



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2009

No. 140

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LINCOLN DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Dr. Adam Dooley, Red Bank Baptist Church, Chattanooga, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come seeking Your blessing on this hallowed hall and the men and women who serve here. We do so with the full awareness of the Apostle Paul's teaching that "there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God."

So Lord, we pray that Your steady hand guide them, Your eternal wisdom inform them, Your compassionate heart encourage them, and Your relentless holiness purify them.

May their decisions preserve America as a city on a hill with a light that cannot be hidden. Forgive us of our sins as we forgive those who sin against us. Bring us to a place of humility before You in order that we might enjoy Your richest blessings.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month.

WELCOMING REV. DR. ADAM DOOLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. I want to welcome this morning to the House of Representatives my pastor, Dr. Adam Dooley, who hails from Berea, Kentucky, graduated from Clear Creek Bible College, and went on to receive his Doctor of Divinity from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

He was the senior pastor at the Red House Baptist Church in Kentucky before he came to my home church of Red Bank Baptist in Red Bank, Tennessee.

Dr. Dooley, his wife, Heather, and their son, Carson, bless our large congregation there in Chattanooga, and today we welcome him to the House of

Representatives as the guest chaplain and thank him for that extraordinary opening prayer this morning.

Welcome, Dr. Dooley.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MAD AS HELL DOCTORS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to acknowledge the presence in our Capitol of a group of physicians who have traveled across the country rallying public support for a single-payer health care system.

The group, which calls itself the Mad As Hell Doctors, is expressing the concern of millions of Americans about a health care system which is failing to meet the people's needs: that there are 47 million Americans without any health insurance, that 50 million Americans are underinsured, that people are literally going broke, not being able to pay their hospital bills.

We clearly recognize that this system is not sustainable. That's why JOHN CONYERS and I drafted a bill, H.R. 676, that provides for universal single-payer, not-for-profit health care. We're already paying for such a system. It's just that we're not getting it because \$1 out of every \$3 goes for the activities of the for-profit system for corporate profits, stock options, executive salaries, advertising, marketing, the cost of paperwork.

It's time to take that \$800 billion a year and put it into care for people. Everyone is covered then for vision care, dental health care, mental health care, prescription drugs, long-term care. It's time for single-payer.

□ 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.

H10411

CONTRADICTING INTELLIGENCE ON IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

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

Mr. KIRK. The United States revealed a secret underground uranium enrichment facility near Qom, Iran. U.S. officials told us they were carefully observing it for "several years." But earlier this year, the Director of National Intelligence, Dennis Blair, provided written congressional testimony that the intelligence community has "no evidence that Iran has yet made a decision to produce highly enriched uranium."

There is a glaring contradiction between the administration's revelation and Blair's testimony. I urge Members to cosign the bipartisan Kirk-Berkley letter calling on Director Blair to account for contradictory testimony on the growing Iranian threat.

The 2007 National Intelligence Estimate on Iran downplaying the threat now appears to be a glaring Intelligence failure. According to the Wall Street Journal, the main authors of that NIE, Van Van Diepen, Tom Finger, and Ken Brill, should be accountable, too.

Congress should ensure that key officials get this right, especially on Iran.

ALERT DRIVERS ACT

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, distracted driving is a serious problem in our Nation. One study conducted by Virginia Tech University found that drivers are 23 times more likely to get into an accident when texting. A recent New York Times/CBS News Poll indicated 90 percent of adults agree that texting while driving should be illegal.

This is an issue that rises above political power. This is why the Department of Transportation has dedicated a 2-day summit here in Washington this week to address the rising concerns of distracted driving on our Nation's highways.

H.R. 3535, the ALERT Drivers Act, which I am proud to introduce along with my colleague, Nita Lowey from New York, would ban anyone from writing, sending, or reading text messages while operating a moving vehicle.

Already endorsed by Ford Motors and the Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, I ask that you join me in curbing preventable accidents on our Nation's roadways and cosponsor the ALERT Drivers Act.

Madam Speaker, we see these accidents all the time. We need to do something.

SMALL BUSINESSES AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, affordable health care is critical to our country, but let's not forget small business. They create 70 percent of the jobs in Florida. Ninety-nine percent of all businesses in Florida are small businesses, but yet in this debate we're looking at charging small businesses an 8 percent tax on payroll. That's like a fixed expense.

They're also looking to raise taxes up to 45 percent, with a 5.4 in sunseting President Bush's tax. So, again, 45 percent. A lot of that's pass-through income for many of our small companies.

These taxes will kill jobs. The 8 percent alone, they're talking, will put 20 percent of our businesses out of business in Florida. I know. I've been in business for 30 years.

Let's help our small businesses. Small businesses create the jobs. We can cannot afford to tax them to death. It needs to be about the economy and jobs.

SAVE THE OCEANS

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the actor Sigourney Weaver showed a movie in the Capitol which was scarier than her movie *The Aliens* because it was fact, not fiction, and it was a movie documenting the acidification of the oceans caused by carbon dioxide that we burn that goes in the atmosphere, goes in the water, and makes the oceans acidic. This documentary showed that the waters off the Pacific coast soon will be so acidic that they can actually melt shell life.

The reason I mention this is that yesterday the EPA rolled out proposed rules to do something about these noxious gases. Some have said we shouldn't do that, but those are the same people saying we shouldn't pass a bill. They're saying we shouldn't regulate CO₂ here, there, or anywhere.

I urge all of us to move forward on a bipartisan basis to stop ocean acidification by passing the energy bill we passed in the House. We hope the Senate will pass it. That's a route to do it. But, one way or another, we've got to save the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.

NATIONAL MEDIA IGNORES MEDIA EVALUATION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, if a poll is conducted but no one hears about it, does that poll really exist? Sacred Heart University recently found out that five out of six Americans see

the national news media as "very or somewhat biased." But you aren't likely to hear about the Sacred Heart poll from the establishment media.

A search of *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and *USA Today* yielded zero articles about the poll. Network news programs have also intentionally ignored it.

It seems the establishment media believe that if they simply ignore the poll, it does not exist. It's no wonder that almost half of Americans have stopped watching a news outlet because of the media bias. By ignoring a poll that shows their bias, the establishment media has confirmed the poll's results that most Americans believe the national media is biased.

And that's just the way it is.

CORAL REEFS

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Last week, the House passed critical legislation to protect one of Florida's most treasured national wonders. The Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement, which I strongly supported, will be a key tool in protecting this endangered ecosystem.

The bill will support grants for coral reef conservation and scientific research at our outstanding institutions like the National Coral Reef Institute in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Coral reefs are integral to our safety and economy in south Florida. They act as a first line of defense against hurricanes and storm surges and they drive our tourist economy by bringing divers, snorkelers, and fishermen from all over the world to our community. In Broward County alone, coral reefs contribute over \$2 billion annually to our local economy.

Madam Speaker, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. Protecting our national treasures is something we can all agree on. I'm proud that my colleagues came together to pass this important piece of legislation.

MEDIA SLOW TO REPORT ON ACORN SCANDAL

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

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, in his latest column, *New York Times* Public Editor Clark Hoyt criticized the *Times* for its lack of coverage of the ACORN fraud and corruption scandal. Hoyt wrote that the *Times* showed "slow reflexes" and risks appearing "clueless" or "partisan" if it does not cover similar stories in the future.

The *Times* wasn't alone. The *Washington Post's* ombudsman admitted the *Post* was slow to cover the story as well and speculated that reporters' liberal leanings might have played a part.

Most other national news outlets ignored or downplayed the ACORN scandal. Days passed before the network news programs covered the story, and only one out of five Sunday news show hosts asked the President about ACORN last week.

The national media should report the facts instead of ignoring stories that don't fit their liberal agendas.

HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN VIETNAM

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I rise today to call attention to the human rights situation in Vietnam, particularly because today Vietnam will be taking over the Presidency of the United Nations Security Council. I find this development shocking and appalling and unacceptable, especially when we look at Vietnam's human rights record.

Just this past Sunday, the police in Vietnam assaulted over 130 monks and removed them from the Bat Nha Monastery before destroying it. Recently, eight dissidents were imprisoned by the Vietnamese Government for practicing their rights to freedom of speech and expression.

Today, Secretary of State Clinton is planning to meet with the Foreign Minister of Vietnam. I would urge Secretary Clinton to address these ongoing human rights violations in Vietnam and to strongly urge the Government of Vietnam to uphold their promises to respect the rights of their citizens.

The United States must recommit itself to making human rights a diplomatic priority.

□ 1015

NETANYAHU U.N. SPEECH

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, last week at the United Nations, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu gave a powerful address, challenging those who would deny the Holocaust. Speaking from the podium, he held up the documents recording the Nazis' plan for the eradication of the Jews. He held up the original blueprints of the Auschwitz concentration camp, signed by Heinrich Himmler, the infamous head of the Gestapo. He called out those nations who sat by idly as President Ahmadinejad put forth vague insinuations that the Holocaust was just a phony pretext for the establishment of Israel. Ahmadinejad at other times has called the Holocaust "a lie based on an unprovable and mythic claim," and he's called Israel "a cancerous tumor that must cease to exist."

