't give up anything if we pass a national health care act? The unions didn't give up anything in this deal, but they got 17.5 interest in a company.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Let's go back to the crux of this issue, and it is the economy, what's happening in the United States economy.

And as we have seen, the Federal Government comes in and effectively nationalizes about 30 percent of our economy, and they are on a deep, long drive to make sure that they can nationalize another 18 percent by taking over health care. And what's more, with the national energy tax, they

want to take over even more of the national economy so that the Federal Government would effectively own or control well over 50 percent of the private business profits earned in this company. What has it yielded for the economy?

And I just looked at an article today that was in the Hill newspaper. And it said President Obama's chief economist has said, today, the jobless rate will remain high despite economic growth. She voiced worry that the economic growth expected in the coming years won't be enough to bring down the unemployment rate to pre-recession levels.

Christina Romer said, in 2010, that's next year, Representative, next year, the economy will likely grow, but the jobless rate will peak at 10 percent.

We are at 9.7 percent unemployment now. It's going to grow, according to the President's chief economist, up to 10 percent. It won't start falling at a rapid clip.

In fact, the administration, independent economists expect next year steady but not over-the-top GDP growth of between 2 to 3 percent. That will bring unemployment down slowly, but not by big movement; Unemployment on the right trajectory, but not coming down.

This is incredible. We were told we had to pass in 3 days a trillion-dollar stimulus plan because the President said otherwise we would go to 8 percent unemployment. We could only wish we had 8 percent unemployment.

We are at 9.7 percent. The President's chief economist said we are going to over 10. And according to the President's chief economist, if this health care plan goes into effect, we will lose another 5.5 million jobs. If we put his national energy tax into plan, it will be another 2.5 million jobs lost every year. The President is bent on a China-India jobs stimulus plan.

We are losing American jobs, ceding them to our national competitors, and the Americans aren't gaining anything for it. That's why last week the flash point, when President Obama stood here in this Chamber and gave a speech to the joint session of Congress, there was one story that overshadowed the entire night, and that was one of our colleagues, Mr. JOE WILSON of South Carolina who had made a statement to President Obama.

And in the midst of that statement, Representative JOE WILSON became effectively the point at the tip of the spear on this debate. And it was over the issue of whether the President was accurate in his statement that illegal aliens would be receiving health care benefits coequal with other Americans that are here lawfully in our country and at the expense of taxpayers. That was really the flash-point issue.

And what we found out last Friday night, we saw Democrat Members of Congress saying we are willing to put that verification in the bill, in other words proving that our colleague, JOE

WILSON, was right, which makes it almost incomprehensible to me to believe that the Democrat majority plans to bring about a resolution tomorrow in this very Chamber condemning our colleague for his words.

He has already apologized for his lack of decorum, everyone agrees with that.

But to think that you would say to one of our colleagues, who the Democrats have already proved right by admitting that they are going to take the provision out of the bill that Representative WILSON was referring to?

It's almost uncanny to me that we would live to see such a day when that would happen.

□ 2230

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady. I believe it says in the book of John that if you forgive men's sins, they are forgiven them. If you hold them bound, they are held bound.

President Obama said he accepted the apology. That's forgiveness. Because the President accepted the apology from the officer and the gentleman, JOE WILSON, no one else in the country has a claim to any other redress whatsoever.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Which is why I thank the gentleman from Iowa, Representative STEVE KING, for penning a letter asking others of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join that letter in support of our colleague, JOE WILSON. I was very happy to sign on to your letter.

But you, STEVE KING, the stunning STEVE KING of the State of Iowa, you took the initiative on that front. You were right to do so. And I am extremely grateful for your leadership on this issue. Because this is the point. When we're talking about this, it isn't about the President; this isn't about any Member of Congress. This is about the American people. Will the American people continue to enjoy the finest health care system that the world has ever known or will we lose our freedom of choice over health care and will Americans lose the control over another 18 percent of private business profits.

This is a big deal. This is a really big issue. Because, since the inception of Bailout Nation less than a year ago, 30 percent of private business profits are now owned or controlled by the Federal Government. If President Obama gets his way, that's another 18 percent—almost 50 percent.

