



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2009

No. 137

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 25, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Let us rejoice in the Lord.

In His beauty, we trace our creation. In His compassion and mercy, we claim our salvation.

In profound humility, we offer our works of justice and our public service on behalf of others, and so we find fulfillment.

To the Lord, we commend this Nation, its people, its resources and its leadership.

May all give You, Lord God, glory, praise, honor, and thanksgiving, today 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 her approval thereof.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS)

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

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

### NORMALIZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REPUBLICS OF ARMENIA AND TURKEY

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

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to recent encouraging developments concerning discussions between the Republic of Turkey and the Republic of Armenia.

On August 31, 2009, Turkey and Armenia, along with Switzerland, which acted as broker for the talks, announced two protocols and a timetable for normalizing relationships between Armenia and Turkey. These protocols have been initialed by both foreign ministries.

While many have seen the longstanding disputes between Turkey and Armenia as intractable, the recent announcement gives hope that these two countries have taken the first tangible steps on the road to reconciliation. The Protocol for the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Turkey reinforces the willingness of these two governments to open their shared border and to advance bilateral relations, including trade and economic cooperation.

Although this process still faces a number of hurdles, including ratification by the two countries' respective parliaments, I am encouraged by and applaud the initial important steps Turkey and Armenia have taken to strengthen their relations by beginning an open dialogue on some of the major issues that divide them. I commend Switzerland for its important role.

My four little boys—Penn, Aubrey, Wyatt, and Sullivan—and all of the children of the world, whether Turkish, Armenian or American, benefit when diplomacy succeeds.

### BIG GOVERNMENT IS NOT THE SOLUTION

(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. Madam Speaker, American families are concerned that the failed solutions they see coming out of Washington all have the same themes: more government, more taxes, more borrowing, and more spending.

At a time when our government is heavily in debt and when our economy is losing jobs, more spending and more taxes are not strategies that will produce jobs or that will protect the value of our currency.

With health insurance reform, we need solutions that are built on strengthening individual choice and on protecting the doctor-patient relationship. We need to expand competition in the health insurance market by letting individuals shop for plans across State lines. Rather than a plan that empowers the government, we can empower individuals and small businesses to band together to secure affordable health care.

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

□ 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.

H9963

God bless Benjamin Netanyahu as a leader of the free world.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS SHAWN PATRICK McCLOSKEY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen American patriot.

Thousands of my constituents lined the streets of Peachtree City, Georgia, this week, waving American flags to honor the late Sergeant First Class Shawn Patrick McCloskey. The sergeant, returning home to his final resting place, died while serving in the U.S. Army in Afghanistan.

Before joining the service, Sergeant McCloskey worked for a construction company in Fayette County. Like many of his fellow soldiers, he was a regular American, going to work every day and providing for his family, when he decided to join the military in 2002. At a great time of anguish for our Nation, he heard the call to duty and answered it.

Sergeant McCloskey became a Green Beret in 2004, and his valor won him many medals and awards, including the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart and the National Defense Service Medal.

Our Nation mourns the loss of each soldier sacrificed on the battlefield. Today, we remember and grieve this great American hero, Sergeant First Class Shawn McCloskey. He died so that we and his fellow Americans could continue to live in freedom.

We thank the McCloskey family for their gift to us. May God bless them during this hour of grief.

#### SCRAPPING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, the United States has an operating national missile defense to protect our west coast. Why would we leave our east coast undefended?

In an ABC story today, it reads, "The Obama administration believes Iran has now lied to inspectors three times. In addition to today's news there were revelations in 2002 about a different clandestine plant, and news discovered in 2007 that Iran had been working to design a nuclear warhead."

Our response should be: Don't trust, but defend.

If the Obama administration believes that Iran has lied to the United States on nuclear weapons, why would we drop our defenses on the east coast?

Our national government is constituted to protect our citizens. By scrapping national missile defense for our east coast, we fail in our job.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT SHANNON M. SMITH

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a brave young soldier, one of American's fallen heroes, Staff Sergeant Shannon Smith of Ohio.

Shannon was a native of Marion, Ohio, and graduated from Marion Harding High School, where he was an accomplished wrestler, winning his weight class in the Ohio Heartland Conference for 3 straight years.

He joined the service in September 1997, serving stateside as well as in Afghanistan, Iraq and Bosnia, before joining the 545th Military Police Company, Arctic Military Police Battalion, based at Fort Richardson, Alaska.

Shannon died on September 8, 2009, in Iraq while serving his country in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Aged 31, he is survived by a loving family, including his wife, Cassie, and his parents, James and Deborah.

In the reading of Shannon's life and in speaking with his family members, it was clear that he had a positive impact on the lives of everyone around him. He had the tenacity of a wrestler and a remarkable sense of humor. He was a leader, a family man and a champion in every sense of the word. He was one of the brave few who stood up and volunteered to serve his country.

He fought to protect us. He gave his life in defense of his family, his community, his State, and his Nation. For this, every American owes him and his family a great debt of gratitude.

Shannon will be missed each and every day, but the strength of his character and the courage he demonstrated through his service will live on.

#### NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR MURDER VICTIMS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this day, we honor the memory of those whose lives are suddenly violently taken by homicide. Everything a person was or ever will be—stolen by the assassin's hands.

Most of us will never lose a loved one to a violent crime. Most of us never even think about murder. Victims don't wake up in the morning knowing they'll be murdered that day, and for their families, it's the most painful and traumatic thing they can ever imagine. Suddenly, their loved one is gone. What takes their place are images of that violent death and of things left unsaid.

Then comes the police investigation—learning more than any layman wants to know about murder—then the trial if the police capture someone, then crime scene photographs; sitting in the courtroom day by day with the one who stole their loved one's life; the

uncertainty, the strain, the verdict. It's not just the one killed who is the victim of murder.

Today, we honor the families who live through the horror of homicide. Families never get over the murder of a loved one. They think about it every day—forever.

And that's just the way it is.

#### ECONOMY

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I stand today to point to upstate New York's leadership and significant accomplishments in partnering education and 21st-century job creation.

This week, the hard work of the capital region's higher education institutions and businesses were highlighted when President Barack Obama lauded Hudson Valley Community College's great work in preparing young professionals and training leaders for the 21st-century economy.

The President spoke about the vital importance of education and about the role community colleges will play in reviving our economy and in preparing a workforce for the future.

I have spent my entire career working to create jobs and high-tech businesses across upstate New York. One of the keys to preparing our economy for success is having a well-educated workforce.

This week, we heard the President lay out three building blocks for innovation: Education, infrastructure and research. This is exactly what we have been working on and developing in upstate New York, and it is what has made our region a leader in the innovation economy.

As our economy becomes more knowledge-based, the continued leadership of our colleges and universities will be ever more important. Twenty-first century jobs will require increasingly knowledgeable workers in the innovative programs, and our Nation's fine higher education institutions are a key to them.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I was watching the Senate Finance Committee yesterday, and I was pleased to see that they were moving along in adopting health care reform and in moving it out of committee. It couldn't be too soon.

The bottom line is that we've heard more reports about how more and more people have no insurance in this country and that insurance is increasingly becoming unaffordable. I know that the Democrats in both the House and the Senate and, hopefully, some Republicans, are moving forward with health

care reform. We are trying to get it done by the end of this year, and it really is important.

People need to have affordable insurance. They need to have choices. I think we need a strong public option as well because that will create competition with private insurance. It will bring down costs, and it will allow more people to find affordable insurance.

The problem is not getting any better. It's getting worse every day, and health insurance reform needs to be done here in the House, in the Senate, and it needs to be sent to the President as quickly as possible so we can deal with this major problem that we face in this country. I would like to see it done in a bipartisan way.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 772 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 772

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2918) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the conference report are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. All points of order against the conference report are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 0915

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2918, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. I rise in strong support of the rule and of the underlying legislation. The bill before us today includes not only the fy 2010 Legislative Branch appropriations bill

but, more importantly, a continuing resolution to keep the government operating for the next 6 weeks.

With a few important exceptions, the continuing resolution provides level funding. In other words, the bill maintains funding levels passed at the 2009 appropriations process levels.

One of those exceptions is in the vital area of veterans health care, which receives an increase in this bill. The VA estimates that it will treat more than 6.1 million patients in 2010, including more than 419,000 veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. That number represents an increase of 56,000 more patients than in 2009.

To ensure that the VA can provide our veterans the care that they need and that they deserve, the bill increases the funding for VA health by \$3.85 billion. I would encourage all Members on both sides of the aisle who wish to provide this needed increase in veterans health care to support the bill.

To address the right-wing talk radio target of the week, no funds in this bill may be provided to ACORN or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries or allied organizations.

In terms of process, Madam Speaker, none of us on either side of the aisle are happy with continuing resolutions. They have been used for years under Democratic and Republican majorities, but they are clearly not ideal.

Here in the House, we have completed our work of passing all of the appropriations bills, and I want to commend Chairman OBEY and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their efforts and all of their hard work.

Unfortunately, it seems that these days that you need 60 votes in the Senate to agree that the sun came up this morning. The Senate has not yet passed all of its bills, and this continuing resolution is necessary to ensure that vital programs continue to receive funding.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, the end of the fiscal year, as we all know, is just a few days away.

Despite this looming deadline, Congress has not completed action on a single appropriations bill. Let me repeat that, Madam Speaker: we have got within 5 days of the end of the fiscal year, and yet not one single appropriations bill has been completed by this Congress.

As a result, the Democratic majority is scrambling to accomplish two things, two things with this underlying bill that we have. The first is to buy more time to get our work done with the continuing resolution, which will keep the government operating for an additional 38 days beyond the September 30 expiration of the fiscal year. The second is to finally take the first

step towards passing our appropriations conference reports.

Madam Speaker, which spending bill has the honor of being considered first? Which spending bill? Perhaps it's our Homeland Security appropriations bill, which funds our Border Patrol and other Federal agencies charged with protecting our States, cities, and ports from terrorist attacks. Or, perhaps, Madam Speaker it's the very, very important Defense appropriations spending bill, which would provide the funding for our troops.

In fact, the very first spending bill that the House is moving to send to the President is our Congress' own funding bill. The underlying Legislative Branch appropriations bill makes the Democratic majority's funding priorities very, very clear.

Madam Speaker, I describe this as the "putting Congress first" appropriations process. That's really what it is. We remember back in 1992, putting people first was President Clinton's campaign motto. We have now seen this Congress establish a new directive based on what we are doing on this appropriations bill, and that is we are putting Congress first.

As we look at this priority, it is very clear that the continuing resolution will allow for more time to take care of everything else. Now, some would say that we, as Republicans, are just belly-aching. I mentioned President Clinton and his campaign back in 1992 of putting people first, and this now the putting Congress first appropriations process.

Well, back in 1996 after President Clinton had been President for almost 4 years, he vetoed the Legislative Branch appropriations bill when a Republican Congress sent it as the second appropriations bill of that season. Madam Speaker, President Clinton said the following in his veto message: "I believe that it would be inappropriate to fully fund regular funding for Congress and its offices while funding for most other activities of government remains incomplete, unresolved and uncertain. I don't think Congress should take care of its own business before it takes care of the people's business."

Those are the words of President Clinton in his 1996 veto message when the second appropriations conference report sent to him was the Legislative Branch appropriations bill measure. He was right to veto that bill and President Obama would be right to do it now, Madam Speaker, following President Clinton's lead.

Unfortunately, even if the President wanted to veto this bill, there is a problem. A veto, as we all know, would shut down the government, something that no one wants. The Democratic majority has made sure that our offices don't have to worry about working within temporary funding; but our veterans, Homeland Security personnel, the fighting men and women will just have to make do.

Madam Speaker, this is just another example of what I am calling the "putting Congress first" appropriations process. Those who follow the work of the Congress know that continuing resolutions are not unusual, and we recognize that on this side of the aisle. The Federal budget is a very serious responsibility, and our work often, under either party, has extended throughout the fall.

What's different throughout this year is not the necessity of a continuing resolution. What's different, Madam Speaker, is the fact that the Democratic majority shut down debate on our appropriations bills, ostensibly for the sake of completing our spending bills on time.

They said that there was a schedule to keep. They said that there was no time for debate and deliberation while the clock was ticking. With regrets to the American people, we just cannot allow for scrutiny and accountability on the spending of taxpayer dollars because September 30 is fast approaching.

Now, as the fiscal year draws to a close, it would appear that the rights of Democrats and Republicans have been trampled on for the sake of a goal that has not come close to being achieved. Throughout June and July, as debate on bill after bill was shut down, we heard the drum beat of the impending deadline.

On June 10 our friend, whom I am happy to see here on the floor, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, announced his "ambitious schedule" saying that his time line would be unworkable as long as we had "procedural cooperation." Of course, we very soon learned that procedural cooperation was a euphemism for closing down the debate.

Now, the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Rules, on June 17 on the House floor, said that the Democratic majority was prepared to push forward at all costs to complete the appropriations process on time.

Again, we now know that those costs were the abandonment of what has been the 220-year history of the appropriations process, and that is open to debate and the rejection of amendments to be considered by Democrats and Republicans. On June 19, the distinguished majority leader reiterated this stance saying that the only way to get our work done is if we limit debate time.

Throughout the summer, the Democratic majority did just that. Every single appropriations bill was considered under a restrictive rule. Spending bills have been historically considered, as I said, under a full and open process that allows for all Members, not just committee Chairs or members of the leadership, but all Members of both parties to make their constituencies' voices heard in the Federal spending process. Yet the Democratic majority announced at the outset of this year's process that they were abandoning open debate for the sake of expediency.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Democratic majority did deliver on the issue of closing down debate for the appropriations process. What they haven't delivered on is the timely completion of our constitutional responsibility. They dismantled the open appropriations process, and, for what? So we could pass the "putting Congress first" bill and leaving the rest of our work to be completed at a later date.

We could call this just another broken promise in a never-ending string of broken promises by this Democratic majority; but this is bigger, this is bigger, Madam Speaker, than just broken promises. We have more than a trillion-dollar deficit, and the year isn't over yet. Our national debt has skyrocketed, skyrocketed to nearly unfathomable levels.

The American people are incredibly frustrated about our fiscal state and the crippling debt we have saddled on our future generations. Yet the Democratic majority has shut out accountability of their spending practices for the sake of a deadline that they didn't even try to keep. That's one of the reasons why we are here today, to extend the deadline on appropriations bills that were rammed through the House without the benefit of many thoughtful amendments from both Democrats and Republicans proposed by those who are deeply concerned about runaway spending.

Now, of course, our friends on the other side of the aisle will have great excuses, and they are excuses we have heard regularly from both sides. They will say that the House has done its work; they can't control what happens over in the other body; we can't control what those guys do on the other side of the Capitol. But when the Republicans were in the majority, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would regularly point out that we had control of both bodies of Congress and the White House. They would say that we were in control, and so we had to shoulder the responsibility.

Madam Speaker, when someone stands up and makes the argument we did our job in the House, but we can't, we can't control what those guys do over on the other side of the Capitol, remember what was regularly said, that when you have supermajority control of the Senate, and now with the appointment of PAUL KIRK, the 60th seat is there in the Senate, when you have control of the White House and a large majority in the House of Representatives, one has to take responsibility.

Now, the situation is such that our friends must take the responsibility. With the impending appointment, as I said, we now have, we now have both Houses of Congress and the White House in complete control of the Democrats. Excuses about blaming the other body for having not done their work really are not acceptable.

Madam Speaker, not one of us, not one of us is interested in a government

shutdown. But this bill makes two things very clear, first, that the Democratic majority is more concerned with padding its own budget for this institution than meeting the rest of the country's needs. Second, the concerns and input of the American people were stifled, we see now, for no good reason at all.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I don't think we need any lectures by Members of the other side about process. If I recall, when they were in charge here, continuing resolutions were a regular part of the process. If I recall correctly, their last year in power they did a short-term CR. That means they got nothing done and dumped all of their appropriations work on the incoming Democratic Congress, which was a daunting task, to deal with 2 years of appropriations. They had their chance, and I think that they messed it up.

□ 0930

The fact is that the bill before us, the conference report before us, is the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, which is an important appropriations bill. All appropriations bills are important. I don't think it does anybody any good to diminish the importance of this.

This is important and it needs to be passed. I fully expect that the other appropriations bills will be conferenced, and we will be dealing with more and more conference reports in the coming weeks.

But, look, what we need to do here, Madam Speaker, is not only pass a conference report for the Legislative Branch Appropriations, but we also need to pass a continuing resolution which includes an increase in veterans' health care.

We have thousands and thousands of young men and women who we have sent to Iraq and who we have sent to Afghanistan. They deserve a first-class health care system when they return. All veterans do. They have served our country with great distinction. They not only deserve the best health care, but they have earned it. There is an increase in this CR for veterans' health.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me say that I completely concur with the gentleman. He's actually making our arguments here about the priority of ensuring that our men and women who have sacrificed and fought on behalf of the cause of freedom do have access to quality health care, that we have the funding for those troops there. That is a very important priority. That's why we should be doing those appropriations bills first.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time.

I thank the gentleman for agreeing with me, and hopefully we will have a unanimous vote on this, because there should be no disagreement on that. Again, in this continuing resolution, I will repeat to my colleagues, there is an increase in funding for veterans' health.

I think we should move forward. Get this conference report done. There will be more conference reports down the road. This is not an easy process. I think I've come to learn that the House of Representatives does not control the United States Senate. I wish we did. We would get a lot more done. But that's not the way our system works.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, Madam Speaker.

The Constitution prohibits Congress from passing a bill of attainder, a bill that, no matter what its form, punishes either a named individual or an easily ascertainable group of people.

Last week, to the great shame of this House, we passed a bill of attainder, a bill stating that no Federal funds shall go to a specifically named organization, ACORN.

Now, in this conference report, we are about to do it again. Why? Because of a desire to punish ACORN. And yet, as ACORN's lawyer wrote to us recently, this is, "to my research, unprecedented in congressional history. Never before has one corporation or entity been the subject of such broad reaching punishment by congressional mandate.

"The punishment here did not follow some criminal or administrative process with basic due process protections. It flowed out of a Fox News network-led call for a public lynching. There was no statement of charges and no reference to a judicial or administrative finding of wrongdoing by ACORN. All that occurred was a Member of Congress making a motion supported with a speech full of negative and largely inaccurate observations about ACORN, followed by a vote."

The fact is ACORN has never been convicted of anything. Lots of charges. So far, no proof in any court or any administrative proceeding. But some charges may be true. And they may or may not—I think not, but that's just a personal opinion—indicate substantial misfeasance. But that's why we have courts and administrative agencies and congressional investigating committees.

It may be that ACORN is guilty of various infractions, and, if so, it ought to be vetted or maybe sanctioned by the appropriate administrative agency or by the judiciary. But Congress must not be in the business of punishing individual organizations or people without trial, and that is what the provision in this conference report does. It

prohibits any Federal funds from going to ACORN for any purpose, clearly as a punishment for alleged misdeeds. This is a classic bill of attainder, and as such, it is flatly prohibited by the Constitution.

We must not ignore the Constitution. Whatever one may think of the subject matter or the organization, the Constitution and the ban on bills of attainder are there for the protection of all our liberties. And we ignore the constitutional provisions at our peril.

This bill of attainder should not be in this conference report, and I will, therefore, vote against the conference report.

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

Let me respond to some of the remarks that have been made so far, Madam Speaker. First, I have to say that, in addressing the issue of ACORN, the gentleman from Worcester said that ACORN was the target of right-wing radio this week. The fact of the matter is there is a Justice Department investigation that, at this moment, is being undertaken to address this issue. So to argue that somehow this is just a product of right-wing radio is silly.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. NADLER of New York. There is an investigation, and let it proceed and let it come to a conclusion, but there is no conclusion yet.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, let me say that I was simply responding to the gentleman from Worcester, who was saying that somehow the ACORN concerns that have been raised are nothing but developed from right-wing radio, as he described it.

It is true that a number of very, very smart investigative journalists have come forward and brought to the forefront some of the most outrageous abuses of taxpayer dollars, and we have seen these reports carried on television. The gentleman mentioned Fox News. We've heard it reported on the radio.

I believe that it is a great service, as we see hardworking Americans, hardworking Americans trying to make ends meet, and that kind of abuse of their tax dollars is outrageous, as has been reported. That kind of abuse is outrageous.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course, I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. NADLER of New York. The point is, of course, as I said—and, by the way, it was I who talked about right-wing radio, not the gentleman from Worcester.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, the gentleman was not on the floor when Mr. MCGOVERN began his opening statement. The gentleman did, in fact.

So now I will say both my friends from Massachusetts and New York are now saying that right-wing talk radio is somehow responsible for this, when, in fact, it has been some very shrewd investigative journalists. And we have seen talk radio and some of the cable television networks bring us to the forefront. Unfortunately, it's taken quite a while for the so-called mainstream media to begin the kind of coverage of ACORN that we are finally seeing.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course, I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Thank you.

The point is, of course, I'm not going to debate the merits of the charges against ACORN. Charges have been made. As I said, some of them may be valid. They may be not valid. And if they're valid, they may indicate pervasive corruption; they may indicate minor errors. We don't know. We'll find out.

But the point is the Constitution prohibits Congress from acting on that information by punishing an organization. They should be punished, if indeed they should be punished, by an administrative agency, by cutting off funds, by HUD or whatever.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, let me say to my friend that the American people get it. They understand that ACORN is responsible for its own actions. They have seen what has taken place. It has been outrageous behavior. And the notion of somehow standing here and defending that when we are dealing with the funding bills themselves, the appropriations process, is just plain wrong.

Let me also say to my friend from Worcester managing this measure that he responded to my remarks by saying that he didn't want to have lectures given and he was tired of excuses being made. You know, the American people get it, too. The notion of pointing the finger of blame back and forth is not what they want.

Children make excuses and get slapped down by their parents. That has happened to me as a kid. It happens to everybody. And the idea of standing here saying, Well, we were lectured here and excuses are being made, so we somehow can continue to do what it is that we want to do. Well, Madam Speaker, I have to tell you that we didn't do things perfectly, but the fact of the matter is we didn't shut down the appropriations process. We did not shut down the appropriations process, denying Democrats and Republicans the opportunity to participate, as has been the case throughout the history of our country, and I think it's just plain wrong to do that. And the American people get that, too.

So we're not providing any lecturing. We're just saying regular order. The rules of the House should be followed, and they have been ignored consistently.

When one looks at the statements that have been made by many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were critical of us when we were in the majority, it's incredible to see that they have taken and ramped up, ramped up the kind of behavior that they criticized on our part.

In fact, on the fiscal year 2000 measure, the fiscal year 2000 measure, as the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill was moving through, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the now chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, said, in talking about the Legislative Branch bill, This bill should not be passed until we know how deep the cuts that are being made contemplated for veterans, for education, for health care, and other areas of major responsibility to our people. Because, in the end, if this bill is one of the first out of the gate and signed into law before the other cuts are made, then the American people are really going to have a right to ask whether we are more concerned with taking care of ourselves than we are with taking care of their own problems.

Those are the words of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee today, who is utilizing the "putting Congress first," the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, as the first measure for tying the continuing resolution to that. And I think that it's a very, very unfortunate thing.

When we had an exchange up in the Rules Committee, I asked the distinguished Chair, As we look at our priorities—homeland security, veterans, our men and women in uniform who are in Iraq and Afghanistan—and we have now chosen that the priority for passage is the funding for the Congress of the United States, the distinguished Chair's response was, Uh-huh. Right. She said, That's it.

And so here we are, putting Congress first, when the American people believe we should be focusing on our border security, the threat of terrorism, funding for our troops. Those should be the priorities that we have. And the notion of standing here, Madam Speaker, having subverted the opportunity for the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike, to be heard in this appropriations so that we could get everything done by September 30, when we failed to meet that, is just plain wrong.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER of New York. The gentleman from California says the American people get it. They know what terrible things ACORN has done. That's not the point.

We do not punish people by referendum or by unpopularity. Congress should not punish people. That's why the Constitution says we cannot pass a bill of attainder. We have courts. We

have due process. We have administrative agencies to punish people or organizations for doing wrong things.

Mr. DREIER: Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. Not for the moment.