I applaud our diplomats and those of many other freedom-loving nations for

showing no tolerance for his hate speech by walking out during the Iranian president's tirade. Any nation that denies one of the most horrific and barbaric acts of hatred and murder cannot be trusted to peacefully develop nuclear capabilities.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2892, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2892) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security 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.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky 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. 2892 be instructed as follows:

(1) Recede to subsection (a) of section 567 of the Senate amendment (the Detainee Photographic Records Protection Act).

(2) Insist on subsections (b) and (c) of section 552 of the House bill (regarding the inclusion of individuals detained at Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba on the No Fly list and the prohibition on the provision of immigration benefits for such individuals).

(3) Recede to the Senate position on subsections (a) and (d) of section 552 of the House bill (regarding certain threat assessments and the transfer of individuals detained at Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the United States).

(4) That they shall not record their approval of the final conference agreement (as such term is used in clause 12(a)(4) of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives) unless the text of such agreement has been available to the managers in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 72 hours prior to the time described in such clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The motion to instruct conferees is very simple. Madam Speaker. It would prohibit the transfer of Gitmo prisoners to the United States. It ensures the detainee pictures are never made public, and it mandates the conference report is made public at least 72 hours before being considered on the floor. It's that simple. And that's exactly

what the Homeland Security appropriation bill is all about, protecting the American people from all threats, including the warped intentions of terrorists and radical extremists.

Let me state my sincere gratitude to Subcommittee Chairman DAVID PRICE for listening to the views of the minority during all of these proceedings, during our preconference deliberations especially over the last few weeks. I truly appreciate his bipartisanship and consideration of our concerns.

Madam Speaker, this motion strengthens the House bill's current restrictions on Guantanamo Bay detainees by ensuring their names have been put on the No Fly List and by clearly prohibiting their transfer to the United States for whatever reason. For 9 months, the Obama administration has insisted the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay be shuttered within the year. But what have we seen during that time in preparation for that? Absolutely nothing, no plan, no idea of how to proceed, no instructions to the Congress, no instructions to the public about where these prisoners would be moved to.

Now we read in the press that the administration is thinking of releasing up to 75 of the detainees there. Where will they go? Europe, Fiji, maybe somewhere closer. Maybe in Michigan, maybe in Kansas, maybe somewhere else in the U.S. Who knows. Certainly the Members in those districts in the U.S. don't know. So this motion prohibits the granting of any immigration benefit for any reason to these detainees. Without such a benefit, there is no legal way to bring these terrorists to American soil and in our constituents' backyards. That means these terrorists cannot be granted the same constitutional rights as American citizens. After all, these detainees are enemy combatants caught on the battlefield. They are not common criminals, and they should not be granted legal standing in our criminal courts by bringing them onto U.S. soil.

From my point of view, we can't waiver on this issue, nor can we be weak. There is no reason these terrorists, who pose a serious and documented threat to this Nation, cannot be brought to justice right where they are in Cuba at Guantanamo Bay. If we want to try them, there is the place. I certainly think that that is where the American people stand on this issue as well. They don't want these terrorists in their hometowns, inciting fellow prisoners in our prisons, abusing our legal system and terrorizing their communities.

In addition, Madam Speaker, this motion insists upon the Senate's language prohibiting the release of detainee pictures, language unanimously adopted in the Senate, supported by this Chamber in June and endorsed by President Obama himself by way of his letter to the Senate on July 29. In that letter, I think the President said it best himself: "Nothing would be gained

by the release of the detainee photos other than allowing our enemies to paint our troops with a broad, damning, and inaccurate brush." I frankly couldn't agree more.

And finally, Madam Speaker, this motion also requires the conference report to be made public at least 72 hours before being brought to the floor for consideration. We want to read the bill before we vote.

So Madam Speaker, the ongoing terrorist investigations ranging from Denver to New York to Dallas over the last few weeks and the persistent attacks by radical extremists upon our citizens, our soldiers and our interests overseas remind us of why there is absolutely no reason to bring a terrorist to American soil or to release images that endanger this great country and its Armed Forces.

I urge support of the motion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Kentucky and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by echoing the words of the ranking member. We have, indeed, enjoyed fruitful cooperation in formulating this bill and bringing it to this point. Mr. ROGERS is a distinguished ranking member. He was the founding chairman of this subcommittee, and I think on both sides, we take pride in the process that we've developed that involves full consultation and, of course, not always perfect agreement, but a respect for each other's views and a product that can rightfully be called the fruit of our common labor.

Having said that, I do want to oppose this motion to instruct. I don't oppose it in its entirety. It has some positive features, but I want to concentrate in my brief remarks this morning on what leads me to ask for a "no" vote. This mainly has to do with some parts of items two and three of this motion.

The motion to instruct would basically prevent us from bringing anyone held in Guantanamo Bay to the United States for the purpose of prosecution. This provision is more restrictive than the House-passed bill, which allowed persons detained at the naval station at Guantanamo Bay to be brought to the U.S. for prosecution.

Accepting a more narrow provision goes against basic American principles, as well as basic American interests. People are to be given due process and access to a fair trial in this country, and it is certainly in this country's interest to bring these people to trial, to dispose of their cases. I must say, this motion also goes against a perfecting amendment that the distinguished ranking member himself voluntarily accepted—in fact, eagerly accepted—in our full committee markup.

So I have to ask, what would have made the other side change its mind all of a sudden? It appears that even when they get "yes" for an answer, it's hard

to accept "yes" for an answer. Without allowing these detainees to come to the United States for prosecution, we're basically saying that our judicial and law enforcement officials are unable to handle these criminals here in the United States, and that our country's core values and interests do not apply in these cases. That's just wrong.

The U.S. has successfully tried dangerous terrorists before—in fact, many times, executing some, putting others behind bars to fade into obscurity. The perpetrators of the 1993 World Trade Center and Murrah Federal Building bombings are perfect examples.

Treating these individuals as though they are so dangerous that we cannot possibly put them on trial or punish them or lock them up and throw away the key, the way we deal with our most savage criminals here in the United States, gives these detainees an exalted status. Why do we want to do that? An exalted status is far from what they deserve.

We can handle this, Madam Speaker. We're up to this challenge, and the last thing we ought to be doing is elevating these Guantanamo prisoners in the eyes of the world. The amendment that was accepted in committee, to permit us to bring these people into the United States for the purpose of prosecution, most certainly should remain.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me just say a word about the process by which this bill is being brought to the floor. We, of course, want to make certain that Members have ample time to study and understand bills before we vote on them. At the same time, I have to say, this bill has been a long time in the making. There has been a long period of discussion and debate and deliberation, and Members of this body should be assured that a full range of interested parties have been involved in crafting this bill in a bipartisan fashion since we received the budget in May.

Even before receiving the budget, we held 15 days of hearings on a wide variety of topics, including responses to natural disasters, technology and efficiency improvements, immigration enforcement, and border security. We had testimony from DHS as well as GAO and other non-Department sources. So it's a thoroughly vetted bill, and the issues in this bill have been thoroughly examined. They've been given their proper due diligence. There are no surprises, and we are, indeed, ready to go to conference.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Madam Speaker, from time to time, people in this House know that I quote my old favorite philosopher, Archie the Cockroach, and Archie said, or maybe it was Will Rogers—I've forgotten exactly which—but one of them noted that there is nothing more pitiful than the sight of a flock of politicians in full flight. They can look as panicked as a loon trying to take off from choppy lake water. And if you've ever watched one of those, it takes them a long time, they make a lot of ruckus, and they look like an unjointed turkey in the process. That's the way the Congress has looked, in my judgment, with respect to this Guantanamo Bay issue.

Now, this country has a problem. After September 11 we picked up a lot of bad and dangerous characters and shipped a lot of them to Guantanamo. We also picked up, on the basis of bad information, some who didn't belong there. From what I can tell, it would appear like virtually every single person there now deserves to be there.

But the problem is that the previous administration had no process by which to separate the merely criminal or the merely misguided from the truly evil. And as a result, thanks in part to the unrelated chaos of Abu Ghraib, the United States, which has rightly prided itself on being the principal advocate of due process and human rights in the world, has come to be seen by some these days as a pretty major apologist for torture and imprisonment without review or remedy. I don't think that's what America really stands for.

President Obama has tried to deal with the fact that Guantanamo has become a major liability to this country in the court of world opinion and in some cases has become a recruiting ground for the very forces that we wish to contain.

In the Presidential campaign, to their credit, both candidates called for closing Guantanamo because they recognized the damage being done to our influence and our security. President Obama won that election and announced his intention to close the facility.

Admittedly, the administration did not demonstrate a high degree of skill in implementing that decision. They had a credible goal, but they clearly had not thought through how to get there. That's why this committee insisted in the 2009 supplemental that the administration present its analysis to the Congress before people who were imprisoned in Guantanamo could be shipped elsewhere and before any detainees could be brought to the U.S. or transferred to another country.

Very frankly, the administration has received very little help from Capitol Hill in thinking through this problem. A number of Members have had legitimate concerns, but they could not come up with any reasonable set of criteria by which transfers could be effected.

Now, this motion would have this body declare that no prisoners can be

transferred anywhere in this country even for prosecution, which they so richly deserve. That means the detainees would have to be transferred to other countries or that Guantanamo would have to remain open as a permanent stain on our reputation for due process.

I think we can do better than that.