This is the issue right now. Will our economy be better off by government taking over the economy. No? Are you kidding. We've already seen demonstration of that in the last few months. Surely, we would not be better off with President Obama nationalizing health care and the energy industry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me just roll this question back across your analytical accountant, CPA, tax lawyer mind, and that is, if 30 percent of the private

profits today are controlled by the Federal Government, and if another 18 percent would be swallowed up in a national health care plan, taking us to 48 percent of the private, what if all private interests were rolled up in shares, and you could buy derivatives of those shares of the private sector? What if you could do that?

And what if the Federal Government then controlled 48 percent of all the shares of the private sector? Because that would be the equivalent, I would think. They would almost be to the point of having controlling interest over the private sector of the economy of the United States of America. Is that how the equation works out?

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's exactly right, Representative. Again, we know President Obama's intention is to effectively nationalize the energy by giving the Federal Government control over the use and distribution of energy.

Remember, we had a conversation earlier.

Then-candidate Obama, Senator Obama, made the statement during the course of his campaign. He said, Americans can't think that they can drive SUVs, set their thermostats at 72 degrees, or eat as much as food as they want, and think the rest of the world will be okay with that.

Well, let's take a look at the report card since President Obama has come into office. By taking over GM and Chrysler, what we're seeing is the diminution of the SUV. We're seeing a lot of these high-end vehicles now being phased out, and instead we're seeing the new cars that the President wants to have put in place by Government Motors. That's the SUV portion.

What about setting our house temperature at 72 degrees and buildings like this one at 72 degrees? Well, once we have the government effectively nationalizing energy, people won't be able to afford to set their thermostats at 72 degrees. They will be sitting at home shivering at 55 degrees in winter, and in summer most likely won't even be able to turn on the air-conditioning.

And what about food? President Obama said we can't eat as much food as we want and think the rest of the world will be okay about that, as if that matters to freedom-loving Americans. Well, we just heard last week that the Federal Government now under the Obama administration is calling for a reordering of America's food supply. What is that going to mean? Now will the White House decide how many calories we consume or what types of food we consume?

You're from an agriculture State, I'm from an agriculture State. My farmers are very concerned about this. Our farmers are some of the greatest geniuses the world has ever seen. When you think of the percentage of farmers that we had in this country producing the food when the Nation first began, we're now at less than 2 percent of our population produces all of the food that Americans consume. Not only that, a good portion of the world as well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, you triggered something in my memory here, Mrs. BACHMANN, and that would be the hearings that we held before the House Agriculture committee. This would have been March 13, 2007. It has to do with what people should be eating and what is healthy, and how we're going to legislate that from the Federal level.

There were those on that committee that thought that we should increase food stamps substantially. In fact, they were pushing to increase food stamps 46 percent. For the most part, they got that job done.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But, how do you justify that when you can't find people that are suffering from malnutrition or people that are actually hungry, chronically hungry. There are people that miss meals. I'm among them. But we don't have chronic hunger in America.

In order to justify the expansion of food stamps, they brought before us the president of La Raza, that's the organization that stands for The Race. Her name is Janet Murguia. And in that testimony she said this—and this is a quote, "There is also mounting evidence that the overweight and obesity trends in the United States are due, in part, to high levels of food insecurity."

So we have a situation where the argument is being made to the United States Congress that we have fat people in America that are overweight because they were worried about some meals that they might miss one day in the future, and they tended to overeat in the present tense. So if we would just give them an unlimited supply of food stamps, then they would eat less, lose weight, and live healthy and happy thereafter, that's what she's telling us. Food insecurity.

So I'm wondering, Where has this world gone, George Orwell? How did we get to this place? And I remember walking down along Franklin Delano Roosevelt's monument and looking at the symbols that he has of the speech that he gave that is sort of the idea of the four freedoms. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion—I'll stand and defend those. They are rights. They are freedoms. They are guaranteed.

But freedom from want and freedom from fear can't be guaranteed by anybody but God. And I'm not sure it's healthy to have freedom from want, because want is what drives us to produce and be better. And then our philanthropy that comes from the times we're short causes us to help other people that are short.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the Representative would allow me to intervene, there is one want that we don't have to worry about any more, and that's one organization in the United States that has been given a great abundance, and that's the organization ACORN.

I know that you have done a great deal of work in trying to expose the nefarious activities of ACORN. We learned last week that ACORN, which

has a persistent record of voter fraud indictments across the country, was brought under indictment for 11 counts of voter fraud down in the State of Florida. And then there were videos that came out showing that ACORN, which is a grand recipient of Federal money, was found facilitating bringing in underage girls illegally across not only State lines but across our country's borders into the United States for the purpose of prostitution.