Once Congress passes a bill of attainder and undertakes to punish an organization for doing whatever it did, we sacrifice our liberties, we sacrifice our due process protections, and that's why it's not up to us to punish. It's up to the court to punish.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield? I yielded repeatedly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for being so generous with the 15 seconds.

Let me just say that article 1 of the United States Constitution very clearly, with section 9, points to us as being responsible for funding. We have the power of the purse here, and the notion of saying that ACORN somehow has a right to U.S. taxpayer dollars is just plain wrong.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, so nobody is confused here—and I appreciate the opinion of the gentleman from New York, but so nobody is confused here—the bill before us, there are no funds in this bill that may be provided to ACORN or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations. None.

□ 0945

We can talk about this all we want, but the facts are the facts, and there's no money in this bill for ACORN.

The gentleman earlier talked about shutdowns of the process. What I recall is when the Republicans were in charge, they shut down the government in 1995. We all know the adverse impacts of that.

For the record, I want to make clear to people that the Legislative Branch appropriation bill does not include Members' salaries. So this notion that we're somehow padding our pockets here is a little bit off the mark. The fact of the matter is, included in the Legislative Branch appropriation bill are moneys to help fund CBO so that it will be easier for Members to obtain PAYGO analyses of their proposals. We're all talking about the need to be more conscious of our debt and our deficit. That's one way to do it.

The other thing is that in this bill is money to protect the people who come and visit the United States Capitol. In this conference report, there are moneys that ensure that the Capitol Complex is as secure and as safe as possible, providing a 7 percent increase in funding for the Capitol Police, covering all mandatory spending and maintaining FY09 force levels. The bottom line here

is that the men and women who protect us in the Capitol Police deserve more gratitude than they're getting the way this Legislative Branch appropriation bill is being described.

This is an important bill. All appropriations bills are important. We're going to hopefully pass all of our appropriations bills and not do what my friends on the other side did when they were in power, and that is just pass it off to another year. I think that we should move forward on this.

Again, in the continuing resolution there is an increase in funding for veterans health care. I think that is important. We owe our veterans more, quite frankly, than we are giving them. I hope that all my colleagues will support not only the rule but the final passage of this conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This has been a fascinating debate, and I know that we want to move to consideration of the measure. I hope that we'll be able to defeat the rule. As I listened to my friend from New York talk about ACORN, to follow the logic that the gentleman has put forward basically is saying that ACORN is an entitlement; ACORN is entitled to these taxpayer dollars. We don't believe that, Madam Speaker. We happen to believe that the outrageous reports that have come forward are very clear and the admissions that have been made by ACORN, and the changes that they are attempting to make now that this kind of behavior has come to light is very important.

So my friend from New York is criticizing the fact that this continuing resolution does not provide funding for ACORN, but only for 30 days. The continuing resolution is 30 days. Basically 30 days following September 30, the end of the fiscal year, funding goes right back up. So I guess his entitlement will be able to be continued.

The notion of somehow saying that the United States House of Representatives, which under Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution, is empowered with spending the taxpayer dollars, cannot cut off funding for ACORN, and for that reason, we're going to see the gentleman from New York voting against the continuing resolution is, to me, absolutely incomprehensible.

Madam Speaker, I've got to say that we've got a process here which is putting Congress first. My friend has just outlined the priorities. I guess I would inquire of him how often he gets calls from his constituents saying, Are you keeping the Capitol Complex safe so that you can move in and out of your office? That is not what the American people are concerned about. I recognize it's important to keep this great Capitol Complex safe, and I'm not saying that we shouldn't pass the Legislative Branch appropriation bill.

I'll tell you what I do believe. I believe that border security and dealing with the threat of terrorism by funding

Homeland Security and I believe that passing the Defense appropriation bill so that our men and women in uniform have the resources that they need through the appropriations process is more important right now, and the American people get that.

With that, if my colleague is prepared to close, Madam Speaker, I will simply say to my colleagues that this measure does, as I said, put Congress first, and we should not put Congress first, ahead of the priority spending for national security, which is priority number one. We continue to have statements made by our friends on the other side of the aisle, including the veto message from President Clinton in 1996. He vetoed a measure because we were passing the Legislative Branch appropriations bill for saying that there are many other priorities that should be ahead of it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule so that we can move ahead in a very, very responsible way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman described this debate as fascinating. I would describe it as kind of bizarre. The Legislative Branch bill that President Clinton threatened to veto, if I remember correctly, the gentleman from California voted for. And I will stress again that there is no money in this bill for ACORN, none, or its affiliates or its subsidiaries. Huge majorities in both the House and the Senate are on record as opposing funding ACORN. This notion that somehow when the CR runs out that the money for ACORN is going to go up, I don't get that. There will either be another CR or we will have passed relevant appropriation bills that will continue the prohibition. So that is kind of a nutty debate, and it is not relevant to this bill because this bill bans Federal funding for ACORN.

The other thing that I will say is that all appropriations bills are important, and we are going to get to all of them. But I think it is wrong to diminish the Legislative Branch appropriation bill, and I think it's wrong to kind of brush aside the importance of funding for the Capitol Police. We have had members of the Capitol Police lose their lives in the line of duty, protecting not only us but protecting our constituents who come here. They deserve to be supported, and they deserve to be thanked. This bill does that.

Again, I will remind my colleagues that in the CR there is an increase in funding for veterans health. Now if you don't want to fund the Capitol Police and you don't want to increase funding for veterans health, then vote against the rule and vote against the final passage of the bill. But I think the vast majority of our constituents are saying, This is a no-brainer. Move this forward. Continue your business. Continue to work on the other appropriations bills, and get your work done. And we are going to do that.

Let me finally say again in support of Chairman OBEY and the members of the Appropriations Committee, they did all of their work in this House. Every single one of the appropriation bills has been passed. It is now up to the Senate to pass their bills, and then we will conference them and bring them back here for a final vote.

Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be offering an amendment to this rule, and I want to briefly explain the amendment. The amendment will provide for adoption of an enrollment resolution that corrects a technical error made by the Senate in the continuing resolution. After the Senate struck a section in the continuing resolution, internal cross-references in the conference report became incorrect. This mistake could block contracting authority for any surface transportation programs, a result that I am certain that no Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, would support. The enrollment resolution corrects the cross-references.

I hope all my colleagues will vote "yes" on the amendment, the rule and the previous question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the rule at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by MCGOVERN:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of the conference report the House shall be considered to have adopted the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2918."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 3183, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of Committee on Appropriations, I move to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Frelinghuysen moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3183 be instructed as follows:

(1) To not record their approval of the final conference agreement (within the meaning of clause 12(a)(4) of House rule XXII) unless the text of such agreement has been available to the managers in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 48 hours prior to the time described in such clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the House Energy and Water bill. It was a good bipartisan compromise. It was my pleasure to work closely with the chairman, Mr. PASTOR, as we put it together. I and many of my colleagues are increasingly concerned that we don't have the level of information that we need to make wise decisions on the legislation. Our jobs require that we read and fully understand complex pieces of legislation that we vote on, and that takes time.

It is for this reason that I am making this motion to instruct House conferees not to sign the final conference agreement until the text has been available to the conferees in an electronic, searchable and downloadable form at least 48 hours prior to conferees' approval.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate the ranking member for the work he has done on this bill. I want to thank him for the cooperation he has given and thank him again for his cooperation in working on this conference.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.  
 The motion was agreed to.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. VISCLOSKEY, EDWARDS of Texas, PASTOR, BERRY, FATTAH, ISRAEL, RYAN of Ohio, OLVER, DAVIS of Tennessee, SALAZAR, OBEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, WAMP, SIMPSON, REHBERG, CALVERT, ALEXANDER, and LEWIS of California.

There was no objection.

□ 1000

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 772, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 189, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 738]

YEAS—209

Adler (NJ)	DeGette	Kind
Altmire	DeLauro	Kissell
Andrews	Dicks	Klein (FL)
Arcuri	Dingell	Kosmas
Baldwin	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)
Becerra	Edwards (TX)	Levin
Berkley	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Ellsworth	Lipinski
Berry	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Lowe
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lujan
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lynch
Boccieri	Filner	Maffei
Boren	Foster	Maloney
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Markey (CO)
Boucher	Giffords	Markey (MA)
Boyd	Gonzalez	Marshall
Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	Massa
Brady (TX)	Grayson	Matheson
Brale (IA)	Green, Al	Matsui
Brown, Corrine	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Butterfield	Grijalva	McColum
Capps	Gutierrez	McDermott
Carnahan	Hall (NY)	McGovern
Carney	Halvorson	McIntyre
Carson (IN)	Hare	McMahon
Castor (FL)	Harman	McNerney
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Childers	Heinrich	Melancon
Chu	Herse	Sandlin
Cleaver	Himes	Michaud
Clyburn	Hinche	Miller (NC)
Cohen	Hirono	Miller, George
Connolly (VA)	Hodes	Mollohan
Cooper	Holden	Moore (KS)
Costa	Honda	Moore (WI)
Costello	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Courtney	Inslee	Murphy (CT)
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Murtha
Cummings	Kagen	Napolitano
Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Neal (MA)
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Oberstar
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Obey
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Olver
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz
DeFazio	Kilroy	Pallone
		Pascrell

Pastor (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta
Perlmutter	Sarbanes
Peters	Shakowsky
Peterson	Schauer
Pingree (ME)	Schiff
Polis (CO)	Schwartz
Pomeroy	Serrano
Price (NC)	Sestak
Quigley	Shea-Porter
Rahall	Sherman
Rangel	Sires
Reyes	Skelton
Richardson	Slaughter
Rodriguez	Smith (WA)
Ross	Snyder
Rothman (NJ)	Space
Roybal-Allard	Spratt
Ruppersberger	Stark
Rush	Stupak
Ryan (OH)	Sutton
Salazar	Tanner
Sanchez, Linda T.	Thompson (CA)
	Thompson (MS)

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Gallegly
Akin	Garrett (NJ)
Alexander	Gerlach
Austria	Gingrey (GA)
Bachmann	Gohmert
Bachus	Goodlatte
Baird	Granger
Barrett (SC)	Griffith
Bartlett	Guthrie
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)
Bean	Harper
Biggart	Hastings (WA)
Bilbray	Heller
Bilirakis	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Herger
Blackburn	Hoekstra
Boehner	Holt
Bonner	Hunter
Bono Mack	Inglis
Boozman	Jackson-Lee
Boustany	(TX)
Bright	Jenkins
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Brown-Waite,	Jordan (OH)
Ginny	Jordan (IA)
Buchanan	King (NY)
Burgess	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Kirk
Buyer	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Calvert	Kline (MN)
Camp	Kratovich
Campbell	Kucinich
Cantor	Lamborn
Cao	Lance
Capito	Latham
Carter	LaTourette
Cassidy	Latta
Castle	Lee (CA)
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)
Clarke	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Linder
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo
Cole	Lucas
Conaway	Luetkemeyer
Crenshaw	Lummis
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Deal (GA)	Mack
Dent	Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.	Dreier
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)
Driehaus	McCaul
Duncan	McClintock
Edwards (MD)	McCotter
Ehlers	McHenry
Emerson	McKeon
Fallin	McMorris
Flake	Rodgers
Forbes	Miller (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)
Fox	Miller, Gary
Franks (AZ)	Minnick
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Fudge	Moran (KS)

NOT VOTING—34

Abercrombie	Conyers
Ackerman	Culberson
Baca	Delahunt
Blunt	Doyle
Capuano	Engel
Cardoza	Fleming
Clay	Graves

Tierney	Langevin
Titus	Loeb sack
Tonko	Meek (FL)
Towns	Mica
Tsongas	Nunes
Van Hollen	Platts
Velázquez	Schmidt
Visclosky	Schrader
Walz	Scott (GA)
Wasserman	Speier
Schultz	
Watson	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Welch	
Wexler	
Wilson (OH)	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Yarmuth	

Platts	Sullivan
Schmidt	Waters
Schrader	Young (AK)
Scott (GA)	
Speier	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1027

Messrs. OLSON, TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, NADLER of New York, SCOTT of Virginia, PAYNE, HOLT, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I regret that I missed rollcall vote No. 738. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, it was my intention to vote against adoption of H. Res 772, a rule waiving points of order against consideration of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2918, Legislative Branch Appropriations and Continuing Resolution. I inadvertently recorded a “yea” vote.

□ 1030

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2918, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 772, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2918) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 772, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 24, 2009, at page H9924.)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Higgins	Johnson, E. B.
Hill	Jones
Hinojosa	
Israel	
Issa	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Young (FL)	

Madam Speaker, the conference agreement which we present to the House today for the fiscal year 2010 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill authorizes a total of \$4.6 billion for the operations of the House and the Senate and for the operating budgets of the legislative branch support agencies. The overall amount is \$254 million above the 2009 enacted level and \$500 million below the request. The net increase over the enacted level is 3.5 percent.

This is the first freestanding conference agreement for the Legislative Branch bill since 2005, and the first since I became Chair of the subcommittee. I am pleased to report that the agreement preserves all of the priorities of the House, and that the Legislative Branch bill is on time and under budget. Madam Speaker, this package was developed in full cooperation with the minority and represents a fully bipartisan agreement.

The principal responsibility of our subcommittee is to serve as stewards of the legislative branch, its institutions, and its employees. In fulfilling these goals, the 2010 Legislative Branch bill provides funding for the routine and recurring costs of paying our hard-working staff, maintaining and repairing the buildings in which we work here in Washington and in our districts, securing the Capitol complex from threats, and for the technologies which we depend on to communicate among ourselves and with our constituents.

Key investments in this category include \$1.369 billion for the operations of the House. This includes basic pay and benefits for employees as well as a number of technology improvements, including funds to replace the aging electronic voting system in the House Chamber. It includes \$328 million for the Capitol Police to protect the Capitol, the Members, and our visitors; \$602 million for the Architect of the Capitol to support ongoing operational costs to the Capitol complex and to fund key initiatives to repair and upgrade these facilities; \$643 million for the Library of Congress, which is an increase of \$36 million over 2009, or 6 percent. This includes \$15 million, as requested, to accelerate improvements in the Library's IT infrastructure, the Librarian's top priority for 2010.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about more than just maintaining the status quo; it includes a number of new investments intended to provide for the long-term health of the Congress, and especially for the House of Representatives. It includes important security funding to protect the employees, visitors, and the institution itself. Let's not forget that one of the planes piloted by terrorists on September 11, 2001, was purported to be headed for the Capitol. A few weeks ago, a brave Capitol Police Officer engaged in a shootout with an individual brandishing a gun. Last year, a bomb was found in a car confiscated by the Capitol Police in

the underground garage of the Government Printing Office. The legislative branch budget may seem trivial and unimportant, but it funds the greatest democratic institutions in the world.

Madam Speaker, the Legislative Branch bill also funds our most important assets: the dedicated employees who staff our offices, committees, and support teams. We have endeavored to provide adequate funds for their compensation and benefits, but must do more if we are to continue to be able to recruit and retain the high-quality workforce which each Member depends upon. I am pleased that this conference agreement retains a House priority—funding for new childcare and tuition assistance programs which are currently being considered by the Committee on House Administration.

We also must take care of and preserve for future generations the grand buildings of the Capitol complex, many of which are aging and badly in need of repair. I am pleased that the conference agreement retains \$50 million of the \$60 million approved by the House in June to initiate a long-term effort to provide for the revitalization of the iconic buildings of the Capitol complex.

The new House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund will allow us to spread the cost of very expensive renewal projects, such as the 100-year-old Cannon House Office Building rehabilitation, evenly over the next decade. It allows the Congress to deal with these requirements in a more thoughtful and deliberate way. I am very proud that this bill steps up Congress' effort to deal with its aging infrastructure in a more forward-thinking manner.

Madam Speaker, this conference agreement also includes the fiscal year 2010 continuing resolution. I fully support this action. There are just 5 days until the start of the new fiscal year, and a continuing resolution is necessary to continue basic government services. It is a clean continuing resolution which follows the same pattern used in previous years, in particular, the fiscal year 2007 continuing resolution which was added to the Defense Appropriations bill by our friends on the other side of the aisle when they were in the majority. The only differences that have been added above the current rate are important increased investments in veterans' health care and funding in preparation for the 2010 census.

Before concluding, Madam Speaker, I want to take a minute to thank the minority, particularly my friend and ranking member, Mr. ADERHOLT from Alabama, for their very strong contributions to this conference agreement. I also want to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee, Vice Chairman MIKE HONDA, Representative BETTY MCCOLLUM, Representative TIM RYAN, Representative DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Representative CIRO RODRIGUEZ, Representative STEVEN LATOURETTE, and Representative TOM

COLE. They all made important contributions to this product, and I truly appreciate their friendship and their effort.

I also want to thank our staff for the work that they have done throughout the year. They have put in long hours and have been very helpful to the Members. This includes Mike Stephens, our subcommittee clerk; Liz Dawson, the minority clerk; Shalanda Young, who has just joined the subcommittee staff; Jenny Kisiah, from the minority; Dave Marroni; and Matt Glassman, from the Congressional Research Service. And I want to thank my own associate staff, Ian Rayder, and the associate staff of all the Members on the subcommittee.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present this conference agreement to the House and urge the support of all Members.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am privileged to have had an opportunity to work this year with the chairman of this subcommittee, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And let me just echo what she was saying about all the staff that has helped on the majority and minority this year in putting this bill together. It is a good bill. We have worked very well together, all the subcommittee members on the minority and the majority side. So I am very happy to report that she has worked in a very open manner through this entire process, been very responsive to the concerns and input of all the members of the subcommittee.

We have worked very closely, and we have worked in a spirit of what I consider real bipartisanship for the needs of the legislative branch. I think it would be fair to say that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has actually gone beyond the call of duty to make sure that this has been a fair process, along with all of her staff on the majority side. So I again want to especially thank the majority and the minority staff for all their work in putting this together, because certainly they do great work in making sure that what we need is put before us.

Division A of this conference report represents the efforts of the conferees to bring back to the House an agreement which was comprised in a bipartisan manner and continues the priorities of the House of Representatives. The conference provides a total of \$4.656 billion, which is an increase of \$155 million, or 3.4 percent, over fiscal year 2009.

Among the highlights of the agreement are:

\$1.369 billion for the House of Representatives. This provides an appropriate level of funding for the Members' representational allowance;

\$328.3 million for the Capitol Police. This amount supports the current level of 1,799 officers and completes the Library of Congress Police merger;

\$602 million for the Architect of the Capitol. This includes a special emphasis on funding life safety and rehabilitation of critical infrastructure. Also, there is \$50 million for a new House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund to more evenly spread out the cost of repairing and revitalizing the historic icon buildings such as the Cannon House Office Building.

Also included in the bill is \$643 million for the Library of Congress. This amount includes \$15 million to fund the first year of the Library's 5-year information technology initiative.

There is \$147 million for the Government Printing Office. This amount includes \$7.8 million to continue the development of the Federal Digital System.

Funds are also provided for additional workforce to meet the congressional demands for the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office.

Our conferees did their work and addressed many of the competing priorities and individual agency challenges that come with this particular piece of legislation. I know that the chairman of the committee, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, feels as I do, that it is nice to have this piece of legislation behind us so that we can move forward. We have been working on this legislation since the very first part of the year, and I know it will be a great birthday present for the chairman, as she celebrates her birthday this weekend, to have this bill behind us. But I am very thankful for the work that we have put in together.

That being said, I think it is important that I stress the point that I am disappointed that the process has brought us to where we are on this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill because it has turned out to be the vehicle for the continuing resolution. This is simply not a reasonable or responsible kind of governing that our constituents sent us here to Washington to do.

As the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, I believe, of course, this bill is very important; but moving this bill forward first, even before Homeland Security and the security of the Nation, is not the proper way to prioritize funding or to meet the critical needs that face the American people.

Madam Speaker, we need a clean continuing resolution and a clean Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, which is what this committee was prepared to do. And while I support the underlying bill and the underlying work that is in this bill, I regret that because of the attachment of the continuing resolution to this conference report I am unable to support this agreement in the House this morning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, at this time, I will continue to reserve.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the ranking member of the full committee.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you very much, Mr. ADERHOLT.

I want to congratulate both Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and my colleague for a fabulous job on their bill working together.

I know that the House realizes that I have serious reservations about some of the procedure involving this bill, but because of the fact that we discussed so much of that on the rule, I choose to submit the balance of my statement for the RECORD and revise and extend my remarks.

Madam Speaker, the House finds itself in a peculiar place today. I'm probably not the only Member in this body surprised by the fact that the majority leadership is putting the budget for the Legislative Branch ahead of the budget for our homeland security, our veterans, and our national defense.

Indeed, many Members on both sides of the aisle are scratching their heads over the fact that the Legislative Branch funding bill has been hijacked by adding to it a 4-week continuing resolution. The CR is necessary because of the absence of any approved spending bills for the fiscal year that begins less than a week from now.

Attaching the CR to the Legislative Branch bill makes a mockery of the legislative process. It's not the CR that I object to but rather that it's being attached to legislation funding the internal operations of Congress rather than higher priority legislation that is ready to go.

Members who are concerned about approving their staff's budget before approving budgets for our veterans, our troops, or the homeland are left with a dilemma of the leadership's making. House Members are faced with the Hobson's choice of either approving their own budget or shutting down the government. Nothing could be more cynical.

To say the least, this is a most unusual precedent. The bipartisan staff of the Homeland Security subcommittee has been working day and night and weekends since August preparing its conference report. My understanding is that the Homeland Security conference report is ready to go. Any remaining issues can and should be resolved at an open conference involving Members and Senators. The whole point of convening a conference committee is to reconcile differences between the bodies.

And yet, even as our law enforcement officials investigate a potential terrorist threat in New York City and Denver, the budget for protecting our homeland has been put on a shelf. How can this Congress possibly justify providing funds for its own use and give less priority to protecting our homeland? I don't get it.

In this case, to put congressional staff salaries ahead of medical care for Veterans, ahead of funding for law enforcement and homeland security, ahead of funding for our troops—is a signal to me that this Congress has its priorities out of order.

Lastly, it's astonishing to me that several commonsense amendments were defeated on

straight party-line votes during yesterday's conference committee meeting. The distinction between the Republican and Democrat positions on these issues could not be clearer.

House Republicans believe that the scandal-plagued organization known as ACORN should be denied funding through the next fiscal year because of recently disclosed efforts, caught on videotape, proposing the use of taxpayer dollars to support prostitution. Mr. ADERHOLT offered an amendment to deny ACORN funding for 1 year. Chairman OBEY and his colleagues voted against the amendment.

House Republicans believe that terrorists captured in the field should not be afforded the same rights as American citizens and therefore should not receive "Miranda Rights." I joined with my colleagues to offer an amendment to deny terrorists these rights. Again, Chairman OBEY and his colleagues voted against the amendment.

House Republicans believe that TARP funds should not continue to be used to bail out banks and other financial institutions even after existing loans have been paid back to the government. Congressman COLE offered an amendment to stop TARP from becoming a permanent, reusable, \$700 billion slush fund for private corporations. Again, Chairman OBEY and his colleagues voted against the amendment.

The priorities of this House majority leadership are clearly misplaced and out of the mainstream where most Americans work and live. I feel badly for Ms. WASSERMAN-SCHULTZ and Mr. ADERHOLT, and their fine staff, for they have worked very well together this year. I want to commend both of them for their work and extend my sympathy for the shameful manner in which their conference report is being brought to the floor today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Madam Speaker, our principal obligation on this bill is simply to keep the government open. We've got enough problems in the economy right now without adding to people's uncertainty. We had concluded that the least disruptive way to do that and the way with the least delay was to attach this continuing resolution to the one appropriation bill that was ready to be conferred, the Legislative Branch Appropriation bill.

This is a relatively straightforward and unadorned CR. As far as funding levels are concerned, we are simply allowing agencies to continue fiscal 2009 levels, with three exceptions:

First, we are following the House's lead when it voted 388-32 to allow the postal service to cover a budget shortfall by postponing a payment intended to prefund its retiree health benefits;

Second, we're funding the census at a somewhat higher rate to allow it to ramp up activities so the 2010 census can proceed. The calendar is not going to change to suit congressional convenience;

Third, we are providing additional funding for the Veterans Health Administration. The VA expects to treat

over 6 million patients in 2010, including almost 420,000 veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1045

The CR also extends a number of authorizations that would otherwise expire: transportation programs, child nutrition, stop-loss payments to our troops, E-Verify, and various other programs.