Has this country, this country that has even tried the worst criminals in the history of the world at Nuremberg, has this country experienced such a pitiful decline of modern thoughtful political leadership that we now have no capacity except to say lock them up forever, no questions asked, and no due process provided under any circumstances? We may want to lock them up. I'm sure we do. But we can do better in the way we do it.

In America we do not provide due process for the benefit of criminals; we provide it for our own safety's sake.

I don't know how many Members are familiar with the play "A Man for All Seasons" about Sir Thomas More, who was martyred by King Henry VIII. When More's son-in-law, Richard Roper, in that famous play, said that he would cut down every law in England to get at the devil, More replied, "And where would you hide then, the laws all being flat? Yes, I give the devil benefit of law, for my own safety's sake."

That's why it's important that we have a process that will allow us to lock up and throw away the key on everyone in Guantanamo who deserves it; but we cannot tell the world that just because this process is difficult, we are simply going to take the easy road and step over the valleys that make this Nation great.

I refuse to believe, as the gentleman from North Carolina has already indicated, I refuse to believe that our law enforcement officials, our prison officials, and our Justice Department officials are not skilled enough and thoughtful enough to imprison these thugs in high-security facilities at minimal or no danger to our citizens and our communities. Our prisons keep us safe from the likes of Charles Manson; David Berkowitz, the "Son of Sam" killer; the World Trade Center bombers; and the Kenyan Embassy bombers, whom I detest because they killed several friends of mine. What we want to propose in conference will be built on the faith that we do have that capacity.

Now, we can either let somebody else deal with our problems, or we can let them fester because we don't want to deal with them and make hard choices ourselves. That's unacceptable, and I think it's time that we face up to that.

What will emerge from conference, I suspect, will be language that any reasonable person will be able to say is a good-faith, effective process by which we can keep Americans safe and still continue to stand for the due process principles that we have always stood for.

I know these people are enemy combatants and they don't deserve it. But we don't make our decisions on the basis of what we think of defendants. We make our decisions on the basis of what we think of ourselves. And that's what makes us the greatest country in the world. And I do not want, as this motion would have us do, to depart from that high standard today.

Again, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this motion prohibits the granting of any benefits to the detainees at Guantanamo to be brought here for criminal prosecution.

As Mr. OBEY has just said, these are enemy combatants caught, captured on a battlefield. They are not criminal defendants; they are prisoners in a war. Prisoners in a war.

They can and have been tried by the military tribunals at Guantanamo. My understanding is that there were five military tribunal proceedings ongoing until this administration halted those proceedings, trying to figure out what they want to do next.

But my point is these are not criminal defendants; these are enemy combatants captured on a battlefield. They are prisoners of war and should be treated as such, as they have been at Guantanamo. Do not bring them to the U.S. for any purpose. Why would you bring an enemy captured prisoner of war to your country, give them the Miranda warnings, and proceed to a trial as you would an American citizen? It's beyond any question, I think.

These detainees, many of them, those who posed a minimal security threat, have been shuttled off to other foreign countries, leaving hundreds of suspected terrorists, hardened killers that are unwelcome by any place on Earth to be potentially bound for American soil.

Madam Speaker, we need to take a very serious step back and closely examine what we are thinking of doing.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

This motion clarifies and says they would not be brought here for any, any, purpose, including prosecution.

Now, if you have any doubts about the kind of people we are talking about, read the resumes of these detainees. Read them, and you will have no doubt that these are enemy combatants sworn to kill you and every American they can find. And you want to bring them to the U.S.? It's insane, Madam Speaker. It's insane.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to a very distinguished former trial judge in the State of Texas for 21 years, Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, this debate goes on, and I hearken back to how did this all start. It started with enemies of the United States killing American citizens on American soil. By

the grace of God, they didn't kill the number they were hoping to kill because they were hoping to bring down those towers in New York completely full of people, and potentially hundreds of thousands of people could have died. But because of the braveness of the police force and the fire department and others, we were able to evacuate those buildings and the casualty toll was not in the hundreds of thousands or the tens of thousands. But, still, every single American life lost there we care about.

I think most people thought we're going to war, world war. That's what I thought. That's what the people I was with in Taos, New Mexico, at the time thought. And we wanted to do something about it. The American soldiers in two fields of battle have done something about it. They continue to do something about it today. And through the work of our intelligence people and the American soldier and the American Marine Corps, we have brought many of these terrorists to captivity. They are enemy combatants captured on the battlefield.

We're not talking about people who have rights to Miranda warnings. My Lord, how can you fight a war if you're going to have to have Miranda warnings every time you come in contact with an enemy soldier? It makes no sense. Neither our Founding Fathers nor the Supreme Court, I would say, ever envisioned us giving Miranda warnings on the battlefield.

But I believe and I think Americans believe that these people mean us harm and by their very presence on the sacred soil of the United States they bring harm to this country. Because I would argue, as we all know, the recruiting of radical Islam is going on in our prisons right now. Witness just recently some arrests that were made inside this country and how those American citizens got to be influenced by radical Islam. Much of it comes out of the prison systems. And we are going to put people that are being held properly in Guantanamo, we're going to bring them to our soil, give them the rights of an American defendant and put them in the prison system of this country where they can continue—even if they are in solitary confinement, their very presence can make them a hero of the recruiters inside the prison.

□ 1045

Gangs are bad enough in the prisons without us creating gangs that are part of an international plot to destroy the United States of America. These people have no business being on the sacred soil of the United States. They certainly don't have the rights that are being argued for here. They are in the right place, where they belong. The military justice system is fair and they will get a fair trial, and I would argue that they belong in Guantanamo and they should stay in Guantanamo.

Yes, I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we have

maximum security prisons that we could put them in. There is one that was featured in "60 Minutes" awhile back in Colorado where we put the worst of the worst; but did anybody listen to how much it costs us to put the worst of the worst in those maximum security prisons?

We are spending enough money around here without going out and spending that kind of money on prisoners where we already have them in a secure facility, where they are being humanely treated, and where they are able to meet with their lawyers and they are able to prepare for the defense of their case. There is no reason on God's green Earth to bring them over here and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars incarcerating each and every one of them in a Federal maximum security prison. It makes no sense in light of the fact that we are practically bankrupting our country with spending in the last 8 months.

So I think Mr. ROGERS has a very good bill here. I think what he is asking in this motion to instruct the conferees is common sense that the American people understand. Now, we get in this political world up here and common sense seems to go out the window. But I think if you stop the average American on the street, they will tell you that these people intend to kill us and as far as we are concerned, we don't care where they stay, but we don't want them in our neighborhood.

I certainly don't want them in Texas, and I would argue that each Member who represents their district in this august body does not want them in their neighborhood. I have a Federal prison that is within 30 miles of my home, and I promise you, my friends and neighbors do not want one of these detainees in that Federal prison because they are evil and they will corrupt those who are already there.

Madam Speaker, we spend most of our time in the courtroom giving people their constitutional rights as criminal defendants. And I have spent, in a criminal case, at least 50 percent of the time spent on every criminal case, my job was to protect those people's rights and make sure that they got every one of them. I did the very best I could. But at some point in time, in a criminal trial, upon the finding of guilt, those rights convert over to the State and to the people to make decisions on punishment.

I would argue these people don't start with those rights, and the American people have in mind what they think should happen to these people that would kill more American citizens on American soil.

Don't we have the courage of our Greater Generation forefathers to stand up to evil when it addresses our country and do something about that evil? Why would we want to coddle people who have a proven track record of being part of the network that attacked the United States of America?

Madam Speaker, I would argue this is an excellent instruction to the con-

ferrees, and I believe Mr. ROGERS and what he has stated here has expressed the will of the American people.

To address just one of the other issues about photographs, I think that pretty well has been decided.

But, you know, one more thing, as we bring these people here and we put them into the American justice system, which I treasure, the American justice system, but in turn the defense lawyers will be able to use the discovery process to find out about covert operations of the United States intelligence. We have already put our intelligence folks in bad places by our bad behavior around this place many times before. But to put our intelligence people in the courtroom with everybody to see, and out those people, if you will, would be absolutely a travesty of justice.

So this is a good thing to do, and I support Mr. ROGERS in his effort, and I would hope that everybody who cares about this country will support this motion.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am still trying to process the notion that we have in our high-security prisons a population that is just waiting to be corrupted.

We are all aware of the kind of people who are in these high-security prisons. They are already corrupted and they are dangerous, and we have proven our capacity to deal with them. I don't think that it behooves this body to cast such doubt on our capacities, the capacities of the judicial and penal systems of this country. We are up to this, Madam Speaker, and yet the motion before us would say that we cannot bring these people into this country for prosecution when it is clearly in our interest to do so. It is in our interest to close Guantanamo within a reasonable period of time and to bring these people before the bar of justice.

I would like to yield 30 seconds to our full committee chairman.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

I find it quite humorous to think that we are doing these Guantanamo prisoners a favor by exposing them to the "gentle niceties" of the prison population in our high-security prisons. In fact, I would suspect that those prisoners at Guantanamo, if they knew what kind of people they would be finding, would much prefer to stay in Guantanamo than wind up in some of those high-security

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this time.

Every so often an issue comes before Congress where I honestly have to admit I scratch my head and say, Do I fully understand what we are talking about here? Because it makes no sense to me.