ACORN was not only enabling this illegal criminal business, they were also coaching people on how to avoid their tax payments that they would have to pay and how to go into federally funded housing.

That's why I have been writing letters to the Census Bureau, to the Housing and Urban Development Agency, to call on them to stop all current and future grants and to investigate all past grants.

ACORN has been a recipient of \$53 million in Federal funds since 1993. Now, since President Obama, who is a former employee of ACORN, since he has become the President, now ACORN has access to \$8.5 billion. And in another bill that passed through the House, an additional \$1 billion—a billion dollars, \$8.5 billion ACORN has access to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mrs. BACHMANN, why didn't you do something about it?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Why didn't I do something about that?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I did. I have and you have. We've been writing letters.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Did you offer an amendment in Financial Services?

Mrs. BACHMANN. I did. I offered an amendment in Financial Services. It did pass out of the committee. And the amendment said that organizations like ACORN or similarly situated organizations that are currently under indictment for voter fraud would be ineligible to have access to Federal grants.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Did Chairman FRANK vote for that amendment?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Chairman FRANK voted for that amendment in the committee, yes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Why isn't it law?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, it came to the House floor and Chairman FRANK said in the course of his remarks here on the floor that he was not—he didn't read the amendment fully. He wasn't aware of what the amendment said. And so he said it came to his attention later by his staff, and so now he was going to change that.

□ 2240

Mr. KING of Iowa. Could that be interpreted to mean that ACORN talked to his staff after the committee meeting and advised him that he should come to the floor and change the language?

Mrs. BACHMANN. I can't tell you whether ACORN spoke with him or not. I have no knowledge of that. All I know

is that when Chairman FRANK came to the floor, he proceeded to pull my amendment out of the bill, which he did, which meant that now ACORN would have access to another \$1.5 billion in addition to the \$8.5 billion that they already have access to.

ACORN, in my opinion, should have the Internal Revenue Service look at their tax-exempt status. In my opinion, I think ACORN has a very tough time proving that they should hold onto their tax exempt status. Not only that, they have a tough time proving that they should be a recipient of any more Federal housing grants. If they want to be an organization, they can, but they shouldn't be a recipient of Federal taxpayer funds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Here is an image. In fact, this poster is not here tonight, but I will try to bring it down later this week so everybody can see it, Mr. Speaker. I thought it would be good for me to go down to the headquarters of ACORN to see what it looked like. So I went on down there to 2609 Canal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana. That's the national headquarters and, for all I know, the international headquarters of ACORN. In there is where they process the paperwork for many of—probably most of—and probably not quite all of their affiliate corporations. But inside those doors, the most fortified building in that neighborhood—I yield back.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Aren't there over 200 affiliated organizations housed, and it's a two story building?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes. But it's a four- or five-story building. I would have to look at the picture to count the stories. But the first two are all bars, and it's fortified. Then above that, it's high enough so that the crowds can't get in. But behind the glass in ACORN's national headquarters on the street side, there's a huge poster: "Obama for President '08," and hanging right next to it is an ACORN flag. I have that picture. I have turned it into a poster. I brought it down here on the floor.

ACORN is a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization. It is unlawful for them to engage in partisan politics, and yet they are a get-out-the-vote organization for Democrats. They are taking Federal tax dollars, and they're pushing it through to run political campaigns, and then they boldly advertise it in the front window of their national headquarters in New Orleans with an Obama poster.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Over and over, I have had people tell me that ACORN is effectively the electioneering arm of the Democratic Party, and that is concerning. At least I would think that the Democrat majority that controls this House would want to hold hearings to clear their name, to say that ACORN is not our electioneering arm and prove that assertion false. I would think that's exactly what they would want to do, which is why I wrote letters to Chairman BARNEY FRANK and to

Speaker PELOSI, demanding that we have oversight hearings and investigate ACORN to take a look at all of the grants that ACORN has received to see if they have been spent wisely, if they've been used according to the rules that have been set up for their disbursement.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mrs. BACHMANN, you have raised a lot of children, foster children, your own natural born children. It is a phenomenal thing. Have you ever caught any of your children with their hand in the cookie jar?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Did any of them ever call for a hearing to clear their name?