So, as I said, this is a relatively routine CR which keeps the government open for the next 30 days.

Outside of those items, we make no policy judgments. We change no existing policy except that, in accordance with the House vote last week, we also say no more funds for this 30-day period for ACORN. There have been some objections by the minority to this process. They claim it is procedurally outrageous because we are attaching the continuing resolution to a specific appropriations subcommittee bill. This is certainly not out of the ordinary.

In fact, in September of 2006, our friends on the other side of the aisle, when they controlled this House, attached the continuing resolution to the defense bill. I have the roll call on that if anyone cares to take a look at it. If you do, you would find out there were only two Members of the other party who voted against it, and in the Senate, the vote was 100 to nothing in support of it.

So there is no difference in what we are doing today, but there is a difference in how we do it. We are up front with what we are doing. We included this action in the conference notes, and voted on it in the conference. That was certainly not the case in 2006 when the action of adding the CR was not flagged or noticed in any way during the conference or in the conference notes. I have a copy of those conference notes here if anyone wishes to see them. So the action that was taken then was simply taken after the fact in contrast to our doing it up front and in full view. So I believe that, in comparison to that, this action is, certainly, totally transparent.

Now I need to take this opportunity to note one other point: Until last night, we were not in a position to move other appropriations bills because of a dispute between the House and the Senate over how to deal with for-profit earmarks. As I think the membership knows, we have put in place in the last few years significant reforms to the earmark process. When we took over control of the Congress in 2007, we put in place a moratorium on earmarks for that year until we could reform the process and make it much less susceptible to wasting taxpayers' money. Since then, including this year's bills, we have cut the dollar amount of earmarks by 50 percent. We require every Member to request earmarks publicly, ending the practice of anonymous earmarks in the House, and to certify that they have no financial interest.

This year, we have gone one step further. Recognizing the potential for abuse in sole-source contracting, we have insisted that all House earmarks designated for for-profit entities must undergo a competitive bidding process. We still allow those entities to be named so we can help, for instance, small businesses get a foot in the door so that they can be noticed by Federal agencies, which all too often simply notice people with whom they are familiar in their inside processes, but we nonetheless require that those entities still submit a bid and compete in a fair competition.

The Senate did not do that this year, and up until last night, was objecting to even allowing the House to follow this policy. Last night, we reached an agreement that will allow us to proceed with House earmarks subject to that new policy.

There is still one small area of disagreement that remains. There are a small number of projects, approximately 5 percent, which have been included in both the House and Senate bills. Until last night, the other body was refusing to allow those to be competed. Under the agreement we reached this year and this year only, those projects will be dealt with according to Senate policy. Next year and thereafter, they will be managed by House policy. So they, too, will be subjected to competition next year.

We reached this agreement because the other body insisted that, because they had proceeded all year under their policies, it was too late to change the rules of the game for them. We recognize that changing policies at this point would be a procedural problem for the other body. We do appreciate their agreement that, starting next year, we can all agree on how to handle for-profit projects and that they will be handled in accordance with the House procedures.

This will enable us to now proceed to conference on a number of other appropriations bills which have been passed by the Senate: We have had a motion to go to conference on energy and water. We expect next week, after two small matters are resolved, to also be able to go to conference on the Agriculture bill. We hope that, within a week, we will be able to resolve a few remaining differences on the Homeland Security bill and to also go to conference on that and other bills as the Senate grinds through them in their processes.

So, having reported that to the House, I would simply urge an "aye" vote for the legislation before us, and would simply note that, given the calendar, a vote against this proposition would be a vote to shut down the government.

With that, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), who is the ranking member of the Homeland Security subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I have no problem with the bill that is before us, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. I think the chairman and the ranking member have done an excellent job with that bill.

However, I have to register my objection to considering the funding bill for Congress and for putting off the bill that funds our homeland security and including it in the continuing resolution.

For almost 7 years, we've had a near-perfect track record of getting the Homeland Security appropriations bill done before funding for the rest of the government. It has taken bipartisan wrangling and compromise, but we've always produced a bill that the President could sign almost unanimously before the other bills.

Why? Because Congress considered the security of the Nation as paramount. This year should be no different.

We've preconference the Homeland Security bill with our Senate counterparts. We could produce a bill for the President to sign in a matter of days. Yet the leadership says no. Include Homeland Security in a continuing resolution, and put it off. Instead, first pass funding for the Congress. Our pay is more important than defending our country.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Not at the moment. I will later.

On June 24 of this year, the House wrapped up consideration of the Homeland Security bill, and passed it with 389 votes in this body. Three weeks later, the Senate passed their version of the bill with a near unanimous vote. So it has been more than 2 months since both bills were passed. Since August, staff has been diligently reconciling these two bills, reaching bicameral, bipartisan agreements. We could have produced a finished bill for this body to consider a month ago. Yet leadership refused to allow it to happen.

So I stand here today very concerned, Madam Speaker. There is virtually no excuse to punt this vital security spending bill and to fund the Department of Homeland Security under a continuing resolution. Instead of actually doing our work and fulfilling the security needs of our Nation, we are placing a priority on Congress' own budget, putting Homeland Security spending on ice, taking the next few Mondays and Fridays off, and basically waiting around until October until we get further direction from on high.

That is as indefensible, Madam Speaker, as it is dangerous. The security and safety of our citizens should be our number one priority. Look around you. We face complex cybersecurity challenges, emerging threats from overseas, terrorist cells operating

on our soil, and increasing violence along the southwest border, which is already claiming U.S. lives.

The fiscal 2010 Homeland Security bill will infuse much needed increases to our efforts to bolster our border security, to track down illegal immigrants, to protect our critical infrastructure, to replace the aging Coast Guard fleet, and to improve the preparedness of our first responders.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Why must our brave Homeland Security professionals wait while we bicker and delay here in the House? Real security demands commitment—commitment from this body and commitment from the Nation's leadership.

I know my subcommittee chairman, DAVID PRICE, and I are ready to finish the work of our bill, and we could do it in a matter of hours, if not days. So I am disgusted, Madam Speaker. I apologize for that, but I think we should reconsider the decision that has been made by leadership to put off funding for the Nation's homeland defense and, instead, to take up funding for this body.

So I will have to vote "no" on the bill, although, I think the Legislative appropriations is okay.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I would simply note, in light of the gentleman from Kentucky's comments, there are at least seven outstanding issues on homeland security that, to my knowledge, have yet to be resolved. One is the border fence. Another is the National Bio and Agricultural Defense Facility. There is an argument about where that's supposed to go. We have the Gitmo issue. We have immigration issues. We have FEMA.

If the gentleman wants to resolve those by agreeing with our position on each of them, I would be happy to see them go to conference right now.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. The fact is that no one has suggested that they delay the Homeland Security bill in any manner whatsoever. We are noting that there are significant substantive differences. Under the rules of the body, we can't bring a conference bill back to this House until we've reached agreement on all of those differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. So I think it's patently preposterous to suggest that this bill is being delayed in any way.

The only thing that is delaying it is honest disagreement and, until last night, the disagreement that we had with the Senate which precluded us

from bringing up virtually any other bill. Thankfully, that is now gone.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No, I will not. The gentleman would not yield to me. I don't see any reason to yield to him.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, in response to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if the gentleman would have allowed the Homeland Security conference to proceed—I mean we passed these bills 2 months ago, the House and Senate. We've had 2 months. Yet the gentleman has not allowed conferees to be appointed to consider the Homeland Security bill. In the meantime, staff and Members have been working with our Senate counterparts. We are in agreement. There are no remaining issues. We're ready to go. Ready to go.

□ 1100

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute just to point out that with the greatest respect to the gentleman from Kentucky, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill before us being used as a vehicle for the continuing resolution was the most ready to go. There were no outstanding issues at all.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has just indicated a number of issues remaining on the Homeland Security bill. We are 5 days from the end of the fiscal year with an intervening weekend included in those 5 days. It is simply a matter of making sure that we are not shutting the government down.

I appreciate the good work of my colleague, Mr. ADERHOLT, and the members of the minority on getting this bill, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill, in the best possible position to serve as a vehicle to keep the government open.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we have a continuing resolution well hidden in a Legislative Branch conference report. Why are we voting on a continuing resolution, Madam Speaker? We are voting on a continuing resolution because this Congress and this President have spent too much money, and now they want more.

Already this President and this Congress have passed into law a \$1.1 trillion stimulus plan which, by the way, since it was passed, we have had almost 3 million more join the unemployment ranks, the highest unemployment rate in almost a quarter of a century. But that stimulus plan weighed in at \$9,746 per household.

Next this Congress and this President signed into law, passed into law an om-

nibus costing \$410 billion, \$3,511 per household.

The bailouts continue. Madam Speaker, another \$30 billion for AIG, almost \$30 billion for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, not to mention \$60 billion for GM and Chrysler. The serial bailouts continue.

What has all this spending brought us, Madam Speaker? It has brought us the Nation's first, first trillion-dollar deficit, and a deficit that increased 10 fold, 10 fold, in just 2 years.

On top of this now the President and the Congress want a \$3.6 trillion budget and a trillion-dollar nationalized health care plan that we cannot afford, meaning that the national debt will triple, triple in the next 10 years.

Madam Speaker, under this spending plan, we are borrowing 43 cents on the dollar, mainly from the Chinese, and sending the bill to our children. If the spending, if the borrowing, if the deficits do not stop, this will be a Congress that will ensure that it's just a matter of time before the Chinese initiate foreclosure proceedings on our Nation. We cannot let that stand.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, what we just heard came from a Member of the then-majority party, which turned \$6 trillion in inherited projected surpluses into a \$2 trillion deficit. We heard that from a Member of the party that provided \$2 trillion in tax cuts primarily aimed at the wealthiest people in the country, all paid for with borrowed money, from the same folks who gave us almost \$1 trillion in spending on the most ill advised war in the country's history, also paid for with borrowed money.

They ran the country's economy into the ditch with record collapse of consumer spending and record collapse of unemployment. Then they are now complaining when Mr. Obama and the majority party are now trying to pull the country out of the ditch.

Someone else can take that seriously if they want, but I won't be one of them.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), who is a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the taxpayers of the 19th Congressional District and all across America. They are angry, Madam Speaker, about the spending and the borrowing that's going on in Washington.

At a time when they are cutting back to make ends meet, paying down their credit cards, saving more, working hard to provide for their families, they don't understand why their government isn't doing the same thing. They don't understand why the government is not only spending all of their tax dollars, but also borrowing almost 50 cents for every dollar that they spend.

This bill before us increases spending for the legislative branch by 5.7 percent. I don't know about other Members in the House, but I think it's pretty hard to explain to the taxpayers why we are increasing our budget by 5.7 percent and the American people are cutting their budgets.

The only explanation I can think of is that Congress doesn't get it. Well, the American people get it. Like them, I don't understand why we are increasing the legislative branch budget when the deficit is going to hit \$1.6 trillion this year, projected to be \$1.3 trillion next year.

This bill includes provisions to continue funding for programs as we complete the remaining annual spending bills, but I would advocate that Congress go ahead and finish the job that it started.

The problem is that these annual spending bills are set forth to increase our spending by 8.9 percent this year. This spending increase would come on top of an 8.6 percent increase last year, a nearly \$1 trillion economic stimulus package, and a \$700 billion financial bailout.

Instead of passing bills to increase spending at a time when we have added \$1 trillion to our national debt this year, Congress should, at a minimum, freeze spending at this level.

Had we gone through normal order, I offered an amendment that would have frozen spending for the coming year and saved the American taxpayers \$43 billion. It's a start, Madam Speaker.

I urge members to vote against this bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Alabama and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as the members of our subcommittee, for the good work that they have done on developing this Legislative Branch appropriations bill.

We have a good solid product to make sure that we can move the legislative branch institutions forward and to preserve the legacy of the Capitol complex and its institutions for future generations. We also are going to make sure that we keep the government running.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, both on the other side of the aisle as well as on my side of the aisle, will vote for this bill. A vote against this bill would jeopardize the security and safety of our citizens. Shutting the government down is not a responsible action.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, here we are on the Floor of the House again, with less than a week to go before the end of the fiscal year, and the majority is not prepared to send a single, finalized appropriation bill to the President for signature. Where is the change that was promised?

In addition to the legislative bill before us today, we have four significant funding bills that have passed both the House and Senate,

and are ready to go to conference or whatever we call conferences these days: Agriculture, Energy and Water, Homeland Security and Transportation/HUD. These are bills that contain important funding for all of our districts, including monies for new and important initiatives that might help the economy.

Over the course of this FY-2010 funding cycle, the majority has run a process that has prevented spending bills from being perfected through the amendment process, primarily to avoid tough votes.

That stunted process has allowed the funding bills to be rammed through the House. Yet, with closed Rules, an 80-seat majority in the House and a 20-seat majority in the other Body, the congressional leadership still cannot manage to move the appropriation bills. As my children used to say, "what's wrong with this picture?"

Ladies and gentlemen, I suggest that what is wrong with this picture is a continuation of what has been going on for the last several months and it is not about the last administration.

Right now, we are: sitting on a 9.6% unemployment rate; struggling with CBO deficit projection numbers that are off the charts for the next several years; suffering the fiscal effects of a gross misallocation of Stimulus bill funds that mostly went to expanding 73 existing government programs and adding 30 new ones for select constituencies; and procrastinating over a healthcare situation about which all agree something must be done, but which the majority refuses to consult the minority or produce a product.

And today, the majority is determined to perpetuate this craziness with a "cooked" appropriation process to temporarily fund the government because the House and Senate cannot get their respective acts together.

No wonder, we heard noisy demonstrations at town hall meetings and in Washington. Folks, the noise from outside the Washington Beltway is not just a response to the healthcare fiasco though that is certainly a part of it.

The noise is part of a steadily growing response to what people rightly perceive to be those running the government in Washington not paying attention to their concerns and fears about spending and the paths we are taking.

This continuing resolution exercise today is just one more example that the majority intends to keep ignoring those concerns.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2010, which will also allow for continuation of government functions through October 31, 2009.

Through this spring and into the summer, the House has worked diligently to approve all 12 regular appropriation bills. Yet, our colleagues on the other side of the rotunda have not finished their work and so today we must approve continued funding for all government operations which are scheduled to expire on September 30, 2009. I hope that we will be able to reach agreement with our Senate colleagues and complete all regular appropriations bills and need no more continuing resolutions.

I regret that the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill does not include funding for the revival of the Office of Technology Assessment, OTA. When OTA operated it provided

Congress with assistance in identifying and assessing the consequences of science and technology in a very useful manner and timeframe.

While I was unsuccessful this year reinstating funding for the OTA, I will continue to fight for the revival of OTA because it would strengthen Congress as an institution, elevate the discourse on matters affected by science and technology, and allow Members to more effectively carry out their duties as the people's representatives.

Another point troubles me greatly. This bill contains in Section 163 a provision to deny funding to ACORN or its allied organizations. I must note that a number of questions have been raised about the constitutionality of this section, and I share these concerns. Article I Section 9 of the Constitution of the United States is explicit that, "No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed." Thus, it is unconstitutional for Congress to pass legislation declaring an individual or a group guilty and sanctioning them without benefit of a trial. Without doubt, the revelations about ACORN presented on the internet and television recently are cause for concern and indicate possible illegality and misuse of funds. Reports on television, however, are not cause for Congress suddenly to become a part of the judicial branch of government and declare guilt and mete out punishment without any legal proceedings. The Congressional Research Service has been asked to look into this question, and concluded that a court would most likely "find that it violates the prohibition against bills of attainder."

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman OBEY for his assistance, and Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida and the members of the conference committee for their hard work in putting together this conference report. Included is a provision of great importance to the Postal Service, over 600,000 postal employees, and 300 million postal customers, who are also our constituents. This conference report includes language from H.R. 22, the United States Postal Service Financial Relief Act of 2009, a bill reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on July 10 and passed by the full House on September 15.

This provision will allow the United States Postal Service to lower its 2009 payment into the retiree health benefits fund from \$5.4 billion to \$1.4 billion. It does not provide any taxpayer funds to the Postal Service. The language was originally included in H.R. 22, a bill that has been properly vetted and amended by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. In line with calls for a more fiscally responsible government, the provision lowering the Postal Service payment does not score. For these reasons, the House passed H.R. 22 by an overwhelming margin of 388 to 32.

The Postal Service faces an unprecedented crisis. Mail volume is projected to drop to 175 billion pieces in fiscal year 2009, from a high of nearly 213 billion pieces. The Postal Service anticipates a loss of more than \$7 billion by end of fiscal year 2009. The losses were driven by the nationwide economic recession, diversion of mail to electronic alternatives, and also by the aggressive payment schedule for retiree health benefits required by the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act. Its fiscal year 2008 payment total for current and future

retiree health benefits was roughly \$7 billion. The Postal Service has paid \$10 billion into the trust fund over the past 2 years. It suffered a combined loss of \$7.9 billion over those 2 years. Without the onerous payments into the trust fund, the Postal Service would have made a net profit of more than \$4 billion over that period.

Reducing the size of the payment into the trust fund for 2009 will bring the postal payment closer to the \$1.6 billion amount recommended by the Postal Service Inspector General, while permitting the Postal Service to survive the economic crisis. Many large companies in the private sector have also temporarily reduced pension and retiree benefit contributions in order to ride out similar, difficult financial circumstances.

I would like to thank Representatives MCHUGH of New York and DAVIS of Illinois for introducing this bill and for their hard work and patience in navigating the bill through the House. Further, I would like to thank the House Democratic leadership and the Budget Committee for working with us to help advance the bill to the floor. Also, I would also like to recognize Chairman LYNCH of Massachusetts for his leadership on the subcommittee and being a tireless advocate for the Postal Service and its employees. Additionally, I would like to thank the Gentlemen from California and Utah, Representatives ISSA and CHAFFETZ, for their help in securing bipartisan support for H.R. 22.

In the coming months, our committee will continue to provide close oversight of the Postal Service, including studying the business model of the Postal Service to help determine what longer-term changes may be necessary.

I am confident that upon enactment of H.R. 22 the Postal Service will be able to meet its financial obligations for this year.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 772, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 190, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 739]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie	Carnahan	Davis (TN)
Adler (NJ)	Carney	DeFazio
Altmire	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Andrews	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Arcuri	Chandler	Diaz-Balart, L.
Baldwin	Childers	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrow	Chu	Dicks
Bean	Clay	Dingell
Berkley	Cleaver	Doggett
Berman	Clyburn	Donnelly (IN)
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Edwards (TX)
Bishop (NY)	Connolly (VA)	Ellsworth
Blumenauer	Conyers	Engel
Boccieri	Cooper	Eshoo
Boren	Costa	Etheridge
Boswell	Costello	Farr
Boucher	Courtney	Fattah
Boyd	Crowley	Filner
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Foster
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Brown, Corrine	Dahlkemper	Fudge
Butterfield	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez
Capps	Davis (CA)	Gordon (TN)
Cardoza	Davis (IL)	Grayson

Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Rush	Petri	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Green, Gene	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Pitts	Schmidt	Tiahrt
Grijalva	McDermott	Salazar	Platts	Schock	Tiberi
Gutierrez	McGovern	Salazar, Linda	Posey	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Hall (NY)	McIntyre	T.	Price (GA)	Sessions	Turner
Halvorson	McMahon	Sanchez, Loretta	Putnam	Shadegg	Upton
Hare	Meek (FL)	Sarbanes	Radanovich	Shimkus	Velázquez
Harman	Meeke (NY)	Schauer	Rehberg	Shuster	Walden
Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Schiff	Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wamp
Heinrich	Michaud	Schrader	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Schwartz	Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Himes	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Hinchey	Mollohan	Serrano	Rooney	Souder	Wolf
Hirono	Moore (KS)	Sestak	Roskam	Stearns	Woolsey
Hodes	Moore (WI)	Shea-Porter	Royce	Taylor	Young (AK)
Holden	Moran (VA)	Sherman	Ryan (WI)	Terry	Young (FL)
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Shuler	Scalise	Thompson (PA)	
Honda	Murphy (NY)	Sires			
Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick	Skelton			
Inslee	Murtha	Slaughter			
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)	Ackerman	Graves	Nunes
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Snyder	Baca	Higgins	Poe (TX)
Kagen	Oberstar	Space	Berry	Hill	Scott (GA)
Kanjorski	Obey	Spratt	Blunt	Israel	Speier
Kaptur	Olver	Stark	Capuano	Issa	Sullivan
Kennedy	Ortiz	Stupak	Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Wilson (OH)
Kildee	Pallone	Sutton	Culberson	Jones	Wilson (SC)
Kilroy	Pascrell	Tanner	Delahunt	Loeback	
Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Teague	Doyle	Mica	
Kissell	Payne	Thompson (CA)			
Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)			
Kosmas	Peterson	Tierney			
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Titus			
Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)	Tonko			
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Tsongas			
Levin	Price (NC)	Van Hollen			
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Visclosky			
Lipinski	Rahall	Walz			
Lofgren, Zoe	Rangel	Wasserman			
Lowey	Reichert	Schultz			
Lujan	Reyes	Waters			
Lynch	Richardson	Watson			
Maffei	Rodriguez	Watt			
Maloney	Rogers (AL)	Waxman			
Markey (CO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner			
Markey (MA)	Ross	Welch			
Marshall	Rothman (NJ)	Wexler			
Matheson	Roybal-Allard	Wu			
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth			

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Dent	Kline (MN)
Akin	Dreier	Kratovil
Alexander	Driehaus	Kucinich
Austria	Duncan	Lamborn
Bachmann	Edwards (MD)	Lance
Bachus	Ehlers	Latham
Baird	Ellison	LaTourette
Barrett (SC)	Emerson	Latta
Bartlett	Fallin	Lee (CA)
Barton (TX)	Flake	Lee (NY)
Becerra	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Biggett	Forbes	Linder
Bilbray	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fox	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Boehner	Gallely	Lungren, Daniel
Bonner	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Bono Mack	Gerlach	Mack
Boozman	Giffords	Manzullo
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Massa
Bright	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Granger	McCaul
Brown (SC)	Griffith	McClintock
Brown-Waite,	Guthrie	McCotter
Ginny	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Buchanan	Harper	McKeon
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Burton (IN)	Heller	Rodgers
Buyer	Hensarling	McNerney
Calvert	Herger	Miller (FL)
Camp	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Campbell	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Cantor	Hunter	Minnick
Cao	Inglis	Mitchell
Capito	Jackson-Lee	Moran (KS)
Carter	(TX)	Murphy, Tim
Cassidy	Jenkins	Myrick
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Nadler (NY)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer
Coble	Jordan (OH)	Nye
Coffman (CO)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Olson
Cole	King (IA)	Paul
Conaway	King (NY)	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Kingston	Pence
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Perriello
Deal (GA)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters

Petri	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Pitts	Schmidt	Tiahrt
Platts	Schock	Tiberi
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Price (GA)	Sessions	Turner
Putnam	Shadegg	Upton
Sarbanes	Shimkus	Velázquez
Rehberg	Shuster	Walden
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wamp
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rooney	Souder	Wolf
Roskam	Stearns	Woolsey
Royce	Taylor	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Terry	Young (FL)
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman	Graves	Nunes
Baca	Higgins	Poe (TX)
Berry	Hill	Scott (GA)
Blunt	Israel	Speier
Capuano	Issa	Sullivan
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Wilson (OH)
Culberson	Jones	Wilson (SC)
Delahunt	Loeback	
Doyle	Mica	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1133

Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. GRIFFITH, TOWNS, ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the conference report 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. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 739 on Conference Report to H.R. 2918, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 739 on the Conference Report to H.R. 2918, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “nay” when I should have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 739, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 739, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I submit to the RECORD the following remarks regarding my absence from a vote which occurred on September 25. I was in a meeting with constituents and unable to make the vote. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present.

H.R. 2918—On Agreeing to the Conference Report for Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, FY 2010 (Roll no. 739)—“nay.”