On every appropriations bill that we see come before the full committee,

there was this notion that we couldn't bring folks from Guantanamo here to be prosecuted. Now, I know how dangerous some of these folks may be. I know how dangerous some of these folks are. I was in New York in my city on September 11. I was not here. Many people forget that was primary day in New York. Many people forget that one of the accomplishments, if you will, of the terrorists was to suspend, in the middle of the day, an election that was taking place in New York. They didn't just attack the symbol of our military power. They didn't just attack the symbol of our financial power. They were not just geared towards attacking, and did not get a chance to do it, to attack the symbol of our legislative power, but they disrupted an election, which is perhaps at the center of our strength, our electoral process.

I was there. I saw the pain. I know that they killed a lot of people, but they didn't defeat us. Let's be clear about that. They killed a lot of Americans, but they didn't defeat us, and they will never defeat us unless we begin to run away from who we are as a people and as a Nation. Unless we begin to throw away and turn our back on the Constitution, on what makes us a unique country, then they have a chance to win.

My friend, and we say this on the floor, but he truly is my friend from Kentucky, says, Why would we want to do that? Why would we want to bring them here? Because we are the United States of America. Because we are a great democracy that is not afraid to bring people to justice when they deserve to come to justice. Because we have nothing to hide.

Ironically, on another issue that I discussed with my friend at length over the years, we want nothing to do with Cuba except to use them to hold people there for trial. Why not bring them to New York where they committed their act, the scene of their crime? Why not let the world know in the middle of our pain, in the midst of all of our anguish over September 11, we are big enough and democratic enough to bring people to trial here within our territory. We have nothing to fear.

As far as whether or not there will be Miranda rights involved and whether the people have rights, why not? What is so difficult to understand about that? There is a contradiction in a country that continuously tells the world we are better, and we are; we are more democratic, and we are; we have a better justice system, and we do, and at the same time says but not for these individuals.

Now, if I was making the argument on behalf of the individuals in Guantanamo, we know how many were detained and eventually released because we have, throughout the last few years, nothing to charge them with. It might be that we have to release some and send them back to their countries, but this fear that somehow they are going

to be watching the streets of Washington, D.C., and eating at local restaurants and planting bombs everywhere, these folks will probably be the most guarded people in the history of the world. But we will do ourselves a great disservice if we continue to say that they cannot be brought to the United States for justice.

Why should they be near our community residents was one of the questions asked. I see it differently. Why not see our system in full bloom? Why not allow the world to see and understand that we are not afraid to bring people here to pay for their crimes, to go before our justice system.

Now, here is another question. So we bring them to justice in Guantanamo. We find them guilty in Guantanamo. Are we going to incarcerate them in Guantanamo? Are we going to keep them in a foreign country for crimes they committed against our country or are we going to bring them to a prison here? If we bring them to a prison here, after convicted, those who are convicted, why not try them here to begin with?

Again, this whole notion that these people have no rights, the terrorists win if we suggest that everybody that comes before us has no rights. That's why I oppose this motion.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14 minutes. The gentleman from North Carolina has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my greatest appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the job they have done on this bill, which will be perfected by this motion to instruct.

Clearly, the work that involves our dealing with these detainees at Guantanamo Bay is very important work. We have been waiting for a long time now for a complete report from the administration giving us an indication as to how they would implement this campaign promise. We find ourselves in a circumstance today where it is apparent that a pretty sizable number of detainees are in plan for release somewhere, perhaps not the continental United States, but foreign countries and otherwise.

It is almost impossible to discuss, in this environment, the most serious concern about these detainees, for much of the information involved is highly classified information. But, needless to say, this is a group of very dangerous people, and a lot of circumstances have changed since the bill has come out of committee and we finally have it here on the floor for consideration by the conference.

Perfecting this package as we go forward by passing this motion to in-

struct would bring us very close to being in mesh with what is being proposed in the other body. It would appear that the leadership of our committee in the other body feels pretty strongly that we should not be spending funds that would allow these detainees to come to the United States.

This motion to instruct, I believe, will cause our conference to be a much more comfortable conference when we go there. I would urge the Members strongly to support Mr. ROGERS' motion to instruct.

□ 1100

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. We have no further speakers, Madam Speaker, and I would be prepared to yield to the gentleman for a close.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I reiterate my request to our Members to vote against this motion to recommit. The motion is long and complex and by no means totally objectionable. But we have highlighted here today a feature of the Guantanamo provisions which not only is objectionable, but fundamentally runs counter to our country's interest—our country's interest in closing Guantanamo in a timely fashion and bringing the detainees there to trial.

It also, in a strange way, seems to question our country's capacity, the capacity of our judicial system and our penal system, to handle hardened criminals, whereas I think that our capacity to handle even the most dangerous criminals is beyond question. And I believe this motion also risks elevating these criminals in the eyes of the world, suggesting that we can not handle them through our normal processes of justice. For all these reasons, I believe this motion to instruct is unwise, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In closing, this is a very simple motion to instruct the conferees on Homeland Security. One, prohibit the transfer of Gitmo prisoners to the U.S., period. Two, insist on the Senate language prohibiting the release of detainee photographs. And three, require that this bill be available at least 72 hours before the bill is brought to the floor so that Members may have a chance to read and consider before they vote on the conference report. That's simple.

These people in Gitmo, if you read their resumes, and study their history, they are not criminal defendants in the sense that most people understand that phrase to be in the U.S. These are hardened killers captured on the battlefield, and they are prisoners of war subject to a military tribunal hearing at Gitmo, which was proceeding until stopped by this administration. They are not criminal defendants. They are hardened criminals on the battlefield captured in the process of trying to kill American soldiers. Pure and simple.

Now, this motion to instruct is in line with Chairman INOUE in the Senate, who has similar prohibitions in his bill for the Defense appropriations bill. This mirrors what the Senate leadership wants the policy of the country to be. And so I would hope all Members would vote for this motion to instruct conferees and keep our position in line with the Senate in prohibiting prisoners at Gitmo from being brought to the U.S., period.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct conferees will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and agreeing to H. Res. 517 and H. Res. 487.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 163, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 746]

YEAS—258

Aderholt	Carnahan	Goodlatte
Akin	Carter	Gordon (TN)
Alexander	Cassidy	Granger
Altmire	Castle	Graves
Arcuri	Chaffetz	Grayson
Austria	Chandler	Griffith
Bachmann	Childers	Guthrie
Bachus	Coble	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Coffman (CO)	Hall (TX)
Bartlett	Cole	Halvorson
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Harper
Bean	Costa	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	Costello	Heinrich
Bilbray	Crenshaw	Heller
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Herger
Bishop (NY)	Dahlkemper	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (UT)	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hill
Blunt	Davis (TN)	Himes
Bocchieri	Deal (GA)	Hodes
Boehner	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Bonner	Dent	Holden
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Inglis
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Inslee
Boucher	Dreier	Issa
Boustany	Duncan	Jenkins
Boyd	Ehlers	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	Johnson, Sam
Bright	Emerson	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fallin	Jordan (OH)
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kanjorski
Brown-Waite,	Fleming	Kaptur
Ginny	Forbes	King (IA)
Buchanan	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Burgess	Foster	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Fox	Kirk
Buyer	Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kissell
Camp	Gallely	Klein (FL)
Campbell	Garrett (NJ)	Kline (MN)
Cantor	Gerlach	Kosmas
Cao	Giffords	Kratovil
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Cardoza	Gohmert	Lance

Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell

Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Peterson
Souder
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise

Schauer
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—163

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Kagen
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

Paul
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weimer
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Adler (NJ)
Barrett (SC)
Capuano
Carney
Maloney
McCarthy (CA)
Neugebauer
Schmidt
Shadegg
Stark
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1140

Messrs. GONZALEZ, CLEAVER, BLUMENAUER, DICKS, HINOJOSA, DAVIS of Illinois, BRADY of Pennsylvania, LEWIS of Georgia, GUTIERREZ, WEINER, OLVER, PAYNE, ENGEL, HARE, VAN HOLLEN, HOLT, SESTAK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. DOGGETT and LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HERGER, YARMUTH, BILIRAKIS, MOORE of Kansas, WILSON of Ohio and TANNER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct 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. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 746, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING WOMEN'S COLLEGE WORLD SERIES CHAMPION WASHINGTON HUSKIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 517, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 517.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 747]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