Mrs. BACHMANN. No. They knew they were guilty, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think that is the case. Clearly, it's a partisan get-out-the-vote organization. They're everywhere in America, in over 100 major cities, and then subdivisions within the cities. Their reach doesn't just go into politics. We saw what was going on with the—what's the nicest word—subornation of prostitution, child prostitution, the encouragement of what appears to be illegal immigration, saying that they're going to help with a child tax credit, the refundable tax credit which is a transfer from the taxpayers to the pimp and the prostitute out of the pocket of the taxpayers, enabled by ACORN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This is ACORN enabling it. And one of our colleagues said that he would hold hearings about ACORN. Several months ago there was one indictment after another that came out after voter fraud. Now these latest indictments deal with the housing grants that ACORN is receiving. He announced that he was going to hold hearings and investigate ACORN. Then the next thing we knew, he was not going to hold those hearings because he said the higher ups told him—these are his own words—he said, the higher-ups told him that he was not to hold hearings.

I think the American people have a right to know. I think they have a right to know that these red flags about ACORN didn't just happen last week. These red flags have gone up months and years ago. Remember, the Speaker of the House said that she was going to drain the swamp. That's what she was going to do, drain the swamp of corruption. But could anything be more corrupt than a taxpayer-funded tax-free organization doing the electioneering bidding for a dominant political party? Does it get any more circular than that and, some might suggest, incestuous?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, it's circular, and it's incestuous. The statement that was made about investigating ACORN was made by Chairman JOHN CONYERS, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I was sitting in the room when that was going on. We had a hearing before the Constitution Subcommittee, the subcommittee chairman is JERRY

NADLER from New York. Chairman CONYERS said, I think there's substance here. I think we should look into it. Chairman NADLER said, When I see something substantive, then I will consider hearings. There was plenty of substance. There is plenty more substance here now.

But since that time, JOHN CONYERS has said, Well, the powers that be—not necessarily the higher-ups—but the powers that be have decided that there wouldn't be hearings. Now who could "the powers that be" be when you are the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives? You really only look up and you think, well, the powers that be are either the Speaker of the House or the President of the United States.

Well, what we do know is the President of the United States used to work for ACORN. That's irrefutable and not arguable. He not only worked for ACORN but he also was a trainer for ACORN, and he headed up Project Vote, which is part and parcel of ACORN. The President wore an ACORN jersey. He was a player and a coach, and now he is an alumni who has hired ACORN to help facilitate hiring people at a minimum on the Census and now they've backed off of that. I'm not all that optimistic that that will stick. But we have a President of the United States with a chief of staff named Rahm Emanuel who used to serve in the House of Representatives. He is known for hardball, hard-core Chicago-style politics. And we're going to have to wonder if we can actually get hearings and investigations.

Here's what needs to happen, Mr. Speaker: this Congress needs to have multiple committees with bipartisan hearings and investigations on every aspect of ACORN. The Department of Justice has to deploy an entire division to go in and do a complete forensic audit of every dollar that comes and goes from ACORN and every one of their affiliates. They have to bring the IRS into this so we can track every dollar, and we've got to see indictments. We've got to see the perp walk. We are going to have to see people put in prison for what they're doing to the American taxpayers, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And also there's video footage today of the President speaking to ACORN, saying that ACORN would be a part of his decision-making on various bills.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, did I hear a gavel? Does that mean my time has expired?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 60 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Okay. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I will just simply conclude. I didn't pick up the sound very well.

I appreciate the gentelady from Minnesota coming to the floor to engage in this discussion and dialogue that we have. I'll appreciate it when this Congress steps forward and does the investigations of ACORN and multiple committees, the Finance Committee, the

Ways and Means Committee, the Judiciary Committee, the Government Reform Committee, those, among others. And when the Justice Department steps up and instead of shutting down an investigation of voter intimidation, which was an open and shut case of intimidation in Philadelphia, if they will step in and really do an investigation of ACORN, let's give the taxpayers their due, let's represent the American people, let's clean this place up, and let's have the high standards that were envisioned by the Founding Fathers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical issue.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. McHUGH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and September 15 on account of a family medical matter.