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, September 25, 2009, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall 738—“nay”; rollcall 739—“nay.”

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to vote on rollcalls 738 and 739. Had I been present, I

would have voted: "nay" on each of these measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 772, House Concurrent Resolution 191 is hereby adopted.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 191

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2918) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:*

(1) In section 158(a) of division B, strike "section 158" and insert "section 157".

(2) In section 158(b) of division B, strike "section 158" and insert "section 157".

(3) In section 162 of division B, strike "sections 158 through 162" and insert "sections 157 through 161".

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 25, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 24, 2009, at 5:57 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1707.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
*Clerk of the House.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1687. An act to designate the federally occupied building located at McKinley Avenue and Third Street, SW., Canton, Ohio, as the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2053. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 525 Magoffin Avenue in El Paso, Texas, as the "Albert Armendariz, Sr., United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2121. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Galveston, Texas, to the Galveston Historical Foundation.

H.R. 2498. An act to designate the Federal building located at 844 North Rush Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "William O. Lipinski Federal Building".

H.R. 2913. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 301 Simonton Street in Key West, Florida, as the "Sidney M. Aronovitz United States Courthouse".

H.R. 3607. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 832. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the Military Officers Association of America, and for other purposes.

S. 1599. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to include in the Federal charter of the Reserve Officers Association leadership positions newly added in its constitution and bylaws.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

On Monday, the House will not be in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, we will consider Senate 1707, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 through 2014 to promote an enhanced strategic partnership with Pakistan and its people; the conference report on H.R. 3183, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010; and additional motions to go to conference on appropriations bills.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, according to Politico, the Speaker announced at your caucus meeting on Wednesday that she intends to have the final version of the Democrat health care bill drafted by the end of next week. My question is: Was the Speaker's statement accurate? And do we expect floor action on the health care bill in the House?

Mr. CROWLEY. A bill will be brought to the floor when a bill is ready to be brought to the floor. I would leave it at that. The bill will be brought to the floor when it's ready to be brought to the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Was the Speaker correct? Do we think it is going to be brought to the floor or ready by next week?

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, if the bill is ready to be brought to the floor by next week, it could very well be that case. The bill will be brought to the floor when the bill is ready to be brought to the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Will the bill be drafted by next week so peo-

ple on the other side could actually see it?

Mr. CROWLEY. Again, the bill will be brought to the floor when the bill is ready to be brought to the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Earlier this week on Monday, our Republican whip, ERIC CANTOR, held a bipartisan town hall on health care with Democrat BOBBY SCOTT, both of Richmond, Virginia, showing bipartisan action. Following the town hall, the majority leader on your side told the media that he would like to meet and discuss health care reform with us, and we have expressed our willingness to meet with him. But we have not been asked by the majority leader yet.

Do you believe that we will be at any time soon, so that our leader can continue to carry on that bipartisan conversation?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for his question. I think the gentleman knows, as do I, that the majority leader is a man of his word; and if he gave his word to do that, I anticipate that he will follow through on that. I can't speak for him. But knowing if that's what he said, I'm sure that he will follow through on that request.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. We look forward to that. Being one of the signatures early on in this health care discussion to a letter that the leadership on this side sent to the President saying that we were willing, able and wanting to sit down to discuss health care, we're still waiting for the President to allow us to have that discussion in a bipartisan manner.

I do believe that the work that our Republican whip, ERIC CANTOR, and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT on your side of the aisle, that the bipartisanship that they showed down there was very positive. We look to your majority leader coming forward and following up and having that discussion with our leader.

Mr. CROWLEY. I think we all welcome bipartisanship on this debate, and we hope in the end that this will be a bipartisan solution to what is a problem not only for Democrats and Republicans but for all Americans. I think if we could have more productive town halls around the country like the one you referred to that took place where the facts and the issues can be exposed, talked about and deciphered, I think we will all be better off for that.

□ 1145

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to know from one standpoint early on and within here as we look across America and we look at the jobless and the idea that we want to create jobs here, many on this side of the aisle worked very hard on a stimulus bill that focused on small business, where 79 percent of all jobs are created. We wanted to focus on job creation. We presented that to the President. Unfortunately, that did not get put into the stimulus.

But the President told us that unemployment would not rise above 8.5 percent if we passed the Democrats' stimulus. Since the signing of the stimulus bill, Americans have lost another 2.5 million jobs and unemployment is now at 9.7, much higher than what the President said it would be.

Will this House bring any legislation next week to help create jobs?

I yield.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I don't think there's any question that these have been very, very difficult months and, quite frankly, years that the American people have been suffering through. We have looked consistently at months—prior to recent months—of 600,000, 700,000 jobs lost per month, quite frankly, going back to the previous administration, under the Bush administration, where the job loss was at its height. I'm happy to note that that job loss has been diminishing steadily over the past few months, and, in fact, we saw an additional 21,000 fewer jobs lost in this month than the prior month.

Having said that, the road to recovery remains a long one, and we understand that. That's why we took the steps that this administration took, following up on the legislation passed in the prior Congress to help stimulate the growth of jobs in this country. And I believe, as many of my colleagues do, that increasingly there are signs that the economy is turning around. I know that Mr. Bernanke, Federal Reserve Chairman said, "The recession is likely over at this point." I think those are very optimistic statements, and I appreciate the chairman's response to a query.

But I do think we still have a long way to go, and we will work to ensure that job loss is not only stemmed but that we have actual job growth. And we anticipate when the Recovery Act is fully appreciated that we will begin to see job growth in this country.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work together. And knowing that with the stimulus the President said unemployment would not go above 8.5, and now it's 9.7, and sitting on Financial Services listening to Mr. Bernanke saying that it will continue to rise, would your side of the aisle be willing to work with us so we could reprogram the money in the stimulus to actually be job creation or help pay down this national debt so our country could actually be stronger? Do you see any future ability of making that happen?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I'll just restate for the record: The CBO, the CEA, Moody's all estimate there are 1 million more jobs now than there would have been without the Recovery Act that we passed here in the House. The Congressional Budget Office said in the budget economic update

that "even though some elements of the CBO's forecast, particularly the unemployment rate, have clearly worsened, such revisions to the forecast reflect a much sharper deterioration in underlying labor market conditions than had been anticipated rather than a smaller impact of the legislation." In addition, the CBO also said that "the fiscal stimulus provided under the American Recovery and Investment Act will significantly boost economic activity above what it otherwise would have been."

So I think, going back to what I said before, we're seeing a reversal in job loss. We are not at zero yet, but as I said before, 21,000 fewer jobs were lost in the prior month than they were the month before that. I think that's showing that it is stemming, it is slowing down. And we anticipate that if it continues in that way, which we all hope for and anticipate it will, we will begin to see job growth.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, when the President first got elected, this side of the aisle invited him to our conference and we sat down and had a discussion about which direction the stimulus bill should go. We actually had a very honest debate.

This side of the aisle wanted to focus on job creation. Our focus was about small business. That's where 79 percent of the jobs are created. And the President said, Well, why don't you write out a bill and bring out some ideas?

So a number of us worked together, a lot of hours, a lot of nights, crafting legislation. And we put this together, and we actually sat down and said, You can't just write down legislation; you need to score it. The idea is for the American people to know what this would cost and how many jobs would it create. And as we put that scoring together, do you know it created twice as many jobs with half the amount of money in the stimulus bill? And we handed that to the President. Unfortunately, it did not get into the bill. And the President said that it was more important on the time of when the stimulus bill passed, and not what was in it; he said if the bill was passed now, unemployment would not go above 8.5 percent.

Well, I don't need a CBO study to understand that's not true. It's now at 9.7. And I think the American people want us to work together to create jobs, not to sit here and somehow celebrate the idea that only 21,000 jobs were lost. We need to be able to work together and celebrate a million new jobs created. We have legislation that allows it, that focuses on small business, focuses on job creation. And I look forward that this Congress could come together.

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the gentleman yield once again? I just want to respond, if I could, to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I'm glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you for yielding.

I appreciate your words of desire for more bipartisanship, and I would just suggest that the Recovery and Reinvestment Act that we passed reflected more bipartisanship in the legislation than was reflected by the vote that took place here on the floor. I think there were many attempts to include some of the ideas and thoughts from your side of the aisle that were included in that bill, and I can talk about a number of them. But it was not reflected in the overall vote that took place. I, too, hope that in the future we can have more of a reflective vote of bipartisanship on issues like that, as we had this week when both Democrats and Republicans voted 331-83 to extend unemployment for those Americans who are still out of work, who are looking and struggling to find employment. And I hope the Senate will act to pass that bill and send the bill on to the President as soon as possible.

I appreciate the gentleman's yielding for this discussion.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct. The bipartisan vote for the stimulus bill was a "no" vote. A number of people on the other side of the aisle also saw that that bill would not hold us to only 8.5 percent unemployment, that there was a better way, a better idea.

The one thing I would always ask the gentleman and those on the other side, bipartisanship means the power of the idea wins at the end of the day. So when a paper is presented that shows it creates twice as many jobs with half the cost, the pride in ownership should not be there. We should allow the American people to actually win, that jobs being created is a much better place for America. And when that is presented again, which we will always gladly do, to sit here and work with you, because we want to put people before politics. We want to create an America that is strong, and we want to leave America not in debt.

So as we move forward, I would always challenge everybody on this floor: The amount of the national debt that is accumulating in this administration is unheard of, and we have to make sure, this generation that's going before us, that we leave an America better off than we were before.

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. CROWLEY. I appreciate again his comments and his desire to work in a bipartisan way to help lift America out of the doldrums that it's in, lift America out of what has been called "the Great Recession."

I think it's also important to note that we didn't get here in the last 9 months. And we can decry the overspending by this administration all we want, but we also have to reflect upon the overspending of the prior 8 years, which I recognize the gentleman was not serving in the House of Representatives at the time, when the other side

of the aisle increased the spending and increased the deficit beyond anyone's wildest dreams.

So I appreciate your thoughts. I too want to help stop putting debt on the backs of my children and my grandchildren. We both share that. And we all need to work together in a bipartisan way to help this President. As he has said, his desire is to slash the national debt in half, and I think we're going to work together to make that happen.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, if the President only slashes it in half, it's still the highest deficit that we have ever had.

I am one who likes to look forward. I may have only been here 3 years, but the one thing I have seen, if you take the entire history since the creation of this country, there have been 44 administrations. If you just take the first 43, from George Washington to George Bush, and you add up all the amount of debt that was accumulating, and that's from the creation of this country to our battles with Britain, to World War I, to the Depression, to World War II, Katrina, Afghanistan, Iraq, Vietnam, Korea, the creation of a highway system, it is equal to the amount of debt that is going to be doubled. That is something that cannot be maintained. That is something that cannot be happening.

The way to get out of it, you have to control your spending and you have to create jobs. That's why the power of the idea needs to win at the end of the day.

So we will continue to come up with the ideas. We will continue to try to work in a bipartisan manner, and we will continue to hand them to you. But the only thing I ask of you is when you see something that would create twice as many jobs with half the cost, let's put people before politics, let's put America first, and let's move forward to the future.

Mr. CROWLEY. I would ask the gentleman, as a point of clarification, was that from George Washington to the beginning of George Bush's term or the end of George Bush's term?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. It's to the end of George Bush's term.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 29, 2009

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

CMS GAG RULE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we are now on day 5 of the Obama administration's gag order barring Medicare Advantage plans from telling their enrollees about the benefit cuts that will result from the Democrats' health care bill.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services actually overturned a Clinton-era ruling that said "prohibiting such information would violate basic freedom of speech and other constitutional rights."

Yesterday, Ways and Means Republicans formally requested a hearing to investigate the CMS gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to get to the bottom of this and find out if the administration is politicizing Federal agencies to stop Americans from learning the truth about his policies.

TOWN HALL MEETINGS ON PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE PLAN

(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, there has been a lot of attention to the fact that Members of Congress held town hall meetings during the month of August, and there was much discussion about the passion that was expressed there.

Well, it's now September, and we're still holding town hall meetings. I had one last Saturday in my district. And let me tell you the passion is still there.

The average citizen in my district looks to Congress to do the right thing. And they are not satisfied. They are not pleased. They are not happy in any way, shape, or form with respect to the Obama health care plan and its various versions here in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

They have asked me to convey to my colleagues the fact that they are concerned about the size of government, the cost of government, the size of taxation, and the amount of debt we're imposing on our children and our grandchildren. They want us to get serious about those things. They don't want us to give up on them.

By the way, they're not mobs. They're not un-American. They are the very essence of America. They come to my meetings in ones, twos and threes. They are everyday Americans wanting a responsive House of Representatives that recognizes simple truths.

□ 1200

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERS). 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.

U.N.: HAVEN FOR INTERNATIONAL TYRANTS?

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, Libya is about to get \$2.5 million in aid from the American taxpayers. And \$200,000 each is marked for foundations run by Omar Qaddafi's two kids.

Omar Qaddafi is an international terrorist. He gave the order for the bombing of the Pan Am jet over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988. And then he led the cheers for the killer when he was returned to Libya. Men, women and children boarded that airplane headed for New York's JFK Airport. A Libyan official checked a suitcase with a bomb in it. The airplane exploded, killing 243 passengers and 16 crew members, mostly Americans. Eleven people on the ground in Scotland were killed when large chunks of the plane fell out of the sky and hit their town.

What are we doing giving this man and his family U.S. taxpayer dollars? Has America lost its way?

The United Nations is starting to look like the bar scene in the Star Wars movies. Murderers, thugs, and terrorists freely roam the halls, and they are asked to speak before the General Assembly. There was a time when the United Nations was a threat to tyrants, but now it seems like it is their home.

Omar Qaddafi said at the U.N. that Lee Harvey Oswald, the person who killed President Kennedy, was an Israeli spy. He called for a civil war in Iraq. He condemned the war on terror in Afghanistan, and he said the swine flu is a biological weapon created in laboratories. Can't tell who he blames that on, however.

Omar also said in his 100-minute rambling rant that we should call the United Nations Security Council the terrorist council, made up of the United States and other nations.

Omar's twin terrorist tyrant, Ahmadinejad, also had some choice things to say at the United Nations this week. The little fella from the desert of Iran said that Israel is committing genocide. He said that capitalism has caused all of the misery in the world. The tiny tyrant also praised himself for his glorious election this year. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is the election where he and his government beat and killed unarmed peaceful protesters that opposed him.

He says the Holocaust is a myth. He wants the destruction of Israel and the United States, and he is building nuclear weapons. Who do you think those weapons are for? And what is the United States' reaction? Well, we canceled our missile defense system in Poland, a defense system that was to protect the United States from intercontinental ballistic missiles from Iran. And our Polish allies think we betrayed our commitment to them and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, has America lost its way?

And let's not forget Hugo Chavez, the tyrant of Venezuela who railed against the United States. He spoke also at the U.N. He is good buddies with the desert rat of Iran. And a New York district attorney recently said that there is evidence that Venezuela is setting up a Venezuelan missile crisis for the United States. Now isn't that lovely. Why do we send U.S. taxpayer money to the U.N. at all? Twenty percent of U.N. funds come from the United States, and the American public is asking: Why? Why do we finance the U.N. that embraces thugs, dictators, terrorists and everyone who hates America and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, since nobody else over at the U.N. has said it, I will, and I will say this without apology: The United States is the greatest country in the history of the world. We have more freedom and liberty than any people in the history of the planet. We have done more than any other nation to help some of the most ungrateful people around the planet in history.

We should not abandon our missile defense system in Poland. We should reevaluate our financial commitment to the United Nations, and we should never give American money to tyrants of nations in the hope of a blissful illusion of buying peace.

Mr. Speaker, has America lost its way? We shall see.

And that's just the way it is.

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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES 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 Virginia (Mr. NYE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### MEDICARE AND GAG ORDERS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Congressional Budget Office headed by Mr. Elmendorf, who is the director, told Senator BAUCUS that his plan to cut \$123 billion from Medicare Advantage, the program

that gives one-fourth of seniors private health insurance options, will result in lower benefits and some 2.7 million people losing their coverage.

Last week, Mr. BAUCUS ordered the Medicare regulators to investigate and likely punish Humana, Incorporated for trying to educate enrollees in its Advantage plans about precisely this fact.

Jonathan Blum, who is the acting director of a regulator office in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, who used to work for Senator BAUCUS, said that a mailer Humana sent to its customers was "misleading and confusing to beneficiaries who may believe it represents official communication about the Medicare Advantage program."

Mr. Blum has also banned all Advantage contractors from telling their customers what Mr. Elmendorf has told Congress. Mr. Blum, as I said, happens to be a former senior aide to Mr. BAUCUS and a health adviser to the President Obama transition team. So for the record, CBO's Director Elmendorf says that cuts to Medicare Advantage "could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program."

But they want to put a gag on the deliverers of this coverage because they are writing to their patients, to the people they are covering, and telling them that they are going to lose coverage if this bill passes, that Medicare Advantage is going to be gutted. Senator BAUCUS is now saying we want to put a gag in the mouths of people who are providing this coverage so they can't tell the senior citizens of this country that they are going to lose Medicare Advantage coverage.

That is a violation of the First Amendment. And, secondly, I don't know of any rule that would allow Senator BAUCUS to do this. This is absolutely a terrible thing. And Mr. Blum doesn't have the authority to do this. Mr. BAUCUS, Senator BAUCUS, does not have the authority to do this, and yet they are gagging the health care providers, the people who are insuring these people and providing coverage, by saying you can't tell them that they are going to lose Medicare Advantage.

The plan of Mr. BAUCUS and other plans here in the House and the Senate are going to cut \$500 billion out of Medicare, and most of it is coming out of Medicare Advantage and they are trying to keep the seniors in this country from knowing it until they get the job done. That is criminal.

First they violate the First Amendment rights of these companies. And, second, they gag them and threaten them with criminal prosecution or some kind of penalties if they don't adhere to what Senator BAUCUS or Mr. Blum says. And then they don't let the American people, the seniors who vote more than anybody else, know that they are going to lose Medicare Advantage and they are going to take \$500 billion out of Medicare coverage.

Seniors need to know this, and yet they are gagging the people who are trying to get the facts out. This is just dead wrong. It should not happen. This is government control in its worst form, and it is something that we should not tolerate.

In addition, I want to read into the RECORD a letter that I got from Dr. Ned Masbaum, who is a forensic psychiatrist in Indianapolis, and he wrote this about the American Medical Association:

"Dear Congressman Burton,

"Thank you for your very well-thought out letter. When I heard about the new AMA position supporting socialized medicine, I felt a sickening feeling in the pit of my stomach. I have been a member of the AMA for over 40 years. Unfortunately, it has gradually become a leftist political cheerleader with the usual pro-abortion and anti-Second Amendment drivel. However, this illiterate position for socialized medicine betrays its own members and the American citizenry. It is so blindsided that it also eliminates the need for the very existence of the American Medical Association. If we all become serfs for the government, we no longer need a formerly scientific professional organization.

"With the AMA headquarters in Chicago, the AMA president and his ilk must have been polluted with Chicago-style politics and their brains have turned to mush.

"This morning, I had a lengthy teleconference concerning the issue with the executive vice president of the Indiana State Medical Association, James G. McIntire, J.D. Apparently ISMA has not yet taken any position. I have also written a letter to the president of the AMA, a copy of which is enclosed, advising my opposition and the intent to resign as a member.

"Please keep up the good fight."

This is the kind of information that needs to get out to Americans. Seniors need to know they are going to lose coverage and \$500 billion is going to be cut out of Medicare.

CARMEL, IN,  
July 22, 2009.

Re your letter of 20 July concerning the AMA.

Hon. DAN BURTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON: Thank you for your very well thought out letter. When I heard about the new AMA position supporting socialized medicine, I felt a sickening feeling in the pit of my stomach. I have been a member of the AMA for over 40 years. Unfortunately, it has gradually become a leftist political cheerleader with the usual pro-abortion & anti-second amendment dribble. However, this illiterate position for socialized medicine betrays its own members and the American Citizenry. It is so blindsided that it also eliminates the need for the very existence of the AMA. If we all become serfs for the government we no longer need a formerly scientific professional organization.

With the AMA headquarters in Chicago, the AMA President and his ilk must have

been polluted with Chicago style politics and their brains have turned to mush.

This morning, I had a lengthy teleconference concerning this issue with the Executive Vice President of the Indiana State Medical Association, James G. McIntire, J.D. Apparently ISMA has not taken any position yet. I have also written a letter to the President of the AMA, a copy is enclosed, advising my opposition and intent to resign as a member.

Please keep up the good fight. Best personal regards to you.

Sincerely,

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

CARMEL, IN,  
July 22, 2009.

J. JAMES ROHACK, M.D.  
President, American Medical Association,  
Chicago, IL.

DEAR DR. ROHACK: Your announcement of the AMA's backing of nationalizing health care was shocking to say the least. It was my mistaken belief that the AMA always opposed socialized medicine since it does not work anywhere in the world. It was also my belief that the organization backed Health Savings Accounts as a truly free enterprise American way to solve the economic problems of our current system. Why would the AMA sell out it's own members and the American public?

If you and the AMA do not reverse your current position immediately, you can say goodbye to me as a member of over 40 years.

Sincerely,

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

On Tuesday, the Congressional Budget Office director told Senator BAUCUS that his plan to cut \$123 billion from Medicare Advantage—the program that gives almost one-fourth of seniors private health-insurance options—will result in lower benefits and some 2.7 million people losing this coverage.

Last week Mr. BAUCUS ordered Medicare regulators to investigate and likely punish Humana Inc. for trying to educate enrollees in its Advantage plans about precisely this fact.

Jonathan Blum, acting director of a regulatory office in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, said that a mailer Humana sent its customers was “misleading and confusing to beneficiaries, who may believe that it represents official communication about the Medicare Advantage program.”

Mr. Blum has also banned all Advantage contractors from telling their customers what Mr. Elmendorf has just told Congress. Mr. Blum happens to be a former senior aide to Mr. BAUCUS and a health adviser on the Obama transition team.

So, for the record, CBO's Director Elmendorf says that cuts to Medicare Advantage “could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program.”

Providing of accurate information by Medicare Advantage plans to its enrollees is not prohibited by applicable Federal rules and regulations.

#### AFGHAN ASSESSMENT

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Commander in Chief, President George W. Bush, relied on his military commander on the

ground to give him an assessment as to what it would take to turn around what was then a very bad situation in Iraq. General Petraeus made his case before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and he was given the resources that he requested. The surge in Iraq provided the necessary level of security that ultimately allowed the political process there to move forward.

Similarly, General Stanley McChrystal has been charged by the Commander in Chief, President Barack Obama, to give an assessment of what it will take to win in Afghanistan and achieve the objectives that the President had committed to earlier this year.

I believe General McChrystal's report was politically sanitized and General McChrystal needs to appear before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees to give an honest assessment of what is going on in Afghanistan.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. FORBES 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 California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### AMERICAN POSITION AGAINST TERRORISM

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stood on this floor about 3 years

ago and called upon the United States to clearly define its position toward what is now the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

I then called upon the IAEA to refer Iran to the Security Council because I believed then that what Western intelligence has long suspected about Iran and what it seems that President Obama is now just beginning to realize, Iran is systematically and relentlessly pursuing the development of nuclear weapons.

Today's revelation that they have a second uranium facility at Qom should remove all doubt in any reasonable person's mind about their inevitable intentions. Yet today's announcement at the G-20 summit by the leaders of Britain, France and the United States reveal that Iran has been covertly operating and developing a new underground uranium enrichment facility at Qom.

It is disgracefully ironic that today's announcement comes only a week after announcing our abandonment of the European missile defense site which could have protected the homeland of the United States against Iranian long-range missiles, and only one day after President Obama chaired a United Nations Security Council specifically addressing the need to halt the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world. Unbelievably, the resolution passed by the Security Council, under President Obama's leadership, omitted any mention whatsoever of either North Korea or Iran.

But regardless of the Security Council's failure to explicitly address the real and present danger that the peace-loving world faces because of Iran's nuclear ambitions, the fact is that Iran has already disregarded three previous rounds of Security Council sanctions and has continued to aggressively pursue a nuclear weapons capability, including building this underground facility and testing the long-range ballistic missiles that could be used to deliver a nuclear payload.