McMahon Price (GA) Smith (NJ)
 McMorris Price (NC) Smith (TX)
 Rodgers Putnam Smith (WA)
 McNerney Quigley Snyder
 Meek (FL) Radanovich Souder
 Meeks (NY) Rahall Space
 Melancon Rangel Speier
 Mica Rehberg Spratt
 Michaud Reichert Stearns
 Miller (FL) Reyes Stupak
 Miller (MI) Richardson Sullivan
 Miller (NC) Rodriguez
 Miller, Gary Roe (TN) Tanner
 Miller, George Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY)
 Minnick Rogers (MI) Taylor
 Mitchell Rohrabacher Teague
 Mollohan Rooney Terry
 Moore (KS) Thompson (CA) Abercrombie
 Moore (WI) Ros-Lehtinen Thompson (MS) Ackerman
 Moran (KS) Roskam Thompson (PA) Aderholt
 Moran (VA) Ross Thornberry Alexander
 Murphy (CT) Rothman (NJ) Tiahrt Altmire
 Murphy (NY) Roybal-Allard Tiberi Andrews
 Murphy, Patrick Royce Tierney Arcuri
 Murphy, Tim Ruppertsberger Titus Austria
 Murtha Rush Tonko Baca
 Myrick Ryan (OH) Bachmann Davis (IL)
 Nadler (NY) Ryan (WI) Bachus Davis (KY)
 Napolitano Salazar Turner Davis (TN)
 Neal (MA) Sánchez, Linda Deal (GA)
 Nunes T. DeFazio DeFazio
 Nye Sanchez, Loretta Van Hollen DeGette
 Oberstar Sarbanes Velázquez Delahunt
 Obey Scalise Visclosky Jackson-Lee
 Olson Schakowsky Walden (TX)
 Olver Schauer Walz Bean
 Ortiz Schiff Wamp Becerra
 Pallone Schock Wasserman Berkley
 Pascrell Schrader Schultz Berry
 Pastor (AZ) Schwartz Watson Biggart
 Paul Scott (GA) Watt Bilbray
 Paulsen Scott (VA) Waxman Driehaus
 Pense Sensenbrenner Weiner Duncan
 Perlmutter Sessions Welch Edwards (MD)
 Perriello Sestak Westmoreland Edwards (TX)
 Peters Shea-Porter Wexler Bocchieri
 Peterson Sherman Wilson (OH) Ehlers
 Petri Shimkus Wilson (SC) Ellison
 Pingree (ME) Shuler Wittman Ellsworth
 Pitts Shuster Wolf Emerson
 Platts Simpson Woolsey Engel
 Poe (TX) Sires Wu Eshoo
 Polis (CO) Skelton Yarmuth Etheridge
 Pomeroy Slaughter Young (AK) Fallin
 Posey Smith (NE) Young (FL) Farr
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cao
 Capito
 Capps
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carson (IN)
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Childers
 Chu
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 487.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 748]

YEAS—413

Costello Himes
 Courtney Hinchey
 Crenshaw Hinojosa
 Crowley Hirono
 Cuellar Hodes
 Culberson Hoekstra
 Cummings Holden
 Dahlkemper Holt
 Davis (AL) Honda
 Davis (CA) Hoyer
 Davis (IL) Hunter
 Davis (KY) Inglis
 Davis (TN) Inslee
 Deal (GA) Israel
 DeFazio Issa
 DeGette Jackson (IL)
 Delahunt Jackson-Lee
 DeLauro (TX)
 Dent Jenkins
 Diaz-Balart, L. Johnson (GA)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Johnson (IL)
 Dicks Johnson, E. B.
 Dingell Johnson, Sam
 Doggett Jones
 Donnelly (IN) Jordan (OH)
 Doyle Kagen
 Dreier Kanjorski
 Driehaus Kaptur
 Duncan Kennedy
 Edwards (MD) Kildee
 Edwards (TX) Kilpatrick (MI)
 Ehlers Kilroy
 Ellison Kind
 Ellsworth King (IA)
 Emerson King (NY)
 Engel Kingston
 Eshoo Kirk
 Etheridge Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Fallin Kissell
 Farr Klein (FL)
 Fattah Kline (MN)
 Filner Kosmas
 Flake Kratovich
 Fleming Kucinich
 Forbes Lamborn
 Fortenberry Lance
 Foster Langevin
 Foxx Larsen (WA)
 Frank (MA) Larson (CT)
 Franks (AZ) Latham
 Frelinghuysen LaTourette
 Fudge Latta
 Gallegly Lee (CA)
 Garrett (NJ) Lee (NY)
 Gerlach Levin
 Giffords Lewis (CA)
 Gingrey (GA) Lewis (GA)
 Gohmert Linder
 Gonzalez Lipinski
 Goodlatte LoBiondo
 Gordon (TN) Loeb sack
 Granger Lofgren, Zoe
 Graves Lowey
 Grayson Lucas
 Green, Al Luetkemeyer
 Green, Gene Luján
 Griffith Lummis
 Grijalva Lungren, Daniel
 Guthrie E.
 Gutierrez Lynch
 Hall (NY) Mack
 Hall (TX) Maffei
 Halvorson Manzullo
 Hare Marchant
 Harman Markey (CO)
 Harper Markey (MA)
 Hastings (FL) Marshall
 Hastings (WA) Matheson
 Heinrich Matsui
 Hensarling McCarthy (NY)
 Herger McCaul
 Herseth Sandlin McClintock
 Higgins McCollum
 Hill McCotter

Platts Skelton
 Poe (TX) Slaughter
 Polis (CO) Smith (NE)
 Pomeroy Smith (NJ)
 Posey Smith (TX)
 Price (GA) Smith (WA)
 Price (NC) Snyder
 Putnam Souder
 Quigley Space
 Radanovich Speier
 Rahall Spratt
 Rangel Stearns
 Rehberg Stupak
 Reichert Sullivan
 Reyes Sutton
 Richardson Tanner
 Rodriguez Taylor
 Roe (TN) Teague
 Rogers (AL) Terry
 Rogers (KY) Thompson (CA)
 Rogers (MI) Thompson (MS)
 Rohrabacher Thompson (PA)
 Rooney Thornberry
 Ros-Lehtinen Tiahrt
 Roskam Tiberi
 Ross Tierney
 Rothman (NJ) Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI)
 Salazar Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda Sánchez, Linda
 T. T.
 Sanchez, Loretta Velázquez
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Scalise Scalise
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schauer Schauer
 Schiff Schiff
 Schock Schock
 Schrader Schrader
 Schwartz Schwartz
 Scott (GA) Scott (VA)
 Scott (VA) Sensenbrenner
 Sensenbrenner Sessions
 Serrano Serrano
 Sessions Sessions
 Shea-Porter Shea-Porter
 Sherman Sherman
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Shuler Shuler
 Shuster Shuster
 Simpson Simpson
 Sires Sires
 Skelton Skelton
 Slaughter Slaughter
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE)

NOT VOTING—19

Adler (NJ) Maloney Shadegg
 Barrett (SC) McCarthy (CA) Stark
 Berman McCarthy (CA) Wexler
 Capuano Neugebauer Whitfield
 Carney Royce Wilson (OH)
 Carter Rush
 Heller Schmidt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1155

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 748, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2892, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRICE of North Carolina, SERRANO, RODRIGUEZ,

NOT VOTING—11

Adler (NJ) Maloney Shadegg
 Barrett (SC) McCarthy (CA) Stark
 Capuano Neugebauer Whitfield
 Carney Schmidt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1149

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SHADEGG. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 747, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE NEWS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 487, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

RUPPERSBERGER, MOLLOHAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. FARR, ROTHMAN, OBEY, ROGERS of Kentucky, CARTER, CULBERSON, KIRK, CALVERT, and LEWIS of California.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3183, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 788 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 788

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. 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 (Mr. ALTMIRE). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 788.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 788 provides for consideration of the conference report for H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for 2010. The rule is a standard conference report rule. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against the consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. However, I want to point out that although the rule waives all points of order, the conference report does not violate either clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairman OBEY as well as Mr. PASTOR for their work to bring this conference report before the House today.

When we think of the long-term health of our country, the Energy and Water appropriations bill is one of the most important bills that we consider. The conference report before us today will keep communities safe from flooding, invest in clean energy and renewable technologies, fight nuclear proliferation, and create jobs through infrastructure development.

Without this bill, millions of homes would be exposed to devastating floods, clean energy research that will power the next generation of money-making technologies will stop, nuclear weapons proliferation would pick up again, and the pace of job creation in the clean energy sector would slow to a crawl or even stop altogether. These are the reasons why today's conference report is so important.

In the field of energy, the conference report fulfills Congress's promise to chart a new path for a national energy policy. The conference agreement provides \$27 billion for the Department of Energy to help fund clean energy development and perform basic scientific research. It devotes millions of dollars to solar energy development, advanced vehicle technologies, energy-efficient buildings, and biofuels that can be grown right here at home.

When we make our own fuel, Mr. Speaker, we create domestic jobs and also take steps toward becoming energy independent. We recognized this fact in the Energy and Commerce Committee when we wrote the American Clean Energy and Security Act, which is why I'm pleased to see these provisions part of today's conference report.

This appropriations bill also funds a number of applied research grants at the Department of Energy for potentially high-reward activities like fusion energy, high-energy physics, and biological research. Future generations will look back at these investments and thank us for having the foresight to recognize that one generation's long-term research is future generations' short-term gain.

□ 1200

Many of my colleagues would be satisfied to know that the conference report also devotes resources to fossil fuel-based energy that can provide a boost to our energy independence efforts in relatively short order. In it, \$672 million is provided for research and development into things like carbon capture and sequestration, natural gas recovery, and unconventional petroleum research activities. This research will benefit independent petroleum producers and can also help make our country more energy independent for the short term.

Also to that end, the conference report takes a responsible approach toward nuclear energy by investing in fuel cycle research and development. By providing more than \$700 million for nuclear energy, the conferees made the pragmatic calculation that nuclear will be part of our energy mix in the

short term. But no matter how electricity is generated, one challenge we face is delivering it effectively to its destination. For this reason, the conference report provides more than \$100 million to modernize and secure our national electricity grid. By almost tripling the amount of funding for grid-connected energy storage and cybersecurity, the conferees have recognized how closely our energy policy is tied to our national security.