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. GRAYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, 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. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, September 15, 16 and 17.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, September 15.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCALISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3325. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize for 1 year

the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance program and the Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security program.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on September 10, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3325. To amend title XI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize for 1 year the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance program and the Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security program.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 15, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3295. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0042] (RIN: 0579-AC78) received August 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3296. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Grape Crop Insurance Provisions and Table Grape Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC09) received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3297. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of Land Management Chief, Forest Service, Department of the Interior transmitting 2008 report, "Monitoring Fuel Treatments Across the Continental United States for Overall Effectiveness and Effects on Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat, Air and Water Quality"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3298. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium Lauryl Sulfate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0041; FRL-8430-5] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3299. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notice of funds transferred between Office of National Drug Control Policy agency programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3300. A letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting Inventory Lists for the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air

Force, pursuant to section 2330a Title 10 of the U.S. Code as amended by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3301. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the proposed test and evaluation (T&E) budgets that are not certified by the Director of the Defense Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) to be adequate for FY 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3302. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Navy, transmitting Report to Congress on Public-Private Competition Result; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3303. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID FEMA-2008-0020] received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3304. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the 2009 Report to Congress, "Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act (SAFE Act)"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3305. A letter from the Council for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Section 108 Community Development Loan Guarantee Program: Participation of States as Borrowers Pursuant to Section 222 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 [Docket No.: 5326-I-01] received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3306. 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 August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3307. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Capital Classifications and Critical Capital Levels for the Federal Home Loan Banks (RIN: 2590-AA21) received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3308. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Capital Adequacy Guidelines: Treatment of Perpetual Preferred Stock Issued to the United States Treasury under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 [Regulation Y; Docket No. R-1336] received September 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3309. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2006 Report to Congress on the Impact and Effectiveness of Administration for Native Americans Projects", pursuant to Section 811(e) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3310. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3311. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting FY 2008 Performance Report to Congress for the Medical Device User Fee Amendments of 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3312. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee; Risk Communication Advisory Committee; Termination and Recharter [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0310] received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3313. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the Administration's report entitled, "Annual Energy Review 2008"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3314. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Consumer Products Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1129; FRL-8941-9] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Implementation Plans of Michigan: Clean Air Interstate Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0294; FRL-8944-7] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions, Pinal County, Arizona [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0521; FRL-8946-2] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Delaware [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0238; FRL-8936-4] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, Mohave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0566; FRL-8939-2] received August 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3319. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2008 [MD Docket No. 08-65] received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3320. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3321. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties en-

tered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3322. 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 Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006., pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3323. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-52, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3324. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-35, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3325. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-45, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3326. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-48, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3327. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-49, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3328. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the 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.

3329. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's required General/Trust Fund Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3330. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3331. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information Systems and Chief Information Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting report on the training on, and use of the government-wide authority for category rating in competitive examining; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3332. A letter from the Solicitor, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3333. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform

Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3334. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the boundary description and classification of the North Fork of the Smith Wild and Scenic River, Rogue River — Siskiyou National Forest, Oregon, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3335. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the boundary description and classification of the Upper Rogue Wild and Scenic River, Rogue River — Siskiyou National Forest, Oregon, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3336. A letter from the General Counsel (Acting), National Indian Gaming Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Various National Indian Gaming Commission Regulations (RIN: 3141-0001) received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3337. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act covering the six months ending December 31, 2008, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3338. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting annual "Report to Congress: National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS)", submitted in accordance with the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Pub. L. 110-180); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3339. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Officials: Definition of Immediate Family Members, As Amended [Public Notice: 6676] received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3340. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department Homeland of Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3299-EM in the State of New York, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3341. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1846-DR for the State of Oklahoma, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3342. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30680; Amdt. No. 482] received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3343. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30678 Amdt. No. 3332] received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3344. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30679; Amdt. No. 3333] received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3345. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G-IV, GIV-X, and GV-SP Series Airplanes and Model GV Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0683; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-15991; AD 2009-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3346. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-60 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0464; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-15992; AD 2008-16-09 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3347. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318, A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0004; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-15995; AD 2009-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3348. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1844-DR for the state of South Dakota, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3349. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Special Rules Governing Eligible Combined Plans received August 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3350. A letter from the Chairman, Social Security Advisory Board, transmitting report entitled "Bridging the Gap: Improving SSA's Public Service through Technology"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3351. A letter from the Regulation Coordinator, Department of Health and Medicaid Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2010 [CMS-1538-F] (RIN: 0938-AP56) received August 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on September 10, 2009 the following report was filed on September 11, 2009]

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 3246. A bill to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy; with an amendment (Rept.