□ 1215

We have reached a crossroads with Iran, Mr. Speaker, that will result in one of two outcomes: either Iran transforms the geopolitical landscape by becoming a nuclear power that proliferates nuclear and missile technology to terrorists throughout the world and then threatens the very existence of countries like Israel; or, by the world's inaction, we place the tiny country of Israel in the unavoidable position of having to act unilaterally with military force to protect themselves and humanity from the threat a nuclear Iran would represent to the entire civilized world. We must not place Israel in that position, Mr. Speaker.

President Obama's announcement today also offered no assurance and, in fact, was a weaker statement than the statement given by Prime Minister Brown and President Sarkozy, who

rightly said that we live in the real world, not the virtual world, and that the real world requires leaders to make decisions to act.

With its languishing economy and literally centuries' worth of natural gas reserves, Iran's claim that it seeks nuclear capability solely for peaceful purposes is ridiculous beyond my ability to express.

It is now open knowledge that for years North Korea gave false overtures that it would engage in negotiations over its nuclear program while holding every deliberate intention to continue its covert development of its nuclear program. We are lying to ourselves and to the world that similar overtures, if made from Iran, will be any less disingenuous. And the implications for our children and our future generations are profoundly significant, Mr. Speaker.

The world must act. As one former Israeli Ambassador put it, "The game is over." Iran is no longer progressing but has now reached the endgame of diplomatic relations.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of every sanction and diplomatic effort possible to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear capabilities. However, ultimately I am convinced the only two things that will stop Iran from becoming a nuclear armed nation and proliferating nuclear terrorism globally in the future will either be a direct military intervention from America or other nations, or the absolute conviction in the minds of the Iranian regime that that will occur if their march toward gaining nuclear weapons continues.

The world must act, Mr. Speaker. For the sake of freedom and for all that free people love, Iran must not be allowed to progress one step further in its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

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.)

#### IRAN: A CLEAR AND PRESENT THREAT

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's decision to scrap a long-range, European-based missile defense shield was not only met with concern among our European allies, but more importantly has sounded alarms here at home where the President's action will leave the Nation vulnerable to Iranian long-range missile attack.

Three years ago, in response to growing threats from Iran, the U.S. developed plans to install a missile defense

system in Eastern Europe to protect Europe and the United States from potential long-range missile attack. Under the program, 10 interceptor missiles would be located in Poland and a radar station would be built in the Czech Republic by 2013. The European-based missile defense system would add an additional layer of defense to the continental United States, which already has a small network of interceptors on the west coast.

The European-based missile defense shield was endorsed by our NATO allies, who called it a "substantial contribution to their collective security." Now, the Obama administration has taken the unusual and highly questionable position of canceling the planned European-based missile defense system in favor of a scaled-back program that will not be ready until 2020.

The threat represented by Iran is real and growing. Last February, Iran launched a satellite, demonstrating substantial progress toward achieving a reliable long-range missile program. A month later, the head of the U.S. European Command testified before the House Armed Services Committee that Iran would be able to deploy an intercontinental ballistic missile, an ICBM, capable of reaching all of Europe and parts of the United States by the year 2015.

The President stated his decision was based upon reduced threats from Iran and greater cost efficiency of his alternative defense system—and anyone watching the news knows that there is no diminished threat from Iran. However, a July 2008 classified report produced by the Institute for Defense Analyses concluded that the European-based missile defense system that the administration now wants to cancel would, in fact, be the most cost effective. I have called on the administration to declassify this report so that all of the facts can be known and we can have a robust debate.

Moscow has made no secret of its opposition to the European-based missile defense system and has repeatedly called for its elimination. Furthermore, European leaders have heard from Russian leaders. The Russians have continually shown that they have no intention of pressing Iran to drop its nuclear and missile programs. For its part, Iran also shows no willingness to be deterred by Russia. Yet, the administration, in courting Moscow assistance in halting Iran's nuclear missile ambitions, has effectively chosen to surrender America's bargaining position with its shelving of the proposed missile defense system.

While the Obama administration's decision to reverse course on European missile defense is being met with smiles in Moscow, Americans have real reason to be concerned. By the administration's own admission, its alternative missile defense system will not be able to be fully capable until 2020, with intelligence indicating Iran will have ICBM capability by 2015. This

means the United States could be vulnerable to Iranian missile attack 5 years before the administration gets its new missile defense system ready.

Not only is Iran near its goal of launching ICBMs, reportedly, it has already the ability to construct a nuclear bomb. Last Thursday, a group of experts at the International Atomic Energy Agency stated, in a report obtained by the Associated Press, that Iran is already capable of building a nuclear bomb and is on the way to developing a missile system capable of carrying an atomic warhead.

Remarkably, in the face of Iran's blatant actions to develop a nuclear weapons program, the administration continues to pursue a course of unilateral disarmament. Earlier this year, the President cut funding for missile interceptors to be based in Alaska as part of the ongoing construction of a homeland missile defense system, reducing the number of interceptors by one-third. I opposed that move and offered an amendment in the House to restore the funding. Unfortunately, the President's cuts were sustained by a Democrat majority of the House.

The administration's record on missile defense at a time when both North Korea and Iran are seeking nuclear weapons capable of reaching the United States is troubling. This year, the administration has cut missile defense by \$1.2 billion, reducing by one-third our intended west coast shield which would protect us from North Korea's advancements and has stopped a European-based system intended to protect the U.S. from Iranian missile threats. In the face of known threats, this administration needs to rededicate itself to defense of the United States' mainland.

It is now my honor to recognize our ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, BUCK MCKEON, who represents California's 25th District, was elected in 1991, has been a leader in ensuring the United States has adequate defense, both that our troops have adequate equipment in their conflicts but also in ensuring that the United States has adequate defense systems.

With that, I would like to recognize Representative MCKEON.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, MIKE. And thank you for holding this Special Order.

I think you have done an outstanding job of getting out to the American people the problem with cutting our missile defense system at a time of war. I have been here a little bit longer than you. I came in 1992. In 1992, we had 18 Army divisions. We are down to 12 now. Actually, in 1998, we were down to 10. We've built it back up in the last 10 years. We had 24 fighter wings; we now have 12. We had 546 Navy ships; we now have 283. Do you detect a trend?

Historically, we have cut our defenses after a war. We did that after World War I, so that when World War II came along, we were training with wooden dummy rifles and it took us a

while to get built up into that fight. By the end of the war, we were building hundreds of planes a day, but it took a long time to get there.

But the world has changed. We're not in a situation now where we can build up defenses after the fact. We have to be prepared ahead of time. We had a golden opportunity to do that. The President, earlier this year in the Democratic Congress, passed an \$800 billion supplemental that was supposed to help us get out of the financial system that we're in. The President called for shovel-ready projects, things that could be done immediately to help the economy. Well, just a couple of things.

I also serve on the Education Committee, and we had about \$14 billion in that supplemental for education, education programs, the Pell Grants, which are very important. But to put \$12 or \$14 billion into IDEA and the same amount into Pell Grants—those are long-range things that will help in the long run—it showed where his priorities are, which it's good to find out where his priorities are. But at the same time, out of \$800 billion, \$300 million went into defense; \$300 million out of \$800 billion. Now, that \$300 million went to MILCON, which are important projects, and we need to build on military bases. Nothing went into weapon systems.

When I came to Congress, we were building the B-2 bomber, and it was supposed to be 132 planes. That was what was needed for defense of our Nation. That was planned out. Everybody bought into it. Everybody agreed on it. They ended up building 21. At the same time, we were planning a new fighter because we needed it to compete worldwide with things that Russia and China were doing, and we were going to build 750 F-22s. In this last budget that was just passed in the House—hasn't finally become law yet. We're still in conference, but they have made a decision that now we don't need 750; we can get by with 187.

I don't know what's changed in the world to make it all of a sudden much safer to give us 187, that that will now satisfy the need. It's a trend that's very disturbing, cutting \$1.2 billion out of our ballistic missile defense. Historically, as I said, we have cut our defense after a war. I don't know that we have ever in our history cut our defense during not one, but two wars which we have going right now in Iraq and Afghanistan, and as you've mentioned, the problems that we see with Iran.

Today's announcement that Iran has a covert uranium enrichment facility should really come as no surprise. Why develop a covert enrichment facility if Tehran claims its program is solely for civilian purposes? Why don't they tell the world? Why don't they brag about it if that's what they're doing? I think people understand there's a reason why they're doing it covertly. This deception shows a clear intent by Tehran to hide a growing nuclear weapons capability.

In the unclassified judgments from December 2007 National Intelligence Estimate on Iran's nuclear intentions and capabilities, it was assessed that "Iran probably would use covert facilities, rather than its declared nuclear sites, for the production of highly enriched uranium for a weapon." However, the NIE went further to say that "we judge that these efforts were probably halted in response to the fall 2003 halt, and that these efforts had not been restarted through at least mid-2008."

Well, what I heard this morning in the President's speech is that they had been building this plant secretly, covertly, to enrich uranium for years. These efforts have been restarted. Today's announcement means that previous estimates on when Iran could achieve a nuclear weapons breakout are now inaccurate.

This disclosure also highlights just how uncertain our intelligence can be. Just a week ago, the administration explained that its primary reason, as you said, for scrapping the European missile defense system to be located in Poland and the Czech Republic was because the threat was now downgraded. In December 2007, our intelligence community judged that Iran didn't have a covert uranium enrichment facility. Now, less than 2 years later, it does. How, then, could the administration be so confident in its assessment that Iran can't develop a long-range ballistic missile by 2015, or maybe buy one from somebody?

□ 1230

We need to be skeptical of policy decisions based solely on intelligence. Intelligence can be wrong as much as it can be right. We have to take into account that it cannot be, even with the best efforts of our Intelligence Committee, the sole basis for a decision. I mean, you can also look at human nature. You can look at past history. You can look at how they reacted in the past. Based on that, how can we expect them to react in the future?

We've witnessed Iran successfully use a long-range rocket to launch a satellite into space, work closely with the North Koreans, who themselves appear to be pursuing ICBMs and continuing to expand their nuclear capabilities. What other covert facility programs does Iran have under its sleeve?

Apparently, they came up with this information because they found out that we had already known about it, so now they're telling the world. What else do they have going on that we don't know about or that they're not telling us or that we're not finding out about?

It's time for the Obama administration to do something concrete about it beyond pinning their hopes on upcoming talks and relying on Russia to protect our security interests. This starts with: stronger sanctions against Iran right now; robustly funding missile defense so that now we have defenses in

place before 2018 or 2020, unlike the administration's plan; and an Iran containment strategy, working with our allies, which will deter Iran and will dissuade allies and friends from proliferating.

I want to commend you, MIKE, for the job you're doing as ranking member on the subcommittee. It's a very important job. I appreciate your holding this Special Order and getting this information out to the people. The American people have to understand this important issue.

Our defense is our main responsibility. We do a lot of other things around here, but the defense of this Nation is our number one responsibility. We do a lot of things that we're not obliged to do by the Constitution, but this is our responsibility.

I commend you for the job you're doing. Thank you for holding this Special Order.

Mr. TURNER. Well, I want to thank you, Representative MCKEON, our ranking member on the House Armed Services Committee. I want to thank you for your leadership on the committee, certainly for your leadership of ensuring that we have a quality defense for the United States and also for your highlighting this important issue.

The issues that you've raised concerning Iran are very important. It should not be lost on anybody that, the very day the administration released its decision to drop the European site—to walk away from the Czech Republic and the Poles—the International Atomic Energy Agency released its statement that Iran was nuclear-capable, that they were capable of making a nuclear weapon.

This was on the very same day, as you were saying, that the President said that there was a downgraded threat when, in fact, there is no evidence that the threat has been downgraded. I keep asking the administration to provide us any evidence that the threat is diminishing from long-range ICBM threats from Iran, and we have no information which would indicate that.

Mr. AKIN. Will the gentleman yield? You're getting me upset.

Mr. TURNER. Representative AKIN, I appreciate your work on this.

Mr. AKIN. This is kind of hard to figure out.

I really am thankful. The ranking Republican member, Congressman MCKEON, does a great job on Armed Services, and he is so gentlemanly and scholarly, and he lays the facts out.

I want to just kind of put these things together and ask anybody if this makes any sense at all. What we're going to do is drop missile defense in Europe. Now, this is something for which quite a number of Europeans had to stick their necks out politically. It is the Czechs and the Polish who are agreeing to put this missile defense in. Now, if you draw a line between Iran and New York City, guess what's in line with that? Well, Poland is.

So now we're going to drop this missile defense program to protect our country and Western Europe from rogue states, particularly Iran, which we now know is putting together three things. They're putting together long-range missiles, nuclear warheads and radical Islam. That's not a great combination. So now we're saying the threat assessment has been dropped. How do you figure that? The threat assessment has been dropped when you're putting long-range missiles and nuclear warheads with radical Islam. I don't feel like the threat assessment should have been dropped. I don't know anybody with common sense who would assert that.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. AKIN, you raised a very good point. I'd like you to speak for a moment on this issue:

The European missile defense shield that was intended for interceptors in Poland and for the radar in the Czech Republic was not just intended to protect the United States. Although, it would have provided protection to the United States by 2013, with the President's plan not providing protection to the United States, by their own Web site admission, until 2020.

You make an important point that it wasn't just to protect us; it was also to protect our European allies. In addition to that, the Czechs and the Poles had gone out on a limb.

Mr. AKIN. We cut the limb off.

Mr. TURNER. There had been tremendous pressure on them not to agree to work with the United States.

For a moment, talk about what the unilateralism of the Obama administration does to those allies.

Mr. AKIN. Well, we just basically cut the limb off from underneath them. I mean who else is going to want to partner with us in some sort of a decent effort to defend the Western World from either nuclear destruction or at least blackmail? These guys have gone out on a limb, and we just cut the limb off from underneath them.

What's even worse is the fig leaf of an excuse from a technical point of view—for those of us on the committee, we know this is just a bunch of baloney—of the idea that we're going to use the standard block 3 missile on a ship to stop intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Look, this missile defense stuff is not as rocket science as people think. It's pretty simple. You've got small ones, medium ones and big ones. The big ones are called intercontinental ballistic missiles, and you can't shoot an intercontinental ballistic missile with one of our two-stage missiles off of a ship. You can't do that and make it work very well.

Not only that, think about the logic of what we're saying. The Navy is complaining that they've got a lot of demands in places where they're going to put their ships. Now, if you're going to try and cover this with ships, you're going to have to have probably three ships on station all the time. That's really expensive. It's a lot simpler to

put the radar on the Czech Republic and some ground-based interceptors in Poland.

So we're talking about, first of all, a technical solution which is not going to give us the protection we need. It doesn't even make any sense. Then to say the threat assessments have dropped, the President is just not making sense in the kinds of things that he's talking about.

Mr. TURNER. Representative AKIN, to piggyback on what you're saying here, you're making the point that the system that was intended to be in Europe was the system that would provide the greatest capability at the lowest cost.

Mr. AKIN. Right.

Mr. TURNER. You have a great reputation with your leadership in the House and for being the ranking member of the Seapower and Expeditionary Forces for the Armed Services Committee. You were elected in 2001, and you've got a great record of service.

One thing that, I think, is important is that we don't just have to take your word for it. There is the Institute for Defense Analyses' unclassified excerpt of the executive summary for the independent assessment of the proposed deployment of the ballistic missile defense system in Europe. This was presented to our subcommittee at the beginning of this year. This was asked for by the Democrat leadership to do an assessment of exactly what you just said—to compare the system that's being proposed by the administration and the system that was intended to go into Europe. This report, which is an independent assessment, reads that the most cost-effective way to protect the United States was the system that this President just scrapped.

Mr. AKIN. I'm the ranking member on Seapower, and you know, there's something that just doesn't make sense.

I've been aboard our ships that have these standard block 3-type missiles on them, okay? I've talked to the people who run those systems, and they tell me, if North Korea launches an ICBM, their chance of stopping it is about 1 percent. The reason is that the missile on the ship is a two-stage missile. It doesn't have the velocity and the ability to get on track with a much faster, higher-moving missile.

So that's why I say you've got small ones, medium ones and big ones. You fight the big ones with big ones, and the big ones are ground-based interceptors. It's a three-stage. That's why we have them in Grayling, Alaska, that's why we have some in California, and that's why there should be some in Poland.

This decision, I believe, was made all based on politics and not based on logic. I'll tell you what makes me secure. It's secure when we have American troops defending American homelands instead of vague promises from some Russian or some Iranian leader that everything is going to be okay.

Mr. TURNER. Representative AKIN, reclaiming my time, I appreciate your comments.

I would like to yield to Representative BISHOP, who is from Utah's First District. He was elected in 2003. He is the former speaker of the House of Utah, and is a great champion for national defense on the Armed Services Committee.

I know you have thoughts about this, and I would like to yield to Representative BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio for giving me this opportunity.

I am pleased to be with the gentleman from Ohio and with the gentleman from Arizona, who will be speaking, I believe, in just a moment. They have really turned out to be experts on our missile defense system, as well as the gentleman from Missouri, who clearly understands the technical nature of what we can do both on the sea as well as on the land.

I am deeply concerned about what we have been talking about in this area. It is very clear that this decision, based on what will happen in Europe, has significant long-term implications to our relationship with those European allies. The gentleman from Ohio and I have been, on several occasions, meeting with German officials as part of the study group on Germany. Is there really an opportunity, once this country has reversed course this way, to expect them to trust us in long-term decisions and in long-term commitments?

I hate to say this, but the idea of our developing a stronger bond with Europe based on this decision, the idea that the current Iranian regime will become nice in its relationships with the rest of the world—I mean I'm sorry. My beloved Cubs, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Parliamentarian, my Cubs have a better chance of making it to the World Series than the Iranians have of becoming nice all of a sudden unilaterally, or the fact that our European ties will be built stronger because of this particular decision.

If I could, I'll expand this slightly and take us a little bit afield because this does deal with the impact to our European defense; it does deal with the impact of the defense of the eastern coast, and it also deals with the impact of the defense of this entire country. We right now have 30 ground-based missiles to defend the entire country, and they're all situated in Alaska—in one spot.

We talked earlier with other administrations about extending that to other areas, which makes sense, about growing that number, which makes sense, about taking not just a ground-based system but also a kinetic energy interceptor system to try to spread out our defense, which, to me, makes sense.

This administration, much of these decisions being made under a unique gag order by the Secretary of Defense, simply took the process of halting our growth so that, once our 30 missiles are

gone, there is no replacement. Halting the kinetic intercept system, even though we were ready for the first test-fire and everything had run smoothly up to that time, simply putting a stop-work order and halting it. Halting the increase in production of our ICBM defense system. All at the same time.

I want to put out one other element that has an impact, because I see these people every day. Look, I grew up watching "Bewitched." If there's one thing I noticed from that TV show it's that Samantha wasn't real. Nobody can wiggle his nose and create a new solution.

Once we decide to unilaterally stop the production of these missiles, if at some point in the future we decide maybe we made a mistake, you don't easily and quickly fix that mistake because, once the industrial base is gone on these elements, you don't bring it back. You cannot simply turn the spigot on and off and, all of a sudden, have the engineers who know the problems and who have worked through them, come back to work for the government.

As one of the generals who was talking to me off the record simply said, Look, first of all, when the work base is gone, it is gone, and we don't bring it back. Most significantly, the first people who leave are the ones we really want. It's not the worst employees who leave first; it's the best employees who leave our industrial base first. Those are the ones we want.

If at some time we decide we were wrong and we have got to fix this problem, that there maybe is a greater threat than we're anticipating. It will cost this government significantly more to restart that work base. It's not just a matter of we're throwing people out of a job. It's not just a matter of boom-and-bust economies. It's the fact that we will have to spend more to recreate what we already have if, indeed, the threat is more significant. Some people in the military currently see that.

Mr. AKIN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I always yield. Every time I take a breath, I'm ready to yield. I just breathed.

Mr. AKIN. To me, it seems like you've understated how bad things are, because not only is the industrial base closed up, the buildings shuttered, the engineers working on some other project at some other place, but it takes time to get it back on track. If somebody is shooting missiles at you and they're going to arrive in half an hour, that's not very much time to start up a business and to rebuild your missile defense. You just can't do it in that amount of time. This requires planning.

The gentleman's numbers and statistics are right. The only thing is, they do have ground-based not just in Alaska. I think there are a few in California, but it's not spread out. Am I wrong on that? I thought there were a couple of them in California. Anyway, the point is right, which is that they're

not spread out. The other point is we're using something to kill something that isn't designed to work from the beginning. It just doesn't make any sense.

As the gentleman has expanded the topic a little bit, let's talk about the different things that have been cut.

□ 1245

Mr. TURNER. Before we move on, I would like to go to Representative TRENT FRANKS who is the Chair of the Missile Defense Caucus of Arizona's Second District, elected in 2003. We were elected at the same time.

Representative FRANKS was talking just today about the covert issue of Iran and what they have announced with their secondary site. You have been a leader on this, both in highlighting the issue, making sure that the technical discussion goes forward so people know what's at risk and what we have the capability of.

But on the threat side, this administration has stepped forward and said that we have a threat that is not the same as we thought. They say it's lessened. Everybody else that I talked to believes that it's either increasing—but no one will say that it is actually diminishing.

Representative FRANKS, I would love for you to talk about the threat issue to our families.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I appreciate the gentleman very much. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I think all of the previous speakers have covered critically important points.

Before I give a statement related to the European site primarily, I just want to say I was struck by the chairman or chairman-to-be, we hope, of the Strategic Forces Committee, your comments saying that the statement that was made by the IAEA related to Iran's nuclear capability came on the same day that the President decided to abandon the European site, I thought were profound. Because, in reality, this ostensible alternative that the President suggests that we can put in place of the ground-based system, we were going to build anyway.

That's nothing new. All we have done is to take out the equation of the ground-based system that, as Mr. AKIN says, would have had the actual capability of interdicting ICBMs. That's all we have really done.

Of course, the system we were building in Europe could have protected the American homeland. Any ability to do that in this so-called alternative that we were going to build anyway will be out around 2020.

I just appreciate the gentleman being able to point out that critically important point, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Obama administration's decision last week to abandon the European site will go down in history as a crossroads in European and American relations.

I am afraid that this and future American generations may be greatly affected. When the administration de-

ecided to abandon U.S. plans for a ground-based missile defense site in Europe, I believe the President fundamentally disgraced and weakened this Nation by breaking his word to our loyal and courageous allies in the Czech Republic and Poland.

Mr. Speaker, America has become the greatest Nation in history because our word has always meant something. The announcement to abandon the protective missile defense shield in Europe has fundamentally altered that paradigm. After the decision was announced, the newspaper headlines in Poland and the Czech Republic stated the situation in the very starkest of terms.

One Czech newspaper had the quote: "Betrayed, the U.S.A. has sold us to the Russians and stabbed us in the back." That's an incredible statement. In the Czech Republic, the daily Lidowe Noviny commented, that's one of their major newspapers, Obama gave in to the Kremlin. This has weakened America's place in the world.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's decision to abandon our faithful allies and instead placate Russian belligerence came on the 70th anniversary to the exact day of the Soviet Union's invasion of Poland after two of humanity's notorious monsters named Stalin and Hitler insidiously agreed to divide the nation of Poland between themselves.

Our allies deserve better than that, Mr. Speaker, after they stood bravely in the face of Russian aggression and paid a tremendous price politically and otherwise to stand by us. They had a right to expect America to keep her word and to stand by them. But, ironically, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Obama's terribly flawed reasoning for the abandonment of the European missile defense site really has everything to do with Russia, because Russia has always hated the missile defense plan because they don't want American presence in their quote former "empire." Knowing that this would diminish Russia's influence in the region, even though the Russian military would not be threatened in any way by the European site, it would not be any real defense of any kind against the Russian federation strike.

Russia's leaders know that if an American radar is placed in the Czech Republic and the American missile interceptors are placed in Poland, those two sovereign countries would be stepping further away from the shackles of Russian oppression in the East and joining with the Americans in the West for the cause of democratic independence and human freedom.