The energy portion of this conference report is only half the story though, Mr. Speaker. For my district and for people living in floodplains across the country, this energy and water conference report is a major victory. Funding for the Army Corps of Engineers is increased over both 2009 levels and over the President's request for a total of \$5.4 billion. For my constituents, this funding can be a matter of life and death. My district is where the Sacramento and American Rivers converge. As a result, Sacramento is the most at-risk city for major flooding in the United States. More than 440,000 people, 110,000 structures, the capitol of the State of California and up to \$58 billion are at risk from flooding in my district alone. Nearly \$90 million of vital funding in this conference report will reinforce levees along the American and Sacramento Rivers to keep these national assets safe and dry.

For all of Sacramento, this means safer homes, more secure schools, better protected community centers and a higher quality of life. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, Federal levees currently provide a 6-to-1 return on flood damages prevented when compared to initial building costs.

But the flood protection funding in this conference agreement is more than just dollars and cents, Mr. Speaker. When I go home and walk along the Sacramento River, and when I look at the houses and schools and parks that sit behind the levees, I'm reminded how vital the Energy and Water bill is. In many parts of the country, it can mean the difference between a thriving city and a disaster area. Flood protection is a regional undertaking though. Floodwaters do not stop and start based on congressional district boundaries. That is why I am pleased that the conference report contains more than \$60 million to improve the ability of Folsom Dam to protect my constituents who live below it. This money will also help the Joint Federal Project to provide greater efficiency in managing flood storage in Folsom Reservoir.

Around the whole country, from Sacramento to the Mississippi River Delta, from rural Ohio to the Bronx River Basin, this conference agreement protects our communities by investing in our aging infrastructure. And when we rebuild our infrastructure, we rebuild our economy. The infrastructure funding in this conference report before us today will continue this pattern of creating jobs while investing in public

safety. For that reason, I strongly support the rule and the underlying conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Mr. OBEY and the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this conference agreement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California, my friend, for yielding me the time. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule—once again, a closed rule—coming out of the Rules Committee and the process that brought this bill to the floor. My friends on the other side of the aisle for the first time in history shut down the appropriation process by placing extremely restrictive rules on every single appropriation bill that has come to the floor of the House this year. Chairman OBEY set an arbitrary timeline to finish the fiscal year 2010 spending bills, which has forced the Democrat Rules Committee to limit every Republican and Democrat's chance to offer an amendment on the floor.

Why? For what reason? There are hundreds of good amendments which were offered by all of my colleagues which were rejected in this unprecedented fashion. Now that this House has finished all the appropriation bills, you would think that my friends on the other side of the aisle would allow for an appropriate time and an appropriate process for consideration of the conference reports, not just come to this House floor but for Members to be heard from and for us to go back to a process which this House was used to in its precedents for so many years.

But no. Last night the conference report was filed after 6 p.m., I believe 6:17, and the Rules Committee met at 7:15 to report out a rule for floor consideration. Our Democrat colleagues in the committee waived the House rule that requires a 3-day layover of conference reports and scheduled a bill on the floor first thing this morning. Additionally, just last week this House voted to adopt a motion to instruct that stated that the conference report, a bill that we are discussing on the floor here today, should be available online in a searchable format for at least 48 hours before it's voted on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, forget the 3-day rule. Forget the 48-hour motion to instruct; this House was given just less than 24 hours to review the conference report and its changes. I don't know when my Democrat colleagues will allow for the open, honest and ethical Congress that they once called for, but we're on the floor once again saying, We have met the deadline that Chairman OBEY wanted. Can we get back to a normal process now, a normal process that is not good just for Republicans and not just for our Democratic Members but good for this House to follow?

Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing the Energy and Water appropriation

conference report for fiscal year 2010. Today it is my intention to focus on the increase in spending over last year's level and destructive initiatives that the Democrat majority continues to pursue that have only killed jobs and led to record deficits. This administration and this Democratic Congress promised the American public jobs, economic growth, economic recovery, health care, a cleaner environment, better education and just a wonderful, wonderful life, all contained within their appropriation bills. And the list goes on and on with other promises.

Yet the only thing up to now that they really have accomplished is record deficits, record spending and record unemployment numbers all across America. The fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water appropriation conference report provides \$33.5 billion in total funding, which is hundreds of millions of dollars above last year's level, and this is in addition to the \$58.7 billion provided in fiscal year 2009 emergency funding just from a few months ago, mostly from the stimulus bill.

We have seen massive government spending. Now this bill does not represent any commitment to fiscal sustainability. More promises, more spending, more deficit, more record unemployment. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration promised America, if Congress passed the stimulus bill, that unemployment would not go beyond 8 percent, that it would create and save millions of jobs. Here we are 8 months later with a record 9.7 unemployment rate, the highest in 26 years, and more than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs since the passage of the \$1.2 trillion "stimulus employment plan."

This summer when discussing the stimulus, Vice President BIDEN said the Obama administration—and I quote—"misread how bad the economy was," even though as a candidate for President and Vice President both of them had been all over the country. They had seen firsthand exactly the circumstance this country was in.

The Obama administration got it wrong. They got it wrong when it came to the stimulus, and the American people know they got it wrong also. The American people can no longer afford this Democrat-controlled House, Senate and White House. We've got to start getting it right, not guessing and getting it wrong. Spending hundreds of millions of dollars more in addition to the \$58 billion additional spending this year is not a way to fix the problem. In June of this year, my friends on the other side of the aisle passed a cap-and-trade bill that will raise prices on energy, goods, and services, and every single hardworking American across the country will pay that price.

In my home State of Texas, the average household can expect to pay more than \$1,100 a year extra as a result of that legislation. Additionally, this legislation could ultimately kill over 1.38 million jobs that are in the manufacturing sector of this economy. That's 1.38 million more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, some time this month the Democrat-controlled House wants to pass sweeping health care reform. Effectively, it will diminish the employer-based insurance market and forces 114 million Americans into a government-run program. This \$1.2 trillion package raises taxes once again, raises taxes once again, raises taxes once again, which is what this Democratic-controlled Congress is about. Raise \$1.2 trillion in taxes on individuals and small businesses that do not participate in the government plan and \$800 billion, which the President talks about will be necessary to fund this massive government takeover and will result in 4.7 to 5.5 million more private-sector jobs being lost in America.

In July, the Congressional Budget Office director stated that the Democratic health care proposal "significantly expands the Federal responsibility for health care costs." Mr. Speaker, I thought that the goal of health reform was to bring costs down for Americans, not to increase the cost, further America toward bankruptcy and to cost 4.7 to 5.5 million more enterprise system jobs. By the way, those are jobs that are not in Washington, D.C.

The American people know that you cannot spend what you don't have, and that's exactly what we are doing here today with the Democratic majority. Earlier this month, the Treasury Department released a statement reporting that the Federal budget deficit reached a record \$1.378 trillion and that the national debt reached \$11.8 trillion by the end of August. This means that since 2007, this Democratic Congress has increased the Federal deficit by \$1.217 billion and increased the national debt by over \$3 trillion. What a record.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to point out that our friends on the other side of the aisle should not tax and spend not only this country but also hardworking families into a further economic recession.

□ 1215

My Democratic colleagues need to get a handle on the out-of-control spending which they dogged us repeatedly about when we were in the majority at far lesser levels.

Rising unemployment and record deficits cannot be remedied with massive increases in spending by Uncle Sam. Huge energy and health care costs that raise taxes and kill jobs is not what our economy needs right now. Americans need a balance. They need to listen to what is happening in Washington only to see that Washington is the problem, not the answer. Americans are tightening their belts because they get it. Congress should be doing the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked today about the process. We have talked today about spending. And we have talked about the overall agenda of this

Democratic majority that is about taxing, it is about spending, it is about record unemployment, rather than working on the things that the American people, the people back home who sent us here to do our job, are working on.

I encourage a “no” vote on this rule.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleague on the other side of the aisle that we’re not debating the American Clean Energy and Security Act or the health care reform bill. We are dealing today with the conference report for Energy and Water Development.

And I must say that this is a bill, a conference report, that has strong bipartisan support. As far as job creation, this is about infrastructure, spending on public safety projects that will save jobs across America. As I said before, it’s a smart investment, the type of smart investment the American people want this Congress to be making at this difficult point in our history.

Our Nation’s levees are crumbling, and we’re putting public health at risk because of things like that. This is the time to invest in infrastructure like this.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the thought process here in Washington is that we can solve all the problems that our country has, just trust Washington. I think now more than ever we are seeing at the end of this year that the leadership in Washington, D.C., the bills that are on this floor, the votes which we take virtually every single time, every single vote is about more taxes, more spending, more rules and regulations that are thrown to the American people with this package about how great this is for the American people.

Yet what happens is that Members of Congress, lots of them in our body on both sides, go back home and they listen to the American people. And they listen to the American people talk what I think is a lot of common sense: common sense about how to fix our health care, how to fix our spending, how to fix the unemployment, how to encourage manufacturing rather than deleting it.

Then they look up and see the political agenda of the Democratic Party, that in the three biggest political bills that represent the Democratic Party we will lose almost 10 million jobs in this country; and the political agenda of the Democratic Party, one which this body is barreling down that pathway to meet and match, has resulted in disaster for people back home.