111-254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3556. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a self-referral disclosure protocol under the Medicare Program to enable health care providers of services and suppliers to disclose violations of section 1877 of the Social Security Act; 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. JONES:

H.R. 3557. A bill to provide an emergency cost-of-living increase for Social Security benefits for 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 3558. A bill to allow incumbent contractors to be eligible to re-compete for Government contracts as small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, 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. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3559. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve awareness and access to colorectal cancer screening tests under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; 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. SIRES (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3560. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to establish the Health Technology Program in the United States Agency for International Development to research and develop technologies to improve global health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona):

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational assistance provided to certain veterans for flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3562. A bill to designate the Federal building under construction at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "Chaney, Goodman, Schwerner Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of Dr. Norman E. Borlaug to the United States and the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the bankruptcy proceedings of Lehman Brothers Holding Inc. and Lehman Brothers Europe Inc. be resolved in an equitable and expeditious process between the United States and United Kingdom, and that the interests of American investors be given due consideration and be treated with urgency throughout; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BACA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H. Res. 737. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week should be established; to the Committee on Education and Labor; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HODES, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Res. 738. A resolution recognizing the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 739. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dr. Norman E. Borlaug for his many contributions to alleviating world hunger; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H. Res. 740. A resolution recognizing the valuable contributions of the extension offices of land-grant universities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 741. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 8, 2009, as national Jumpstart's "Read for the Record Day"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr.

BROWN of Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 742. A resolution congratulating the Warner Robins Little League softball team from Warner Robins, Georgia, on winning the 2009 Little League Softball World Series; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H. Res. 743. A resolution honoring the life of Frank McCourt for his many contributions to American literature, education, and culture; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 52: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 55: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 124: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 197: Mr. KRATOVIL.
 H.R. 272: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 275: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 294: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 422: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 433: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 501: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 503: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 537: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 571: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 621: Mr. FARR, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 634: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 646: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHU, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 669: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 678: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 758: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 793: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 868: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 916: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 930: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 932: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 953: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 997: Mr. ISSA and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1021: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 1038: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1053: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 1067: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1193: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1213: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1215: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 1228: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1245: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1327: Ms. CHU, Mr. NYE, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 1392: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NORTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1570: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1615: Mr. MAFFEL.
 H.R. 1618: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 1646: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1685: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1691: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1751: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1821: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1826: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1831: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1868: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 1894: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1908: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1927: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1932: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
 H.R. 1941: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1946: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1956: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1977: Ms. SUTTON and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2002: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 2058: Mr. CARTER and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2062: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2068: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 2095: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2115: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 2190: Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2220: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MINNICK, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 2222: Mr. HIMES and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 2243: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 2246: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HODES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2292: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 2358: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 2377: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2397: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 2408: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2421: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 2425: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2456: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 2499: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2524: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 2543: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. OLVER and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2578: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2607: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 2625: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 2626: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2685: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 2766: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2817: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2842: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2859: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 2866: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2891: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2935: Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2941: Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 2969: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 3017: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3024: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 3039: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 3040: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 3043: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3044: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. FARR and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3092: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3149: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3164: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3168: Mr. CASTLE.
 H.R. 3173: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 3212: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3220: Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 3226: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 3274: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 3286: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 3307: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3310: Ms. FOX.
 H.R. 3339: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 3365: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HALL of New York.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 3383: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 3400: Mr. COLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SHADEGG.
 H.R. 3404: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3406: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3408: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 3418: Mr. BRIGHT.
 H.R. 3421: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 3465: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3467: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 3471: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 3472: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3492: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 3502: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 3506: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 3524: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 3527: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 3535: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3536: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 3545: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MAFFEL, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3549: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3554: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. COBLE and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. REYES.

H. Con. Res. 128: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. OLSON.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. CAO.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. MINNICK and Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MASSA, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 81: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 167: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. NYE.

H. Res. 215: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 260: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Res. 266: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Res. 267: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 443: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 494: Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 554: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H. Res. 558: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 577: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 604: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 615: Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 619: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H. Res. 638: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 649: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KUCNICH.

H. Res. 660: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 672: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 676: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 679: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 686: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SIREs, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H. Res. 692: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HODES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NYE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SPACE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MASSA, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HARE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr.

NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 700: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 704: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H. Res. 707: Mr. HARPER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 721: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H. Res. 725: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. ISSA.

H. Res. 727: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 733: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. CHU, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Res. 734: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BILBRAY.

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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GORDON of Tennessee, or a designee, to H.R. 3246, the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.