Mr. AKIN. I think you just covered something that is absolutely amazing. You know, we don't put enough emphasis, maybe, on history. You are saying to the very day 70 years from the time Russia invaded Poland is when we just drove the knife in the back of Poland and cut the ground out for them as they were trying to defend their own country and the European countries. Is

that what I just heard, 70 years exactly to the day we just sold them down the river?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Yes, sir. Of course, as Mr. TURNER said, on the exact day that the IAEA said that Iran was gaining nuclear capability.

Mr. AKIN. On the same day that the IAEA is saying that Iran is gaining nuclear capabilities; and 70 years before when Poland was invaded, we make the brilliant decision to abandon Poland, to abandon the one tool we have to stop intercontinental ballistic missiles and hold this fig leaf of an excuse that we could use a medium-range missile to try to stop things. This is a horrible decision.

Mr. TURNER. The important point, I think, for the IAEA's, International Atomic Energy Agency, statement is that they are saying it's no longer theoretical. I mean, we are not standing on the House floor, the four of us, saying that we are ringing a bell of the threat to the United States. This independent International Atomic Energy Agency says that Iran has the capability now, today. It's not as if someone is saying in projecting the future, this independent agency, which is charged for overseeing this, being the agency that is supposed to know what capability that countries have, has made this announcement saying that they are today capable of making a bomb.

When you couple that with what Iran has accomplished with their missiles, having already put a satellite into orbit, again, we are not talking theoretical again. This is not as if we are projecting that some day Iran is going to have a missile. Iran used a missile to place a satellite in orbit, the same technology that you would be utilizing in order to reach the continental United States.

Those two technologies, the nuclear capability and the missile technology capability, are coming together to be a real threat to the United States. Now, here is the thing that just confuses me most about the administration's statements.

We know that the plan that they just scrapped would have placed interceptors and radar in Europe that would have been available to protect the United States from intercontinental ballistic missiles projected by 2013, could be 2014; 2013 is when it was projected to be completed.

The President comes forward with his plan and says Iran is going slower—no indication that anyone has or that we have that Iran is going slower—but all intelligence says that Iran could have this capability to reach the United States with their nuclear weapon by 2015. The President comes forward with a plan that says we are going to be ready and able to protect the continental United States by 2020?

This is a gap of 5 years there, even if you use the President's numbers. You use their numbers, you go to their Web site and you see 2020. You see Iran's ca-

pability from all intelligence agencies is 2015, and they could be sooner. As Ranking Member MCKEON said, they could buy it, or they could have advances.

But this President, sitting here in 2009 says, I don't have to be prepared. The next generation isn't going to be prepared for the next 11 years; 2020 is 11 years away; and he says, I am not going to have the capability, I don't need the capability. I don't need the capability to protect ourselves from a country that the International Atomic Energy Agency says has the capability to produce a nuclear weapon and where our intelligence agencies say will have the capability of a missile.

Representative FRANKS, I know you have some thoughts on that.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. You are exactly right. Here is the thing that is most profound to me. Since the timeframe that you mentioned is correct, that means that any alternative system could come far too late to have any influence on Iran's calculus to go forward with its missile program or its nuclear program.

The idea if we had the ability to knock down anything they threw up, anything that they should launch, if they knew that America could interdict those missiles, all of a sudden they might say we are taking a tremendous chance, maybe on a military intervention here. You never know, and if the Americans can knock this down anyway, maybe we should reconsider. That was the hope.

Mr. TURNER. You are right, the deterrence, the deterrence effect it would be.

Speak for a minute, Representative FRANKS, on Russia because this also amazes me. This President has had Russia say to him abandon your missile defense of the country. He has done so without a concession from Russia. At the same time he is on the eve of going into the START negotiations where Russia is going to be asking for additional concessions from the United States. But there are those in the press, because I was on a couple of talks shows, and they said, well, this really isn't about Russia because this missile defense system was no threat to Russia.

Why is it, if it's no threat to Russia, that Russia would be asking or that we should be conceding? Do you really think the administration is going to be able to advance our security by putting our missile defense system down for Russia?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I absolutely do not. You know, we have had a lot of Russian belligerence lately, as you know. They have spoken against this for a long time. But the report surfaced in March of this year that the President was going to offer Russia a promise that the United States would not build the missile defense site if Moscow would commit to helping us to discourage Iran's nuclear program. That was the so-called equation.

But you have to recall that Russia was actually the one who has already delivered nuclear fuel to Iran. They were the one who was paid \$800 million to help build the Bushehr power plant in Iran that could have implications for building fissile material in the future. Of course, they have been complicit in helping them with their missile program.

Moreover, it is just this week—I think this is an important thing to know—Venezuela's Hugo Chavez announced the purchase of more than \$2 billion in arms from Russia, including rocket technology, and has declared that Venezuela will get started on a nuclear program with Iran's help. This is some sort of unholy alliance here. To somehow suggest that Russia is going to be a help here, I think, is naive beyond degree.

Mr. TURNER. Representative BISHOP, you were talking about the issue of our industrial base. It has a huge impact when we defund programs because then we lose capabilities that we currently have. If we are not making these interceptors anymore, or if we are lessening the number of interceptors, then we are diminishing our capabilities to defend ourselves.

But we pay a really great cost in the issue of innovation. When you defund a program, not only do you lose the intellectual capital that's there, but what we want to do next suffers. I know you have been a big advocate for ensuring that we invest in our industrial base and for ingenuity in the future.

What are your thoughts on what actions that the administration has taken, its impact now?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, we were talking about cutting back on all of these missile defense programs, not in Europe, but also with our ground-based kinetic energy to save \$1.8 billion. If we look at what we have been throwing around for stimulus money, for other types of programs, even Cash for Clunkers, it kind of is very small in relationship to the impact it is having on research and development. What does it actually cost to try to defend this country?

I appreciate the historical context some of you have been putting into it. The fact that the decision in Europe was announced 70 years to the day, let's face it, if you want to go to some other irony, the time that Secretary Gates was saying that he was going to stop the production of more than 30 ground-based missiles in the KEI was the exact same day the North Koreans were shooting a missile that was threatening Japan going over it.

He was holding a press conference, reassuring the State of Hawaii that we had enough missile defense system to protect everybody on the date of their second shot. I think one of the things we need to do in America is quit holding press conferences about our missile defense and making decisions, because something bad always happens on those particular days.

But it is undisputable, the fact that every program that is started has glitches in them that have to be worked out. That's why you want an experienced work base to try to be there who have gone through that program, who have worked through it, who know what works and know what doesn't work so you don't have to keep reinventing the wheel. As you said, even if we were going to save \$1.8 billion by not doing this, if at some point we realize along the line that 30 missiles is not enough to defend this entire country, it is going to cost significantly more than that to rebuild it.

We, for example, on the ICBM rocket motor program wanted to keep a warm line in the industrial base so that we could churn out a minimum number of missile motors so that we could refurbish those ICBMs that we are going to keep. Well, we didn't put enough money in the budget to do that.

What it meant was that there were people who were laid off because the private sector could not keep that warm line functioning. Even though the military knew they insisted they were going to have to have a warm line, what it meant in the long term was instead of putting about \$10 million or \$20 million in the line, they are going to have to put four times that much money to start the warm line project again.

What I am trying to say is here—and we are throwing around a lot of numbers, let me try to make this easier—it is cheaper for us in the long run to keep an industrial base of experts so that we can maintain what we have and try to find the research and development to improve what we have.

If we start and stop, it is expensive to restart, to reboot that program. It does not save us money in the long run.

□ 1300

It does not give us better defense in the long run. It does not help with research, and it doesn't help people who lose their jobs, gain their jobs and lose their jobs and uproot their families when we don't benefit from it in the long run.

I appreciate you bringing that particular issue up.

Mr. TURNER. One of the things I find fascinating about this administration's funding requests is that they've cut ground-based missiles in Alaska. They've cut the ground-based missiles that were planned to go into Europe. They have done so by trying to sell that they're committed to Aegis and THAAD as defensive systems. And in their plan that they put out upon canceling the system in Europe, they said we're going to invest more heavily in those systems.

Well, let's look at what they really did. Because, obviously, if they say they're going to do it, we'd all think here that in this body, the legislation that's coming through this body would reflect the administration's commitment to that.

However, although this administration has talked about increasing theater missile defense inventories, Aegis and THAAD, and have added \$900 million in the budget, we're not seeing the sizable inventory increases reflected in the budget. For example, in FY 2010, the budget acquires less Aegis SM-3 interceptors than the initially projected FY 2009.

So what does that mean? It means that in FY 2009, when the budget came through this House, there was a certain level of purchases that had been indicated for the SM-3 interceptors. And what did the administration do? They came in asking for less. The FY 2009 budget projected that 24 additional SM-3s would be required in FY 2010; yet the FY 2010 budget requests only 18.

Budget documents indicate that the SM-3 inventory will grow from 133 interceptors to 329 within 5 years. Let's do that again. The budget documents indicate that the SM-3 inventory is supposed to grow from 133 interceptors, what we currently have, to 329 within 5 years.

Where will the additional SM-3s come from in the out years? If so, what other programs are going to be squeezed? How are they going to go from 133 to 329 when they're buying less than what was proposed? Where's the big request for the additional ones?

The FY 2009 budget indicates three additional THAAD batteries will be acquired; yet the budget requests no funds for additional THAAD radars. According to the contractor, major suppliers could go cold in FY 2010. So for the administration to say, We're not against missile defense. We're not eliminating missile defense. We're just shifting focus. They're not shifting focus. They're not even buying what was planned.

Representative FRANKS, I know you have been a big advocate for all of these systems.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I agree. I guess I just repeat that we were trying to build out these systems anyway. This was something that was already on the drawing board. We want to have a robust system that is able to interdict short-range, medium-range, and long-range. And THAAD and Aegis, none of us on the Republican side would argue one moment that those aren't important, but the challenge is that we're taking away our ground-based system, which these other things are still on the drawing board, in many cases.

I thought that Mr. BISHOP made a point that was so critical. It might be my last point here, Mr. Chairman, if you would let me make it, because it's really a quote to Mark Helperin in the Wall Street Journal after the President's decision last week to abandon the plans for the European missile defense site. He stated it this way, kind of that historic, 50,000-foot view thing that we're talking about. He said, "Stalin tested Truman with the Berlin

Blockade, and Truman held fast. Khrushchev tested Kennedy, and in the Cuban Missile Crisis Kennedy refused to blink. In 1983, Andropov took the measure of Ronald Reagan, and, defying millions in the street, Reagan did not blink. Last week, the Iranian President and the Russian Prime Minister put Mr. Obama to the test, and he blinked not once, but twice. The price of such infirmity has always proven immensely high," Mr. Speaker, "even if, as is the custom these days, the bill has yet to come."

Mr. TURNER, I would just say this in closing here. If the Obama administration continues down this road of appeasement and denial, the Nation of Iran will gain nuclear weapons capability and pass that technology on to terrorists, as well as perhaps even the weapons, and this generation and so many to come will face the horrifying reality of nuclear jihad.

Those of us who have been blessed to walk in the sunlight of freedom in this generation will relegate our children to walk in the minefield of nuclear terrorism in the next generation.

I just hope that somehow reason can somehow be injected back into this system and we can understand, from a historical point of view, that when we stood up to despotism in the past, it was always a good thing. When we counted on appeasement, it always hurt us. I just pray that we can catch it soon enough here.

I thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Representative FRANKS. I appreciate your comments on that. It's very important we look at this through the lens of the administration's policies with respect to Russia.

There is no historical perspective where conceding to Russia early has ever gained anything at the bargaining table. When you concede to Russia prior to entering into negotiations, they say, What else am I going to get when I get to the negotiating table? They never say, Well, that was very great of you, and I appreciate what you have done. I'm now going to do something, too.

In this instance, the President had already signaled in a letter that allegedly went out in the beginning of the year that he was willing to look at conceding on missile defense for Russia's help on Iran without any indication whatsoever that Russia is willing to help. In fact, as you have pointed out, Representative FRANKS, they have done the opposite. They have been active in selling technology and providing technical assistance to Iran.

But also, Iran has shown no indication of their interest in being dissuaded, and, in fact, the International Atomic Energy Agency said, Time for persuasion and time for dissuading is over; that Iran is now declared by the International Atomic Energy Agency to have the capability to create a nuclear weapon. That was announced the very same day the President decides to

abandon the nuclear shield that we should have had with our missile defense shield, with the President moving from what would have been a 2013 deployment for a missile defense shield in Europe to a 2020 protection.

So I appreciate your points with respect to Russia. As we enter the START negotiations, obviously we have a significant amount of concern as to what this administration is going to be doing with respect to our strategic assets, having already compromised on our missile defense.

Representative FRANKS, thank you for being with us and participating in this.

Just to recap for a moment as to where we are timewise, the President has put forth an alternative plan for missile defense that he says is going to be available for protection for the United States for intercontinental ballistic missiles by 2020. He scrapped the plan that was intended to provide protection for the United States from ICBMs by 2013.

All the intelligence that we have to date shows that Iran could have ICBM capability by 2015. The International Atomic Energy Agency says that Iran already has nuclear capability. Let's put that into a calendar.

We would have had a system that would have protected us by 2013. The President has taken that off the table. The intelligence agencies say that Iran could have nuclear capability, coupled with missile technology, that could reach the United States by 2015. The President says, That's all right. We'll wait for another 5 years and have capability to protect the United States by 2020.

That's an unreasonable time period to put the United States at threat with this threat, and it's one that we should all be concerned about.

I have asked the President and the Secretary of Defense to declassify this report from the Institute for Defense Analyses. It's an unclassified excerpt, executive summary, which I'm holding here, of an independent assessment of the proposed deployment of ballistic missile defense systems in Europe that said that, actually, the system that he scrapped would have been the most cost effective. It would have been a system that would have provided 24-hour coverage at the least amount of cost and, by the calendar that we just have discussed, would have been available as early as 7 years earlier than the President's plan for protecting the United States.

While the administration has dismantled our capabilities in Europe, at the same time they have cut missile defense overall by \$1.2 billion, lessening our capabilities in some very important systems, including diminishing, by a third, our capabilities in Alaska.

The administration has indicated that they can use our Alaska ground-based missile systems to protect the United States if Iran should get capa-

bility earlier than their system is available in 2020, but to show their commitment to that system, they've cut it by a third. So we're actually going to have less capability there.

Now, in addition to the lessening capability in Alaska, we are losing the opportunity for what would have been an integrated system. With THAAD and Aegis and the European system and Alaska, we would have had opportunities for multiple shots if the United States should have a threat that is posed to us. And, as Representative FRANKS indicated, this system, once in place, would have acted as deterrent to stop the advancement of missile technology and hopefully say to countries that the United States is advancing the type of technology that would provide us the important protection that we need.

The impact of the President's decision on our European allies is one of which many people have grave concern. Both Poland and the Czech Republic are very concerned that this administration unilaterally made the decision to abandon the missile defense shield and to leave them having taken the step of agreeing with the United States, in the face of Russian opposition, without a United States partner there, without a system moving forward; both of those countries having made statements indicating their concern of a continuing strong relationship with the United States.

I know that we all remain concerned about showing to our NATO allies that we remain committed to a strong missile defense for this country, strong deterrence in the area of nuclear proliferation, and this administration, by taking this step backward, weakens, overall, our capabilities and certainly those relationships.

Representative BISHOP, I know one of the areas that you spoke on at the House Armed Services Committee as we were moving forward with the National Defense Authorization Act was this overall cut to missile defense of \$1.2 billion. When we look at what it's doing to Alaska, it is lessening our capability. The missile shield that was there was intended to have 40 interceptors. The administration has cut it to 30.

They've significantly diminished the airborne laser. They have reduced the other programs that they've indicated that they're going to rely on with Aegis and THAAD, actually lessening the amount of investment that was projected in FY 2009.

I know you're concerned about what that cut represents, and so am I. Perhaps you could speak for a moment on that \$1.2 billion cut that this House and Senate and this administration is advancing at a time that we know that North Korea and Iran are getting increased technology.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, if sometimes you put a spin on it to try and allow talking not just necessarily about the numbers that we're throwing

out there but the human face of what this means, about the individuals who actually are working in these programs to try and make this country more secure, they're the ones who are losing their jobs, which is okay if there's a long-term purpose. But I think you actually put it very well, brilliantly well, in saying so simply that the decision in Europe, instead of being prepared 2 years before the threat is viable, we're now going to change that to be prepared 5 years after the threat is viable. That makes no sense.

In that term, saving a billion dollars is not necessarily in the best interest of this country. Not only do you hurt individuals who are working in that area, but you hurt the entire Nation, who is depending upon their results to provide us with some modicum of protection.

Not only does it not make much sense to say, okay, we already have the holes dug, we're ready to put the missiles in there, and now we stop, even though all the parts are there; not only does it not make sense to say even though the missile is already at Vandenberg Air Base in California, we won't go ahead and finish the test to see if it would have worked or not or how effective it would be; those are not productive approaches. And it illustrates that we, as a country, are now in the position where we seem to be vacillating with not a clear and precise idea of where we want to be in the future and what we will use to defend ourselves in the future.

As the gentleman from Ohio correctly said, even if your assumption is we'll take money and we'll shift it to some other place, to announce shortly after that you're going to flatline military spending and still want to find \$60 billion in some kind of savings within the system doesn't mean we're actually going to move forward in any particular area. It puts us into a world that is very, very dangerous.

In the 1930s, we decided to cut our fighter plane program because we wanted to save some money, and when World War II broke out, we found that our bombing runs were having over a 20 percent casualty rate, which was unconscionable. We stopped our bombing runs until we could build up the fighter program to accompany them.

We no longer have that luxury of time. We live in a world where we no longer have the luxury of time, which Abraham Lincoln understood was part of the strategy you have in warfare. We don't have that anymore.

We must be prepared now, not to find out we made structural and strategic mistakes sometime down in the future when we don't have the ability to repair that situation.

□ 1315

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Representative BISHOP. I appreciate your tenacity on this and your advocacy for national defense.

To give a recap of the time frame that we're dealing with, this administration scrapped a plan that would

have provided a missile defense capability to the United States mainland from Europe that would have been available as early as 2013. All of our intelligence agencies are indicating that by 2015, Iran could have missile technology to reach the United States. That's why we needed that missile defense technology in 2013. They were going to have ICBM capability by 2015.

The International Atomic Energy Agency said just last week that Iran already has the capability to produce a nuclear weapon. So when we're talking about 2015, and they are going to have the ICBM capability to reach the United States, we are talking about a missile perhaps with a nuclear warhead. This administration scraps that plan and, instead, proposes a plan that will not be available until 2020.

So by all the information we have right now, this administration's action has a 5-year gap that has developed in the time period where the administration is accepting the capability by Iran without having the missile defense technology to protect the United States.

What else are we hearing from Iran? Today there was an announcement that Iran has a covert uranium enrichment facility. This should come as no surprise. This is a country that has continued to seek missile technology, nuclear technology and nuclear capability. We understand that Tehran is not just trying to do this for civilian purposes, that it actually represents a threat to the United States, and that's why people have been such advocates to ensure that this country has the appropriate missile defense technology to protect the country.

So the administration responds and says, It's not just 2020. We have capability in Alaska. That will be our backup plan. We can use our missiles in Alaska to protect the United States from Iran.

The problem with that is that this administration, through this House just this year, cut Alaska's missile defense capabilities by a third. So we would have had our AEGIS and THAAD capability, we would have had our European capability, and we would have had our Alaska capability, perhaps for multiple shots that could have occurred in order to protect this country from Iran's quest for an ICBM with it, as is now said by the IAEA, to have a nuclear capability. Instead, this administration says, We're taking Europe off the table. We are going to rely on what we have, and we're going to take our Alaska capability and cut it by a third.

It puts our country at risk. It puts our families at risk. The President should reverse this decision and should proceed with supporting our allies in NATO, supporting the Czech Republic and Poland, who have been there for us, and put the system in place, protecting the United States.

The President said that the system that he is doing is more cost effective. There is a classified report—I have an

unclassified version of it—an independent assessment of the proposed deployment of ballistic missile defense system in Europe. This report says that the most cost-effective plan was the one that he just scrapped. I will end with reading a letter that I sent to Secretary Gates, requesting that he make this independent assessment and study available. We hope that he releases it so we can have a robust debate on that.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized for the privilege and the honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

As we wrap up this congressional week and I listened to the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Utah and the gentleman from Arizona talk about missile defense and our national security, what I have heard over this last hour is a technical, tactical, strategic explanation of why America has taken the positions that we have, the decisions that have been made in the previous administrations, and I think a clear and stark analysis of what apparently is a huge diplomatic mistake made by the President of the United States.

I would make the point that those who defend him seem to always revert back to a default position of, The President must have gotten something for it. They speculate that there must be a quid pro quo to pull the rug out from underneath the Eastern Europeans—in particular, the Poles and the Czechs—who in their headlines, as I believe Mr. FRANKS said—the headline in one of those papers said “Betrayed!” To betray the Poles and the Czechs, the United States of America, the integrity of our Nation and the confidence in our national security have been diminished in a way that probably can't ever be rebuilt.

But those who defend that decision will argue, Well, the President is a smart negotiator. He is a brilliant man. Therefore, we have to trust his knowledge and his judgment because he must know something that we don't. Yet I haven't heard one of these imaginative characters that can defend anything and advocate for anything come up with a single thing that would be worth doing what the President did. What could possibly be worth giving up the integrity and the credibility of the United States? What could possibly be something that could come out of any negotiations with Iran or Russia that could emerge as a plus on this side that would offset the loss of international credibility, the word of the United States and our commitment to our allies, let alone giving up the strategic position of being able to take out Ira-

nian missiles shortly after they leave the launching pad, instead of leaving this 5-year window, as Mr. TURNER just said?

If your President is so much smarter than you are that he must have gotten something accomplished behind the scenes that's so valuable that even you can't conceive of what it might have been, I don't know if you call that a rational thought or a religion. But, Mr. Speaker, we're in a situation here where the United States and the world is in a very, very dangerous place. This globe is a giant chessboard; it's a giant Monopoly game, and it's a giant Risk game that's going on. It's a giant poker game that's going on. And there are some poker players, chess players, Risk and Monopoly players out there that are really good and really smart, and they spend their time trying to figure out how to outmaneuver the United States. It has taken place ever since the dawn of the Soviet Union, and the Monopoly game here in the United States broke the Soviet Union, and they imploded.

Now we have Putin over there on the chessboard, at the poker table, and he is making moves on this global chessboard that seek to reconstruct what he can of the former Soviet Union. It's been in his interest to cause Iran to be a thorn in our side and for us to think that we could ask Putin to, well, be open and do us a favor and maybe he could talk real nice to the Iranians and they would stop their nuclear endeavor—after all of these years and these billions of dollars spent and the great diplomatic risks that they take?

These people are not going to just simply tip over their king and walk away from this chessboard. For the President to think that dialogue is diplomacy and that you can accomplish things just because you talk about it is an inherently left-wing, myopic European view, and it's something that I've heard from their mouths in the discussions that we have over in that part of the world.

We have with us Mr. BISHOP from Utah who has significant insight into that part of the world, the politics of Western Europe as well as geography of that part of the world—Iran, the Middle East, Eastern Europe and also Western Europe. I have asked the gentleman if he would stick around long enough to impart some of that broader view to explain the forces that are at play in this dynamic, the forces of Russia, the forces of Iran, the Islamic effort that's there, the Israeli position that's there, the threat that comes from Iran threatening to annihilate and wipe Israel off the face of the Earth.

And by the way, this move, in my view, brings it closer and closer that Israel likely will have no choice but to at least attempt to take out the nuclear capability of Iran. Their survival might very well be at stake. So this move that might look like its a move designed to pacify the Russians might

well end up being something that compels the Israelis to make a military strike. And it may well be a tool that, once removed, the missiles are in the Middle East, and this is a decision that is now made that moves us to the inevitability that there will be military action take place as a result of a pacifist action on the part of the President.

This is what comes when you go to—let me call it the Neville Chamberlain School of Diplomacy or capitulation, for remember when he returned from Munich waving a letter saying that he had achieved “peace in our time.” Well, that peace in our time didn’t last long. I was thinking about the situation of how it was that Hitler actually negotiated with the Russians for a while and that ended up with Poland being divided and a global war as a result.