So the Republican Party will continue to come to Washington and be faithful after listening, and we will go to our committees and we will throw our ideas on the floor and ask the committees to vote on them. We will con-

tinue to have Members come to the Rules Committee that seek time, permission to speak about ideas that will better the bills.

Yet we find that in these instances before the Rules Committee, it really doesn’t matter. It doesn’t matter not just for Republicans, but it really doesn’t matter to a Democrat either. They will block the best ideas that come from the heartland.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a way to continue. We are once again coming to the floor, as I have done all year, and my colleagues DAVID DREIER, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, and VIRGINIA FOXX, as we explain the rules and explain the Rules Committee, explain what is happening: receiving a bill at 3 o’clock in the morning; getting a bill, as we did last night, 1 hour before the meeting; not even following the rules from a resolution we had just the week before about online availability of bills.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the American people are up in arms and insisting that Members of Congress read the bill first; that every single Member of this body is given a chance every single time to say, I disagree with the direction that the Democratic leadership is taking us.

We need to read the bills. We need to take the ideas from people in the heartland, through their Representatives in committees and up in the Rules Committee, and make these in order and follow a process that the American people, if they were sitting in, would say, Why not take more time? Why not understand the bill? Why not cut spending? Why not make some commonsense directional issues happen in this Congress? This leadership, these bills continue to follow a process that the American people are questioning.

We will continue coming to the floor and politely, on behalf of people back home, say that we would hope that we would go back to regular processes instead of setting a new record every time for closed rules. I think it’s important. I think it’s important.

We will keep coming to the floor, and we will dutifully keep speaking up, and we will make sure that we are properly representing those people who are talking about better process, better direction, and doing the things that will work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The rule before us today is a fair rule that is aligned with the customary practice of the House for rules governing debate on conference reports.

After numerous hearings and constructive negotiations with the Senate, the Appropriations Committee has crafted an important and balanced bill. It invests in new technologies, scientific research, and conservation efforts that are critical to the long-term health of our economy and our planet.

Most importantly for my district, this legislation increases funding for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Every dollar is crucial for my constituents in Sacramento as we work to improve our water infrastructure, as I know it is to all my colleagues in the House with similar bills.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman PASTOR for recognizing how critical this funding is to all of us. We rely upon it to fortify our levees, raise our dams, and keep our communities safe and dry.

This bill also looks to the future by investing in the development of a new smart grid to ensure electricity delivery and energy reliability. And it makes a strong commitment to renewable energy and scientific research.

I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 788 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on H. Res. 692 and H. Con. Res. 151.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 181, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 749]

YEAS—234

Abercrombie	Conyers	Green, Al
Ackerman	Cooper	Green, Gene
Altmire	Costa	Grijalva
Andrews	Costello	Gutierrez
Arcuri	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Baca	Crowley	Halvorson
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hare
Barrow	Cummings	Harman
Bean	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Heinrich
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Herseth Sandlin
Berman	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Berry	Davis (TN)	Hill
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Himes
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hinchev
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bocchieri	DeLauro	Hirono
Boren	Dicks	Hodes
Boswell	Dingell	Holden
Boucher	Doggett	Holt
Boyd	Donnelly (IN)	Honda
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hoyer
Bralley (IA)	Driehaus	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Edwards (MD)	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Edwards (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Capps	Ellison	(TX)
Cardoza	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Carnahan	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Etheridge	Kagen
Castor (FL)	Farr	Kaptur
Chandler	Fattah	Kennedy
Childers	Filner	Kildee
Chu	Foster	Kilpatrick (MI)
Clarke	Frank (MA)	Killroy
Clay	Fudge	Kind
Cleaver	Giffords	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Kissell
Cohen	Gordon (TN)	Klein (FL)
Connolly (VA)	Grayson	Kosmas

Langevin Neal (MA) Sestak Thornberry Walden Wolf
 Larsen (WA) Oberstar Shea-Porter Tiahrt Wamp Young (AK)
 Larson (CT) Obey Sherman Tiberi Westmoreland Young (FL)
 Lee (CA) Oliver Sires Turner Wilson (SC)
 Levin Ortiz Skelton Upton Wittman
 Lewis (GA) Pallone Slaughter
 Lipinski Pastor (AZ) Smith (WA)
 Loeb sack Payne Snyder
 Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter Space
 Lowey Perriello Speier
 Lynch Peters Spratt
 Maffei Peterson Stark
 Markey (CO) Pingree (ME) Stupak
 Markey (MA) Polis (CO) Sutton
 Marshall Pomeroy Tanner
 Massa Price (NC) Taylor
 Matheson Rahall Teague
 Matsui Rangel Thompson (CA)
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes Thompson (MS)
 McCollum Richardson Tierney
 McDermott Rodriguez Titus
 McGovern Ross Tonko
 McIntyre Rothman (NJ) Towns
 McMahon Roybal-Allard Tsongas
 McNerney Ruppertsberger Van Hollen
 Meek (FL) Rush Velázquez
 Meeks (NY) Ryan (OH) Vislosky
 Michaud Salazar Walz
 Miller (NC) Sánchez, Linda Wasserman
 Miller, George T. Schultz
 Mitchell Sanchez, Loretta
 Mollohan Sarbanes Watson
 Moore (KS) Schakowsky Watt
 Moore (WI) Schauer Waxman
 Moran (VA) Schiff Weiner
 Murphy (CT) Schrader Welch
 Murphy, Patrick Schwartz Wilson (OH)
 Murtha Scott (GA) Woolsey
 Nadler (NY) Scott (VA) Wu
 Napolitano Serrano Yarmuth

NAYS—181

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

Adler (NJ) Lamborn Quigley
 Barrett (SC) Lujan Schmidt
 Capuano Maloney Souder
 Carney McCarthy (CA) Wexler
 Greigrey (GA) Neugebauer Whitfield
 Inslee Pascrell

NOT VOTING—17

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1252

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SIMPSON and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING TAY-SACHS AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 692, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 692, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 750]

YEAS—415

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

Dingell Kirkpatrick (AZ) Platts
 Doggett Kissell Poe (TX)
 Donnelly (IN) Klein (FL) Polis (CO)
 Doyle Kline (MN) Pomeroy
 Dreier Kosmas Posey
 Driehaus Kratovil Price (GA)
 Duncan Kucinich Price (NC)
 Edwards (MD) Lance Putnam
 Edwards (TX) Langevin Radanovich
 Ehlers Larson (WA) Rahall
 Ellison Larson (CT) Rangel
 Ellsworth Latham Rehberg
 Emerson LaTourette Reichert
 Engel Latta Reyes
 Eshoo Lee (CA) Richardson
 Etheridge Lee (NY) Rodriguez
 Fallin Levin Roe (TN)
 Farr Lewis (CA) Rogers (AL)
 Fattah Lewis (GA) Rogers (KY)
 Filner Linder Rogers (MI)
 Flake Lipinski Rohrabacher
 Fleming LoBiondo Rooney
 Forbes Loeb sack Ros-Lehtinen
 Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe Roskam
 Foster Ross
 Foyx Lucas Rothman (NJ)
 Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer Roybal-Allard
 Franks (AZ) Lummis Royce
 Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel Ruppertsberger
 Fudge E. Rush
 Gallegly Lynch Ryan (OH)
 Garrett (NJ) Mack Ryan (WI)
 Gerlach Maffei Salazar
 Giffords Manzullo Sánchez, Linda
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant T.
 Gohmert Markey (MA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Gonzalez Marshall Sarbanes
 Goodlatte Massa Scalise
 Granger Matheson Schakowsky
 Graves Matsui Schauer
 Grayson McCarthy (NY) Schiff
 Green, Al McCaul Schock
 Green, Gene McClintock Schrader
 Griffith McCollum Schwartz
 Grijalva McCotter Scott (GA)
 Guthrie McDermott Scott (VA)
 Gutierrez McGovern Sensenbrenner
 Hall (NY) McHenry Serrano
 Hall (TX) McIntyre Sessions
 Halvorson McKeon Sestak
 Hare McMahan Shadegg
 Harman McMorriss Shea-Porter
 Harper Rodgers Sherman
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL) Shimkus
 Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY) Shuler
 Heinrich Melancon Shuster
 Heller Mica Simpson
 Hensarling Michaud Sires
 Herger Miller (FL) Skelton
 Herseth Sandlin Miller (MI) Slaughter
 Higgins Miller (NC) Smith (NE)
 Hill Miller, Gary Smith (NJ)
 Himes Miller, George Smith (TX)
 Hinchey Minnick Smith (WA)
 Hinojosa Mitchell Snyder
 Hirono Mollohan Souder
 Hodes Moore (KS) Space
 Hoekstra Moore (WI) Speier
 Holden Moran (KS) Spratt
 Holt Moran (VA) Stark
 Honda Murphy (CT) Stearns
 Hoyer Murphy (NY) Stupak
 Hunter Murphy, Patrick Sullivan
 Inglis Murphy, Tim Sutton
 Inslee Murtha Tanner
 Israel Myrick Taylor
 Issa Nadler (NY) Teague
 Jackson (IL) Napolitano Terry
 Jackson-Lee Neal (MA) Thompson (CA)
 (TX) Nunes Thompson (MS)
 Jenkins Nye Thompson (PA)
 Johnson (GA) Oberstar Thornberry
 Johnson (IL) Obey Tiahrt
 Johnson, E.B. Olson Tiberi
 Johnson, Sam Oliver Tierney
 Jones Ortiz Titus
 Jordan (OH) Pallone Tonko
 Kagen Pastor (AZ) Towns
 Kanjorski Paul Tsongas
 Kaptur Paulsen Turner
 Kennedy Payne Upton
 Kildee Pence Van Hollen
 Kilpatrick (MI) Perlmutter Velázquez
 Kilroy Perriello Vislosky
 Kind Peters Walden
 King (IA) Peterson Walz
 King (NY) Wamp
 Kingston Pingree (ME) Wasserman
 Kirk Pitts Schultz