I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah. I am interested in your perspective on this global chess, poker, Monopoly, Risk game that’s taking place.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa spending some time talking. We had the opportunity earlier this year of traveling to Germany together to meet with the chancellor, the foreign minister, the economics minister, the interior minister, several of those to talk about it. I recognize that I’m not putting myself here as an expert in this particular area because sometimes it is a matter of perspective.

I know at one time when I was over in Germany meeting with our fellow parliamentarians, who are members of the Bundestag, that I was amazed as we started talking about the impact of the Helsinki Accords on the ultimate destruction of the Soviet Union and the falling of the Communist empire. They seemed to have a greater emphasis on the significance of the Helsinki Accords than I have ever heard any political scientist in the United States putting on it.

So sometimes there is that perspective that is somewhat different. But in dealing specifically with how we should resolve and go forward, specifically with Russia which is rejuvenated, there are a couple of things to keep in mind. I’m not sure quite how you play with them all, but there are a couple of things to keep in mind. The first one to keep in mind is, the Russians have not played nice with their neighbors who used to be part of the empire. So the Ukrainians, they clearly cut the oil and gas and threatened the economic security and independence of the Ukrainians at a time when it was not the most convenient, and it created more political instability in the Ukraine, as if that was a part of an overall goal.

Shortly after that, there was the invasion of Georgia, another former republic of the USSR that is now an independent nation. Certainly, the consequences of that have yet to be actually played out in the international

arena. But what the Russians did cannot be considered as a nice neighborly approach to any type of situation.

I would also put into that milieu of understanding some concepts of what is going on internally in Russia. The Russians have traditionally liked having scapegoats for internal problems. One of the problems that the Russians are facing right now is one of demographics. They are losing population. They have a massive amount of land to control without a population that is growing or an economy that is growing to handle that. And one of the elements that historically has happened within the Russian mind-set is to try to find some scapegoat for that particular approach. I think we have got to keep that in the back of our minds as we are dealing with how we actually move forward in relation to the Russians and everywhere else.

It is, indeed, correct, as the gentleman from Iowa said, that if the Russians had been helping us to pressure the Iranians in a nonviolent embargo approach, that we would be further along in that effort to try to pressure the Iranians to use only a peaceful nuclear program, rather than what we, I think justifiably, suspect for all kinds of concepts that would be going there. We would not have Mr. Morgenthau from New York City, who can never be considered a right-wing radical Republican, talking in newspaper and magazine articles about the interconnect between Iran and Venezuela and how some of the money that was supposed to be stopped in the embargo has been able to be laundered through Venezuela and the connection between this. Eight times Chavez has visited Iran. Iran is now putting money into Chavez’ efforts. So I see the future of the problem when we look at the Iranians on the east, Venezuela on the south of our country, the North Koreans on our west coast and realize that we are living in some very perilous times.

I happened to be in Germany when Ronald Reagan was talking about putting the missiles in Germany. It was heavily contested at the time. The Soviet Union was violently opposed to it, and there were a lot of pacifists within Europe who said that putting missiles in there was the worst thing we could possibly do; it will escalate the conflicts; it will escalate the violence. And what we found out in looking at history is it did just the opposite. It worked in actually bringing about a longer term peace as well as, ultimately, the end of a reign of terror of communism and allowed people who had never been free to finally become free.

That is why I am so worried about our decision, after our Polish and Czech allies went out on a limb politically to allow us to have some kind of missile defense system that would protect Europe and the eastern coast of the United States before the Iranians could develop anything offensively, to stop that prior to that, saying that we

will now come up with a program that won’t work until 5 years after the Iranians would probably be effective. I worry about what the result is, and I worry that we, as a country, have not learned the lessons from history, from the past, because we seem to be making what I consider to be mistakes as we deal with these rogue nations.

□ 1330

And mistakes as we deal with our allies in Europe, insulting them, putting them in difficult positions, and then yanking the rug out from under them, as well as putting ourselves at some kind of military disadvantage as to the defense of this country against other countries that significantly are malevolent in their attitudes towards the United States, it’s a very cumbersome and difficult situation as we look at how that chess game is being played.

I think the demographics of what is taking place in Russia should not be overlooked. They have decisions that have to be made, and they don’t have a lot of very good choices before them right now. They will be looking for choices which kind of deflect the inability of their interior policy that is not working.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Briefly reclaiming my time, a question forms in my mind, and I’d like to take advantage, Mr. Speaker, of the expertise which I will assign to the gentleman from Utah in his understanding of history. And I’m looking back upon those events in the 1980s and this event that’s coming up for the 20th anniversary this November 9, the fall of the Berlin Wall.

When I watched that happen on television, I saw literally the Iron Curtain crashing down. Every time a hammer blow landed, every time they hit it with a chisel, every time they knocked another chink or pulled a section of the wall down, that was the Iron Curtain being deconstructed. Demolition of the Iron Curtain that took place began on November 9 of 1989.

Now, at that moment the pundits in the news media didn’t understand what was taking place. They didn’t see that as the Iron Curtain. They saw it as the family reunification plan. And therein lies the large flaw that took place on the part of the liberals. They didn’t understand the dynamic that had taken place. But Ronald Reagan understood it at that moment. I’m not convinced that his immediate successor understood it to the depth that Ronald Reagan did.

But this question has always lingered in me. I thought that it proved to the world that free markets and free enterprise and freedom would always prevail over communism, socialism, despotism, totalitarianism of any kind because of the dynamics that come from the creativity and the productivity and the freedom that comes from the human spirit and the checks and balances that exist in the marketplace.

Yet I didn’t hear them capitulating in their argument. They just suspended

their arguments for a little while. And then front-and-center, full-blown, proud, global Communists disappeared.

But where did they go is the question? Did they go back and lick their wounds and change their ideology and come back as free enterprise capitalists? I don't remember their doing that. But I wonder if the gentleman from Utah has any thoughts on what happened to those front-and-center Communists from 1989. Where are they? Some have passed away but some are still with us. What are they doing today and what do they believe in, and how does this fit into the equation?

I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa offering me this opportunity to tell you flat-out that I don't know what they have done or where they are going.

I do know that what we have found is for the United States to be effective, we had to be strong and secure and make sure that our self interests could be protected.

I just finished a book about the Civil War and about Lincoln as the Commander in Chief and his approach to it. He was much more intellectual about his view of the war than we are. He understood that time and resources are weapons just as much as individuals are or soldiers are in using war. And to be honest, the problem he had with the Union generals through most of the war was they didn't catch the concept of time and resources as an integral part in making decisions. He got it. And he was very much vilified at the time because he insisted on an approach which ultimately said the only way we can win is if we are forceful and strong and insist on this.

If Lincoln had simply backed off and said, What we're going to do is we're going to negotiate a peace with the South, there would have been a lot of people that would have said, Yeah, I am tired of the war; let's negotiate a peace with the South. And a lot of people in the North would have said, Yeah, let them go; we don't want to be part of them anyway.

But what Lincoln clearly understood from the geography of the situation and the future is that the Civil War would have been the first war between the States, not the only war. It would have been the first of many wars in the States as the North and South then battled over economic issues, transportation in the Ohio Valley, use of the Port of New Orleans, frontier land in the West. He clearly got what the future would be.

I think President Reagan, when he decided to stand tough and he was highly criticized for it, got what the future would be. He did not want to see a world where there was nuclear proliferation, but he understood that America had to be tough in order to get to that point.

I worry that we have somehow lost those lessons of history, and we don't realize that for the United States to

move forward, we have to ensure that we are perfectly capable of defending ourselves. That's why I'm worried. The decision that we made to take the missiles, not implement the missiles in Poland and the radar system in Czechoslovakia, does not make us more secure. The idea of trying to cut our ground-based missile defense does not make us more secure. And where is this overall vision that we are trying to go? Where is this concept that we have to have security first before we can therefore start to negotiate other items around the world?

I'm concerned with our enemies, especially Venezuela, who are clearly malevolent in their approach to us, spreading that document throughout the rest of Latin South America. At the same time, the Iranians are very bellicose, to say the least. And North Korea, who knows what you want to do with him. Those are the concerns. Those are concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity of speaking with the gentleman from Iowa. I know when we had the chance of going to Germany, he was very forceful in presenting an American approach, and he was willing to ask the tough and difficult questions when the rest of us were trying to be reticent here, not in an obnoxious way, by any means, but in a way of saying somebody's got to play the devil's advocate and say, What does this really mean, and where will we go in the long term?

And I appreciate his efforts in that. And I know, if you'll excuse me at this time, that he will also go through that in this period of time that he has on the floor. And, Mr. Speaker, he will do what he always does. He asks the right questions in a way that you can't avoid trying to find a good answer to those questions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much appreciate the diplomatic gentleman from Utah for his contribution to the knowledge base and the decisionmaking process that we do here in this Congress. And I would suggest that he's a little overly humble when he says he doesn't know the answer to what happened to those Communists. When I think about the discussion that we've heard about Ukraine, Georgia, Iran, Venezuela, North Korea, South America, Mr. Speaker, all of these areas are discussed in a book written by Colonel Robert Chandler called "Shadow World." It's 500-and-some pages long. And Mr. Chandler takes the situation of the world at the end of the Cold War, and that would be at the implosion of the Soviet Union, and he begins to identify the leading personalities in the world, those leaders and those ideologies within the countries that are, let me say, Communist interests, hardcore Communist interests.

And he takes the person around the globe to every populated continent and talks about the core politics of each of those countries, including these countries that have been mentioned by Mr.

BISHOP of Utah and especially Venezuela and North Korea and some of the other countries in South America, also Putin in Russia and how things unfolded and Gorbachev's position as well.

It is a very, very educational compilation of what happened after almost 20 years ago when the Berlin Wall went down, the Iron Curtain came crashing down, and the people who were holding up that part of the world, the left side of the world, those on the east side of the Berlin Wall, who had a managed economy, who had the central planning that set up 5-year plans for the collective farms, those that told everyone else when to go to work, what raw materials to deliver. And if you remember, Ronald Reagan and some of the others made the joke that, well, people in the Soviet Union pretended to work and the Soviet Union pretended to pay them. But eventually that house of economic cards collapsed.

A question was before us as a Nation, and that question was, while the Soviet Union was developing a missile capability to eclipse our own capability here, such a devastating force of ICBMs that there was nothing the United States could do to survive such an attack, that mutually assured destruction was going down the path of a destruction that would be so bad in this country that civilization itself may not survive.

The question that was before us was articulated best by the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, who, as she stepped down from that position in the early 1980s, said this contest that's going on, this Cold War, is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board, and the only question is will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily? That was the most succinct example of what was taking place in that Cold War in the 1980s.

We know how it played out now. We look back on that, and almost 20 years ago the Soviet Union could no longer hold their economics together. They couldn't keep their military out even in places like East Germany. So they opened up the border with Hungary. People flowed around through Austria and Hungary. And at a certain point, there wasn't any merit in guarding the Wall anymore because people were streaming around the end. And so they went over the top and began to sit up on top of the wall with hammers and chisels and saws and anything they could get their hands on. And, yes, some broke bottle of champagne, and there was family reunification.

But it was the Iron Curtain crashing down nearly 20 years ago that should have been a lesson for the whole world that free enterprise always defeats a managed economy, because no matter

how many smart people you put in positions of power, they can't micro-manage an economy that is a combination of everybody's individual productive and economic activity every day.

The invisible hand, as Adam Smith famously described, and actually didn't, about how free enterprise works with providing the incentives and managing the supply. So it works like this: If the grocery store runs out of bread, the store owner understands he has to have more bread or otherwise people will go someplace else to shop. And if there's a cheaper, better bread at the neighboring store, that store owner is not going to sell his bread. So that's how bakeries get started, how grocery stores grow and shrink, how chain stores begin, how manufacturing begins.

Our control, our managed economy is this: Free enterprise drives our economy. And the buy, sell, trade, make-gain culture that we have that's part of what made America great, one of the central pillars of American exceptionalism is free enterprise. When we have that working for us in this country, Americans are more productive than anybody else in the world.

Our job here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is to get government out of the way and to provide the kind of tax and regulatory structure as minimally as we can so that the result is the individuals in this country will see our average annual productivity go up. And if people are rewarded for their productivity, they will produce more. If you tax them and punish them and regulate them, they will produce less. So in places like the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, they just simply suppressed the productivity by taking away the rewards.

I can give you a simple example that stands out in a very stark way. And that is Communist China, a country of more than a billion people, about the same geographical area of the United States, having trouble in a lot of ways competing in the technological and educational side of this. But some years ago, they decided they were going to let their farmers, who are less controlled now than they were, be able to get engaged in the honey business without having government interference. So, in other words, government doesn't appoint themselves a few thousand beekeepers and have them deliver all that honey for a set price. They let them compete on the open market.

And what has happened? China almost immediately began exporting honey and competing against the honey here in the United States because they had some people that could be beekeepers. That's like a little microcosm of free enterprise that sprung up out of China because they took the regulations away, took their managed economy away and let people produce all they could produce and sell all they could sell and keep a significant share of the profits.

Well, here in this country, we've had that as a tradition across the breadth of this economy, and it's diminished significantly, Mr. Speaker.

So the vitality of free enterprise brings about the best in us, the highest productivity, the most innovativeness in us. It gives us an incentive to extend each of our educations. It gives the inventors an incentive to invent. It gives the people that are producing and doing the experiments on pharmaceuticals an incentive to produce better medicine. And those who invent better surgery techniques get to cash a bigger check.

□ 1345

Well, even though they are humanitarians driven by a desire to do good in their work, when you really need to reach back for that extra adrenaline when it gets late at night when the rest of the world is tired, or maybe you don't feel very good because you are exhausted, that extra incentive of profit makes a difference and a reward for it in a society that appreciates it.

Around the globe, there is a line of scrimmage between freedom and the suppression from freedom. So when the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) humbly said he didn't know the answer, I think perhaps he didn't know the answer that I wanted him to give—that will happen—but he understands very thoroughly how the rearrangement that took place after the fall of the Berlin Wall at the end of the Cold War, some countries and philosophies lined up on the side of the freedom. Those countries are among those countries where we already had the holes dug to place the missile defense shield, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, have you failed to notice that the people who have achieved their freedom most recently love it and adhere to it the most? The Poles love their freedom. The Romanians love their freedom. And the Czechs love their freedom. They remember what it is like to live under the boot heel of the Soviet Union. They remember clearly within their own families the fear of the occupation that took place before, in many cases World War II, and certainly during and after it.

I recall in a trip over to that part of the world with Mr. BISHOP a conversation with a man about my age whose father's first military operation he was engaged in was Auschwitz, not at Auschwitz to liberate Auschwitz, but at Auschwitz fighting for the Russians. Those things don't pop up easily in our history books, but this broad global concept of who is on what side of this line of scrimmage, who is on the side of freedom and who is on the side of suppressing freedom, we need to understand this.

These forces know instinctively what is at play out here on the globe. And so we wonder, what is the chess board that Putin is playing on? The Monopoly board that Putin is playing on? He is not about advancing freedom; he is

about diminishing freedom. The freedom in the Soviet Union, I should say Russia, and some of our satellite states, has diminished since Putin stepped into control.

We met with significant leading personalities in Russia, and I am going to avoid saying their names because I don't need to turn more heat up on them; but you would recognize many if not all of them, Mr. Speaker, and they told us that there really no longer exists a free press in Russia, not a newspaper that they can count on that has any influence that is free to print what it wants to print. There is not a free legislature in Russia any longer either. They are the people who are controlled by Putin, and they don't have free markets. We know that the Mob has taken over a lot of that economy, and there is a payoff that goes on inside of all of that.

So a Russia that had an opportunity to take a step up after the implosion of the Soviet Union now is stepping into the darkness of the left again, moving towards a communist state, taking away the freedom of its people and their ability to effectively have freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and freedom of the press and freedom of their economy. Those things have been significantly diminished under Putin, and they understand that and they see that.

The leaders of freedom in Russia today would have believed that the Russian people would have stepped up by now and gone to the streets and taken their country back. It has not happened. I would encourage that they do so, that they take their country back. We thought it was happening during the days of Yeltsin when he climbed up on the tank. Good things happened there, but we should not forget that we are the vanguards of freedom here in the United States of America for the world. We are the inspiration for the world.

And when it looks like the model for our diplomacy is simply capitulation to Russia, under the belief that our community organizer in chief somehow is a master of foreign policy, well, he is the manager of foreign policy and he is the Commander in Chief of our military, and certainly I stand with our military, and I want to help coach him on the foreign policy a little bit.

I don't know why the press has not been more critical of the President's foreign policy. This huge plunder of just announcing that he is going to pull the missiles out of Poland and Czechoslovakia, take that shield away, and almost at the same time you notice that the information was leaked out about the nuclear capabilities of Iran, which we have just heard in the previous hour, Iran developing the capability, that they have the capability to develop a bomb now and they are in the process we know of developing the capability to deliver it.

And it doesn't take very much of a missile to drop one into Israel, and it

only takes one weapon dropped into Israel to annihilate the entire country. And they have said that is what they intend to do.

We look at the President of the United States, his foreign policy experience seems to have, before he became the Commander in Chief and the chief architect of our foreign policy, his foreign policy experience comes to this: having been raised in part in Indonesia at a young age which would give him some sense of the culture but probably no sense of the global, military, cultural dynamics, but raised at least in part in Indonesia.

A President who has once traveled to Kenya, and once traveled to Pakistan. I don't know quite how that happened, but it was announced. And beyond that, the foreign policy experience for our Commander in Chief and the chief architect of our foreign policy seems to be a trip to Germany to give a speech during the campaign. That is not anything that has ever happened before that I know of during a Presidential campaign, but it looked at the time like he wanted to be President of Europe, the United States, and the world.

In any case, very, very limited on foreign policy experience. And the lessons of history, the lessons so well drilled into us by Neville Chamberlain's School of Appeasement when Chamberlain came back from the trip to Munich and waved the letter in his hand, the letter that Hitler had signed, and he said: I have guaranteed peace in our time.

That was the image of Chamberlain getting off the plane from Munich. And what happened? Within weeks the Nazis invaded Poland. They carved it up with the Russians, and we were off and running in a global war that cost tens of millions of lives. They remember that in that part of the world. They are afraid of being brought back into another war. The Poles remember being run over by the Nazis and the Russians, and then occupied by the Russians for all of these years up until 1990 or so.

This is a very sensitive situation that is going on. When the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) mentioned the Ukraine and Georgia, the importance of the sovereign state of Georgia should not be diminished.

We should understand that this chess game that I have talked about, the central square on the chess board for Putin is Georgia. That is the nexus through which the energy flows, the energy that is produced in gas and oil wells east of Georgia, east of the Caspian Sea, roughly 1.2 million barrels of oil going through Georgia by pipeline on a daily basis, 1.2 million, a train that has constant tankers of crude oil being hauled through the nation of Georgia on their destinations to the tanker ships and the Black Sea, and the natural gas that flows in pipelines through Georgia to other places in Europe.

Georgia is the nexus. Think, Mr. Speaker, of an hourglass, and on one

side of that hourglass is a lot of the production of oil and natural gas that is east of the Caspian Sea, flowing through this nexus of Georgia with pipelines, rail lines, and coming out the other side at the Black Sea and going on to land-based places around Western Europe.

Think of the Russians shutting off the natural gas to Germany a year ago January. Think what that meant when they did that. And to have the Germans take the position that it really didn't affect their foreign policy toward Russia because they only got 30 percent of their natural gas from Russia.

Can you imagine if Hugo Chavez had 30 percent of the natural gas coming into the United States and he turned the valve down and shut off our gas in January? Our furnaces would have gone dark on us, and our houses would have gone cold. If that had happened, what would we do? Would we accept that? If we didn't have the power to do something about it, would we capitulate to the demands of Hugo Chavez?

My answer, I think we would say yes. I think if we didn't have the power or another alternative, we would have to negotiate.

I am going to suggest that the Germans are negotiating with the Russians because they can't do a confrontation, and Putin knows it. That's why he shut the energy off that was flowing through Georgia for 4 days. He sent a message to Europe that he can do that anytime he pleases. When he shut the gas off that was flowing through into Germany, that said clearly that Putin can do that anytime he pleases.

So if someone controls your energy and they can shut the valve down anytime they please, you end up being a little nicer to those folks unless you produce another alternative. Well, the alternative that is being produced is building a new pipeline around to the North Sea. And where does it come from? Russia. That puts them in more control. My answer would be: I don't want any of that; let's develop our own energy sources and not be dependent upon those energy sources that are coming from Russia. But that has been Putin's strength. When energy prices went up, he found himself sitting on a lot of cash. That is unusual for a country whose energy falters; but because Russia has a lot of energy, they have had a significant advantage.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should remember when the Berlin Wall went down in 1989 and the Soviet Union imploded within the next couple of years that the people that were Communists, Socialists, Marxists, Maoists, they didn't go away. They didn't look at the model of this dynamic vigor of the United States economy that is driven by our people and decide they wanted to be more like us. Some did; not many.

Most of them went underground for a little while and then tried to get back in power. The former Communists are

there seated in the legislatures across that part of Europe today. In small numbers, and in some cases they don't get to call themselves Communists because that has been stained by the history of it, but they still believe the same thing. They still want to manage. They still believe that their elitist mind-set can tell the rest of us what to do. They want to take away the freedom of individuals to make their own choices economically and militarily and politically and culturally. And, in fact, persecute the churches while they are at it.

We need to understand Communists haven't changed. They might have taken on different names. They might have declared themselves Social Democrats or to be Progressives. They might just be the Democratic Socialists of America that are supporting Progressives in this Congress, but they are the same people with the same ideology.

And us freedom-loving people, I should say we freedom-loving people, need to understand that there are basic principles of Americanism, and free enterprise is one of them. And those who undermine free enterprise are undergoing anti-American activities because they are undermining our vitality and our freedom and are taking away our ability to take this Nation up to another level of our destiny.

That is part of this equation that is taking place here as the President of the United States—whom I happen to have this portrait of. I think it is a flattering one actually and well done as far as the artwork is concerned. The President of the United States brings an ideology to the task of community organizer in chief. With a limited foreign policy experience of having traveled, lived shortly in Indonesia and traveled to Pakistan and I understand to Kenya, and beyond that his trip to Germany to give his speech there with the Autobahn Bismarcks—I think that is the victory monument or the triumph monument that's there in Berlin—with that in the backdrop, not the Vandenberg Gate which he tried to do, that is not a lot of foreign policy experience to be playing on this global chessboard with the world's number one economy, the world's number one military, and with the destiny of the world hanging in the balance if you make a mistake.

□ 1400

No one has a crystal ball, but this is a very high-risk endeavor taken on by our Commander in Chief. And those who are experts on the military side of this, it's not quite universal, but there has been a broad criticism that has been made. And I have no idea. My imagination cannot tell me what he could possibly have gotten for capitulating on the missiles in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

And so, Madam Speaker, that brings me to the subject matter that has, I will say, riveted the American people over the last couple of weeks, and that

is the issue of ACORN, ACORN being the place where the President got his start in politics, where Barack Obama first engaged in community organizing, and his community organizing being part of—the most high profile that he did was Project Vote, the get-out-the-vote effort. And Project Vote that he worked for is a very close, indistinguishable-from affiliate of ACORN.

So ACORN in Chicago has always had a broad and deep connection. It has always been very active there. From the early days when ACORN originated in Arkansas and emerged across the rest of the country, ACORN has had a very solid presence in Chicago. And the President of the United States might, in his most candid moments, confess that he wouldn't be very likely to be the President of the United States if it hadn't been for ACORN, ACORN's ability to register voters and get out the vote and bring about the kind of leverage within the inner city that allows ACORN to influence votes at the inner city level.

Now, ACORN is a corporation, and its structure is something that seems to be a little bit mysterious. It has been often reported that they're a 501(c)(3); that's not for profit. That means they can't engage in partisan political activities. And we have seen as a report from the Government Reform Committee that ACORN has up to 361 affiliates; in fact, they list 361 affiliates in their report. Some of those may not be active affiliates, and there may be some affiliates that didn't get picked up in the report done by the Government Reform Committee. But ACORN has turned into a spiderweb of this conglomeration of affiliates.

So when I speak of ACORN, Madam Speaker, I'm speaking of ACORN and all other affiliates, think 361 corporations, a third or more of them being 501(c)(3) not for profits, some 527 organizations, and some 501(c)(4) organizations, and other corporate structures, organizations that share, in many cases, interlocking boards of directors and an interlocking mission that reaches out and has become a vacuum that sucks up taxpayer dollars in many of the States and from the Federal Government.

They have received over 53 million Federal tax dollars since 1994, and I think that's a small piece of it until we examine all of the affiliates. Many of the States have contributed to ACORN in one way or another by reentering into contractual agreements with them; ACORN and ACORN Housing, for example, essentially in the business of brokering low-income housing.

So these are some of the things that ACORN has done. They've contributed to the toxic mortgage situation that brought about the economic meltdown just a year ago, and they've done so by shaking down lenders, by demanding contributions from lenders. What large major investment bank has not written at least one fat check to ACORN?

Madam Speaker, I'm going to suggest that they have shaken down many of

the banks that have been bailed out. And we should take a look and see which banks received TARP funds and look there and see which banks also contributed money to ACORN. And we need to bring all of the finances together of the private corporations that are part of this funding for ACORN as well as government. It's not enough just to audit what government sent to ACORN. It's important that we go to the private corporations as well and see what has happened.

But we know that ACORN has gone in and intimidated lenders. Lenders have written checks in order to, let me call it, "influence" ACORN to stop demonstrating in their banks so that they can actually do business. We know that ACORN personnel, including Maude Talbot—her first name actually escapes me, but Talbot is the last name, the head of ACORN in Chicago who has claimed Obama as her own—have bragged about going in to intimidate lenders in their offices and talked of other circumstances about shoving the lender's desk over against the wall, surrounding the loan officer, screaming and yelling and chanting at him until such time as he would get tired of that behavior and commit to loaning certain amounts of money into these areas in their neighborhoods. That's a shakedown, Madam Speaker. ACORN was involved in that.

And we know while they were shaking down lenders, they also were here in Washington, D.C., convincing this Congress that we should pass legislation to lower the standards of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac on their secondary lending market. And when that happened, it lowered the standards that undermine the foundation of requiring credit for loans. And when that happened, it laid the foundation, in fact, it eroded the foundation for credibility and credit and it began the downward spiral of the mortgage lending crisis. And at the core of that, as you look through it, you will see ACORN there over and over again shaking down lenders, coming to Congress, undermining the underwriting requirements that Fannie and Freddie required in order for them to purchase these bundles of mortgage-backed securities that were being created by individual bad loans in bad neighborhoods that were promoted by ACORN, who was getting checks from the lending institutions and getting agreements from the lending institutions to provide blocks of money that would be loaned into neighborhoods that ended up being bad loans.

ACORN is at the core of the financial meltdown. And by the way, the President of the United States was at the core of ACORN as a lot of the genesis of this was being generated; headed up Project Vote, later on hired ACORN to work for him to get out the vote during the Presidential campaign. So the President of the United States started out with ACORN. He trained their trainers. He represented them in court

to undermine, by the way, the integrity of the ballot box, in my view. And that's a Motor Voter issue, which we would disagree with philosophically. Headed up Project Vote.

The actions of ACORN in Chicago have been tied together integrally with the President of the United States all the way through. And here we are now with ACORN helping to, on film, apparently facilitate child pornography and being willing to work with and advocate for what to do with illegal immigrant children brought into prostitution rings in five cities in the United States at a minimum, that being Baltimore; Washington, D.C.; Brooklyn, New York; San Bernardino, California; and San Diego.

Madam Speaker, that was appalling to this Congress. It finally got us to the point of revulsion where we could finally vote to shut off funding going to ACORN and their affiliates. And that vote was a vote of 345-75 here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Just the day before, I didn't think it was possible, but the American people saw the character and the culture of ACORN in that film, those five films that took place inside those five cities, and we understand there are more that have not been released yet. And what happens? Finally, some of us that have been calling for investigations are starting to get a little bit of movement.

But what needs to happen, Madam Speaker, is an all-out full court press on ACORN and all of their affiliates. We need to have the Department of Defense unleash their investigators to trace down, through all the activities of ACORN and all of their affiliates, and work in cooperation with IRS investigations of ACORN and all their affiliates, track every dollar that comes into the affiliates and every dollar that goes out. The commingling of funds, the transfer of funds, we need to have the Department of Justice go back down into the embezzlement that took place of nearly \$1 million out of ACORN by the brother of the founder of ACORN, covered up by the founder of ACORN.

Brothers do that, I understand. One of them commits a crime and apparently the other one covered up the crime, which is a crime itself. And then they misappropriated funds that were pension funds in order to backfill the hole that was created in their accounting by the embezzlement of Dale Rathke, all of this covered up by his brother, Wade Rathke. And they covered it up and held it away from the functioning board of directors of ACORN at the time.

We have ACORN producing over 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations, complicit in the beginning, and part and parcel of the mortgage lending crisis, embezzlement/coverup by its top officers, and now we have ACORN helping to facilitate child prostitution rings and setting up houses of ill repute and helping to facilitate loans to

do that, and advocating that the, let me just say, pimp and the prostitute not claim all of the 13 or 14 presumably illegal children that they were going to bring in from El Salvador into Baltimore, but just to claim three of them so it wouldn't raise the levels of suspicion. And then they could qualify for the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, child tax credit up to three children, \$1,000 a year per child, and then the earned income tax credit, which would probably add another \$3,000 to that, most likely, given the advice that they gave, to game the taxpayer for a check for a cumulative of about \$6,000, and just as a matter of fact and a matter of course.

ACORN would help with the income tax filings. They would help with gaming the taxpayer. They would help with a loan for the house of ill repute, and they would turn a blind eye, at a minimum, to illegal immigration. This is Baltimore. But in San Diego, they advocated to help with that. We have friends in Mexico. You have to trust us. We'll get this done for you. Unbelievable. No conscience.

We saw the culture of it. But all the parts that we've been talking about up to the part of the prostitution, people would deny it. We had defenders over here on this side of the aisle, but now they can't deny it because once you transpose the image of facilitating child prostitution as a matter of culture within the corrupt criminal enterprise of ACORN and their affiliates, once you expose that, none of the rest of this is unbelievable. It's entirely plausible, and it is, in fact, entirely real.

ACORN has created now a closed, contained economy within itself where its tentacles reach out and suck in and draw down Federal money, State money, contribution money, shakedown money from banks and other lending institutions and corporations to keep ACORN off their back, do the shakedown endeavor. And once that money gets drawn in, then it becomes something that gets commingled. And as it's commingled, then it goes out to further their political enterprise, corrupting the election process in the United States. And if there is anything that I am aggressive on defending, it is the integrity of the ballot box, and they have assaulted the integrity of the ballot box.

The President of the United States grew up in ACORN. He hired ACORN. He worked for ACORN. He hired ACORN. He is a player and a coach. He wore their jersey and now he is the equivalent of the owner. And he had set them up to do the census, and twice now the Census Bureau has announced that they aren't going to use ACORN to help with the census. Why would anybody think ACORN can count people better than they can get people registered to vote? Four hundred thousand fraudulent registration forms. Can't we imagine that ACORN would pay a commission for everybody that the census workers could count?

And if they paid people on commission, they would just simply fill out forms and expand the numbers, or count people two, three, four, five, six times. Even if they set up expectations and not a quota, the result ends up being the same, even though it's not as stark a violation of the law. You can't have American people counted by people that can't even handle a voter registration form with an expectation that it has an even even chance of being a legitimate voter registration form.

Madam Speaker, when they take your vote, when they undermine the integrity of the ballot box, that's more important itself than the Constitution, because even though the Constitution guarantees the rights that we have, the only thing that guarantees the Constitution itself is a legitimate election process. If the American people lose their faith in a legitimate election process, the whole thing comes crashing down.

If we don't believe that our vote counts, we can't accept the decisions of government. I mean, think what would happen if we elected a President of the United States, or Members of Congress, United States Senators, Governors of the States, and the American people believed that they were not the elected President, Governor, or Congressman, but they were simply those that happened to be on the side that was gaming the system.

□ 1415

We wouldn't accept their decisions either. If we don't accept the decisions that are made by government, then the progress of civilization comes to a halt and digresses, and we fall into the depths of a totalitarian state eventually as well.

Legitimate elections are the underpinnings of our Constitution, and the guarantees in the Constitution can't be sustained if we lose our faith in the election process. The worst thing that can happen in this country from a policy standpoint would be to see the integrity of our ballot box further eroded by organizations like ACORN. So this is very important. It is very important that the President of the United States stands up and takes a position on ACORN.

Did you notice he was really quiet about some things? He was quiet about Van Jones. Van Jones, the former Green Jobs czar, quit on a Friday night. I guess it was a Saturday morning, at 12:01 a.m. on a Saturday morning. Curiously, the President had nothing to say about Van Jones. Curiously, the press had no questions for the President on Van Jones, and he is a self-alleged Communist. Yet Van Jones drifted from the scene because he became too toxic.

There was a little incident up in Massachusetts of a professor from Harvard who was trying to break into his own house and who had a police officer called to his location. The President

saw fit to engage himself in that and to hold a beer summit between Professor Gates and Officer Crowley.

Now we've had the United States Senate vote to un-fund ACORN. We've had the House of Representatives vote to un-fund ACORN. We have the Treasury Department starting an investigation. At least it's implicit in their press release that's coming out. We have the Justice Department looking to see if they've written any checks to ACORN but not investigating ACORN and their affiliates thoroughly. We have a number of ranking members of full committees on this Hill who are doing what they can with the resources they have.

We don't have a single full committee Chair who has announced investigations and hearings into ACORN at this point. We've got Congress doing a slow walk right now on ACORN. We have the President of the United States, who could get himself injected into a lot of different discussions but who has not yet really made much of a peep regarding ACORN.

Now, if the Senate says un-fund ACORN and if the House says un-fund ACORN, why can't the President say un-fund ACORN? That's what I'd like to know.

If the President of the United States would step forward and say to this Congress, Investigate at my request, and I'll turn over all the resources of the entire executive branch of government to drill down through ACORN and all of their affiliates, and will chase every dollar, every director and every employee who has committed an illegal activity and will prosecute them to the fullest extent of the law and will bring about perp walks and prison time for people who are breaking the law, it would happen—it would happen overnight. But he has not. He sat in his ivory tower, and alluded a little bit to the inappropriate actions that might have taken place and about how we should, maybe, get to the bottom of it. They are not yet serious, Mr. Speaker.

They are not going to be serious until the American people make it the highest priority that they have. It's hard to make it the highest priority when you're watching your health care on the chopping block in the United States Senate, when you've watched our national security be diminished significantly by pulling the missile defense shield plan from Poland and Czechoslovakia, when you're not keeping faith with the people who have most recently achieved their freedom—that's the Eastern Europeans—and when you're putting the United States at risk and are empowering Ahmadinejad and empowering Putin and are setting up a tone of going wobbly at a time when we need to be the strongest.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 AT PAGE H9946

DIVISION B—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2010

Division B provides continuing appropriations for all agencies and activities that would be covered by the regular fiscal year 2010 appropriations bills, until enactment of the applicable regular appropriations bill, or until October 31, 2009, whichever occurs first.

DAVID R. OBEY,  
DEBBIE WASSERMAN  
SCHULTZ,  
MICHAEL HONDA,  
BETTY MCCOLLUM,  
TIM RYAN,  
C.A. RUPPERSBERGER,  
CIRO RODRIGUEZ,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

BEN NELSON,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
MARK PRYOR,  
JON TESTER,  
LISA MURKOWSKI,  
THAD COCHRAN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of an illness.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a death in the family.

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. KAGEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. NYE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. SCHIFF, 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. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, September 29.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1599. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to include in the Federal charter of the Reserve Officers Association leadership positions newly added in its constitution and bylaws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 29, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter and second quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, UKRAINE, KAZAKHSTAN, MONGOLIA, CHINA, AND CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 31 AND AUG. 13, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Amy Lozupone	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Danielle Maurer	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Amy Lozupone	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Danielle Maurer	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		988.00		(3)				988.00
Amy Lozupone	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		988.00		(3)				988.00
Danielle Maurer	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		918.00		(3)				918.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		918.00		(3)				918.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Amy Lozupone	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Danielle Maurer	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		216.00		(3)				216.00
Amy Lozupone	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		205.00		(3)				205.00
Danielle Maurer	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		205.00		(3)				205.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, UKRAINE, KAZAKHSTAN, MONGOLIA, CHINA, AND CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 31 AND AUG. 13, 2009—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Jennifer Stewart	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		205.00		(?)				205.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Amy Lozupone	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Danielle Maurer	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/10	8/11	China		401.00		(?)				401.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Amy Lozupone	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Danielle Maurer	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/11	8/13	Canada		684.00		(?)				684.00
<b>Committee total</b>											<b>51,093.00</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Chairman, Sept. 14, 2009.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

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

3803. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Meptyldinocap; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0854; FRL-8429-7] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0810; FRL-8434-2] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tembotrione; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0813; FRL-8431-5] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiram; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0020; FRL-8431-9] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3807. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Farm Credit Administration Board Meetings; Sunshine Act (RIN: 3052-AC58) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3808. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Annual Independent Audits and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3064-AD21) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3809. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Annual Independent Audits and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3064-AD21) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3810. A letter from the Dep. Dir., Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defining "Small Number of Animals" for Minor Use Designation [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0176; Formerly Docket No. 2008N-0011] (RIN: 0910-AG03) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3811. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances; Table of Excluded Non-narcotic Products; Nasal Decongestant Inhalers Manufactured by Classic Pharmaceuticals LLC [Docket No.: DEA-329I] (RIN: 1117-AD23) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3812. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Controls, Telltales and Indicators [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0145] (RIN: 2127-AK04) received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Revisions to Denver Emergency Episode Plan [EPA-R08-OAR-2005-046 ; FRL-8957-3] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Notice 24 for Significant New Alternatives Policy Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0118; FRL-8959-2] (RIN: 2060-AG12) received

September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3815. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Diego Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0620; FRL-8956-9] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3816. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0473; FRL-8956-8] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3817. A letter from the Acting Legal Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facilitating the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands [WT Docket Nos.: 03-66, FCC 09-70] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3818. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Biloxi, Mississippi) [MB Docket No. 09-125] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3819. A letter from the Chief, Policy Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum and Adopt Service Rules and Procedures to Govern the Use of Vehicle-Mounted Earth Stations in Certain Frequency Bands Allocated to the Fixed-Satellite Service [IB Docket No. 07-101] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3820. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 0908141238-91252-01] (RIN: 0694-AE72) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3821. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Refinement of Income and Rent Determination Requirements in Public and Assisted Housing Programs; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: FR-4998-F-05] (RIN: 2501-AD16) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3822. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Grand Prairie, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0363; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-11] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3823. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Low Altitude Area Navigation Route (T-Route); Rockford, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1114; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-17] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3824. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Standards; Aircraft Engine Standards Over-torque Limits [Docket No.: 2007-28502; Amendment No. 1-65, 33-30] (RIN No.: 2120-AJ06) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3825. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1099; Airspace Docket No. 08-AWP-10] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3826. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace and Amendment of Class E Airspace; North Bend, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0006; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANM-1] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3827. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Oooguruk, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0196; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-3] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3828. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Quinhagak, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0763; Airspace Docket No. 08-AAL-22] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3829. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Arlington, TX [Docket No. FAA-2009-0362; Airspace; Docket No. 09-ASW-10] received September 16, 2009, pursu-

ant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3830. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Neligh, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0191; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-4] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3831. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedure, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30682; Amdt. No. 3335] received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3832. 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.: 30681; Amdt. No. 3334] received August 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3833. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Excess Risk Estimate for Highway-Rail Grade Crossings Along the Florida East Coast Railway Line [Docket No.: FRA-1999-6439, Notice No. 21] (RIN: 2130-AB88) received September 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3834. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Investment Companies-Leverage Eligibility and Portfolio Diversification Requirements (RIN: 3245-AF92) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3835. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treatment of Services Under Section 482 Allocation of Income and Deductions from Intangible Property Apportionment of Stewardship Expense [TD 9456] (RIN: 1545-BI78, 1545-BI79, 1545-BI80) received August 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3836. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Declaratory Judgements — Gift Tax Determinations [TD 9460] (RIN: 1545-BD67) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3837. A letter from the Industry Director, Retailers, Food, Pharmaceuticals, and Healthcare, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tier II Industry Director's Directive on the Planning and Examination of Contractual Allowance Issues in the Healthcare Industry #2 received September 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MACK, Ms. CASTOR of

Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. KRATOVLJ);

H.R. 3650. A bill to establish a National Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Program, to develop and coordinate a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, and to provide for the development and implementation of comprehensive regional action plans to reduce harmful algal blooms and hypoxia; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BOREN:

H.R. 3651. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 3652. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; 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. HODES (for himself and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3653. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the display of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 3654. A bill to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to procure, launch, and operate the next generation of weather forecasting satellites; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3655. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to establish rules to prohibit unfair or deceptive acts or practices related to the provision of funeral services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3656. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and intensify programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to translational research and related activities concerning Down syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 3657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for members of the United States Public Health Service and National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration Corps to transfer unused benefits under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program to family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3658. A bill to make technical corrections to subtitle A of title VII of the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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. OBEY:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2918.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 779. A resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Runaway Prevention Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Res. 780. A resolution recognizing the celebration of Filipino American History Month in October; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. COBLE):

H. Res. 781. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Down Syndrome Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 204: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 213: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 275: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 333: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 391: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 422: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 442: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 482: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 510: Mr. MCMAHON.

H.R. 557: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 560: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 571: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 574: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 668: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 690: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 725: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 734: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 795: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

H.R. 977: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 981: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1054: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1079: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1084: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1086: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1193: Mrs. DALONEY and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1206: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1208: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1233: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1242: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1245: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 1265: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 1313: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1362: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1378: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1408: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1456: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1458: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1505: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1570: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1578: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1587: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1600: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 1616: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1625: Mr. FILNER and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1670: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1695: Mr. NYE and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 1723: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1740: Mr. CAO and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1806: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1826: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1831: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1903: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1970: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1977: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1987: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1993: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 1995: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2035: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2058: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2084: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 2190: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2194: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2246: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2254: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2275: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WEINER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2296: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 2329: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2349: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2366: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2377: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2408: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2421: Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 2425: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2443: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2452: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MACK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2476: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 2499: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2528: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 2555: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2567: Mr. FILNER and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 2579: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2590: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2600: Mr. KIRK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 2625: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 2626: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2655: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2688: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2745: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2766: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2906: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2935: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WU, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2936: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2976: Mr. KIRK and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3003: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 3024: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 3046: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3078: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3116: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3164: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3245: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3264: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3265: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3276: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3286: Mr. MASSA and Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 3400: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3464: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3468: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3486: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3488: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3502: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3503: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3524: Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 3571: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3585: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3610: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 3611: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3613: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3630: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 3639: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. FORBES.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. SESTAK.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. FORBES, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 185: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MACK, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Res. 16: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 20: Mr. INGLIS.

H. Res. 159: Ms. BEAN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 175: Mr. HODES and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 291: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 398: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ALLEXANDER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MACK, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. SIRE.

H. Res. 511: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 554: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Res. 561: Mr. MCMAHON.

H. Res. 562: Mr. MCMAHON.

H. Res. 563: Mr. MCMAHON.

H. Res. 569: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 603: Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 615: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 630: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 704: Mr. LINDER.

H. Res. 707: Mr. HODES.

H. Res. 711: Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Res. 721: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. LATTI.

H. Res. 727: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLBRAY, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 729: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 730: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. MATHESON.

H. Res. 741: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. MAFFEL.

H. Res. 743: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 748: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 749: Mr. BLUNT.

H. Res. 750: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. Chu, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MAFFEL, and Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 752: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 754: Mr. BOREN.

H. Res. 757: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 763: Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 771: Mr. OBEY.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 6, September 23, 2009, by Mr. GREG WALDEN on House Resolution 554,

was signed by the following members: Greg Walden, Vernon J. Ehlers, Michael N. Castle, Roy Blunt, Jerry Moran, Rob Bishop, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Dan Burton, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Jo Bonner, Charles W. Dent, Brian Baird, Jean Schmidt, Judy Biggert, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Walter B. Jones, Michael T. McCaul, Bill Shuster, Candice S. Miller, Fred Upton, Walt Minnick, Thadeus G. McCotter, Dave Camp, Michele Bachmann, Jeff Fortenberry, Ed Whitfield, Aaron Schock, Pete Sessions, Randy Neugebauer, Frank R. Wolf, Mike Pence, Michael C. Burgess, Lynn Jenkins, John R. Carter, Sam Johnson, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Kay Granger, Thomas J. Rooney, David P. Roe, Gregg Harper, Virginia Foxx, Jim Jordan, Cliff Stearns, Bob Inglis, Harold Rogers, Lee Terry, Bill Cassidy, Todd Tiahrt, Joe Barton, Timothy V. Johnson, John Sullivan, John Kline, Marsha Blackburn, Kevin McCarthy, Doug Lamborn, Donald A. Manzullo, Edward R. Royce, John Boozman, Paul Ryan, Paul C. Broun, Parker Griffith, Rodney Alexander, John Fleming, Jeff Flake, Sue Myrick, Daniel E. Lungren, Steve King, John B. Shadegg, Mac Thornberry, Bill Posey, Glenn Thompson, Christopher John Lee, Steve Scalise, Wally Herger, Duncan Hunter, Todd Russell Platts, Gus M. Bilirakis, Kevin Brady, Trent Franks, Thomas E. Petri, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Tom Cole, Pete Olson, K. Michael Conaway, Lynn A. Westmoreland, John Abney Culberson, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Ginny Brown-Waite, Bob Goodlatte, J. Randy Forbes, Mike Rogers (AL), Jeb Hensarling, Louie Gohmert, Jo Ann Emerson, Frank D. Lucas, Joe Wilson, David G. Reichert, Jason Chaffetz, Cynthia M. Lummis, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Brian P. Bilbray, Michael K. Simpson, Mario Diaz-Balart, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Peter J. Roskam, Robert J. Wittman, Dean Heller, Joseph R. Pitts, Ted Poe, Jim Gerlach, Ander Crenshaw, Tom Price, Robert E.

Latta, Ron Paul, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Dana Rohrabacher, Tom Latham, Michael R. Turner, Mark E. Souder, Don Young, Gene Taylor, Mary Bono Mack, Connie Mack, Robert B. Aderholt, Leonard Lance, Mike Rogers (MI), Ken Calvert, Tom McClintock, John Campbell, Ralph M. Hall, Frank A. LoBiondo, Darrell E. Issa, W. Todd Akin, George Radanovich, Dennis R. Rehberg, John J. Duncan, Jr., Spencer Bachus, Anh "Joseph" Cao, John Shimkus, John Linder, Zach Wamp, Adam H. Putnam, Nathan Deal, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Mike Coffman, Howard Coble, Brett Guthrie, Tim Murphy, Jerry Lewis, Mark Steven Kirk, Patrick T. McHenry, Vern Buchanan, Gary G. Miller, Elton Gallegly, Peter T. King, Erik Paulsen, Geoff Davis, Patrick J. Tiberi, Devin Nunes, Christopher H. Smith, Jack Kingston, Steve Austria, John L. Mica, Eric Cantor, Dan Boren, Steve Buyer, Lamar Smith, Peter Hoekstra, Jeff Miller, Adrian Smith, Scott Garrett, Mary Fallin, John A. Boehner, C.W. Bill Young, Phil Gingrey, J. Gresham Barrett, Kenny Marchant, and Steven C. LaTourette.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 5 by Mrs. BLACKBURN on H.R. 391: Gregg Harper, Geoff Davis, Kay Granger, Eric Cantor, Fred Upton, Gresham J. Barrett, Joe Wilson, Jeff Miller, Kenny Marchant, Frank D. Lucas, Daniel E. Lungren, Kevin Brady, Jim Jordan, and Jason Chaffetz.