Waters Westmoreland Wu
 Watson Wilson (OH) Yarmuth
 Watt Wilson (SC) Young (AK)
 Waxman Wittman Young (FL)
 Weiner Wolf
 Welch Woolsey

NOT VOTING—17

Adler (NJ) Luján Pascrell
 Barrett (SC) Maloney Quigley
 Capuano Markey (CO) Schmidt
 Carney McCarthy (CA) Waxler
 Gordon (TN) McNerney Whitfield
 Lamborn Neugebauer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1300

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING FOR RELEASE OF LIU XIAOBO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 151, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 151, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 751]

YEAS—410

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

Donnelly (IN) Kline (MN) Pomeroy Welch Wittman Yarmuth
 Doyle Kosmas Posey Westmoreland Wolf Young (AK)
 Dreier Kratovil Price (GA) Wilson (OH) Woolsey Young (FL)
 Driehaus Kucinich Price (NC) Wilson (SC) Wu
 Duncan Lance Putnam
 Edwards (MD) Langevin Radanovich
 Edwards (TX) Larsen (WA) Rahall
 Ehlers Larson (CT) Rangel
 Ellsworth Latham Rehberg
 Emerson LaTourette Royce
 Engel Latta Reyes
 Eshoo Lee (CA) Richardson
 Etheridge Lee (NY) Rodriguez
 Fallin Levin Roe (TN)
 Farr Lewis (CA) Rogers (AL)
 Fattah Lewis (GA) Rogers (KY)
 Filner Linder Rogers (MI)
 Flake Lipinski Rohrabacher
 Fleming LoBiondo Rooney
 Forbes Loebbecke Ros-Lehtinen
 Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe Roskam
 Foster Lowey Ross
 Foxx Lucas Rothman (NJ)
 Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer Roybal-Allard
 Franks (AZ) Lummis Royce
 Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel Ruppertsberger
 Fudge E. Rush
 Gallegly Lynch Ryan (OH)
 Garrett (NJ) Mack Ryan (WI)
 Gerlach Maffei Salazar
 Giffords Manzullo Sánchez, Linda
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant T.
 Gonzalez Markey (CO) Sanchez, Loretta
 Goodlatte Markey (MA) Sarbanes
 Gordon (TN) Marshall Scalise
 Granger Massa Schakowsky
 Graves Matheson Schauer
 Grayson Matsui Schiff
 Green, Al McCarthy (NY) Schock
 Green, Gene McCaul Schrader
 Griffith McClintock Schwartz
 Grijalva McCollum Scott (GA)
 Guthrie McCotter Scott (VA)
 Gutierrez McDermott Sensenbrenner
 Hall (NY) McGovern Serrano
 Hall (TX) McHenry Sessions
 Halvorson McIntyre Sestak
 Hare McKeon Shadegg
 Harman McMahan Shea-Porter
 Harper McMorris Sherman
 Hastings (FL) Rodgers Shimkus
 Hastings (WA) McNeerney Shuler
 Heinrich Meeke (FL) Shuster
 Heller Meeks (NY) Simpson
 Hensarling Melancon Sires
 Herger Mica Skelton
 Herseth Sandlin Michaud Slaughter
 Higgins Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Hill Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Himes Miller, Gary Smith (TX)
 Hinchey Miller, George Smith (WA)
 Hinojosa Minnick Snyder
 Hirono Mitchell Souder
 Hodes Mollohan Space
 Hoekstra Moore (KS) Speier
 Holden Moore (WI) Spratt
 Holt Moran (KS) Stark
 Honda Moran (VA) Stearns
 Hoyer Murphy (CT) Stupak
 Hunter Murphy (NY) Sullivan
 Inglis Murphy, Patrick Sutton
 Inslee Murphy, Tim Tanner
 Israel Murtha Taylor
 Issa Myrick Teague
 Jackson (IL) Nadler (NY) Terry
 Jackson-Lee Napolitano Thompson (CA)
 (TX) Neal (MA) Thompson (MS)
 Jenkins Nunes Thompson (PA)
 Johnson (GA) Nye Thornberry
 Johnson (IL) Oberstar Tiahrt
 Johnson, E. B. Obey Tierney
 Johnson, Sam Olson Titus
 Jones Olver Tonko
 Jordan (OH) Ortiz Towns
 Kagen Pallone Tsongas
 Kanjorski Pastor (AZ) Turner
 Kaptur Paulsen Upton
 Kennedy Payne Van Hollen
 Kildee Pence Velázquez
 Kilpatrick (MI) Perlmutter Walden
 Kilroy Perriello Walz
 Kind Peters Wasserman
 King (IA) Peterson Weiser
 King (NY) Petri Schultz
 Kingston Pingree (ME) Waters
 Kirk Pitts Watson
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Platts Watt
 Kissell Poe (TX) Waxman
 Klein (FL) Polis (CO) Weiner

Wittman Wolf
 Woolsey Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—21

Adler (NJ) Gohmert Pascrell
 Barrett (SC) Lamborn Quigley
 Capuano Luján Schmidt
 Carney Maloney Tiberi
 Conyers McCarthy (CA) Visclosky
 Deal (GA) Miller (NC) Waxler
 Ellison Neugebauer Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1307

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 788, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 788, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 30, 2009, at page H10150.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) each will control minutes 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3183.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act for fiscal year 2010.

The conference agreement before us is a good one, and it merits the support of all of the Members of the House.

The agencies and the programs under the jurisdiction of energy and water development contribute to solving many of the most pressing challenges facing our country, including strengthening and maintaining our water infrastructure, advancing U.S. scientific leadership, combating global climate change with renewable and cleaner energy technologies, and providing security against nuclear threats. I believe the conference agreement provides strong support for these agencies and programs.

The total amount of funding included in the energy and water conference agreement is \$35.5 billion. This constitutes an increase of \$204 million from the enacted level for fiscal year 2009. While the conference agreement is below the budget request, the primary reason for this difference is the Congressional Budget Office score of the Department of Energy's budget. The conference agreement provides \$571 million above the budget request in program scope to further critical energy, water development and related goals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman BYRON DORGAN, and his ranking member, ROBERT BENNETT, for their hard work during this conference. I especially want to extend my appreciation to my ranking member, the Honorable RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, for his extraordinary cooperation and insight. I truly value his support and advice and that of all of the members of our Energy and Water Subcommittee. I believe we are all proud of this bipartisan product.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I would also like to thank the staff for their help in shepherding this bill through the House and through conference with the Senate. The subcommittee staff includes Taunja Berquam, Robert Sherman, Joseph Levin, James Windle, Casey Pearce, and our detailee from the Corps of Engineers, Lauren Minto.

I also want to thank Richard Patrick of my staff and Rob Blair and Kevin Jones of the minority staff, and Nancy Fox and Kathleen Hazlett of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's staff.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous support in the House for the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2010. The agencies and programs under the jurisdiction of Energy and Water Development contribute to solving many of the most pressing challenges facing our country, including strengthening and maintaining our water infrastructure, advancing U.S. scientific leadership, combating global climate change with renewable and cleaner energy technologies, and providing security against nuclear threats. I believe the conference agreement provides strong support for these agencies and programs.

The total amount of funding included in the Energy and Water conference agreement is

\$33.5 billion. This constitutes an increase of \$204 million from the enacted level for fiscal year 2009, and is approximately \$929 million below the budget request. While the conference agreement is below the budget request, the primary reason for this difference is a Congressional Budget Office score of \$1.5 billion for the Department of Energy's budget request for the Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program. The conference agreement provides \$571 million above the budget request in program scope.

Title I of this conference report provides funding for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, including the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program. The conference agreement provides the Corps with \$5.4 billion in fiscal year 2010, slightly above fiscal year 2009, and \$320 million over the budget request. These investments will provide increased transportation efficiency on our nation's waterways, job creation, clean water, and, most importantly, will ensure the safety of our citizens. The conference agreement also recognizes the increasing cost of aging infrastructure through significantly increased funding for the operation and maintenance of existing projects.

The conference agreement continues to limit new contract obligations that require funding from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund due to the insolvency of the Fund. If the revenue stream is not addressed, the level of investment must be adjusted to the available resources—resulting in increased costs to existing projects as they are suspended, as well as the deferral of new projects in need of recapitalization. I would urge the administration and interested parties to pursue this issue with the relevant authorizing committees.

Funding for title II, which includes the Central Utah Project Completion Account and the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, is \$1.13 billion, \$12 million above the amount appropriated last year and \$67 million above the budget request. The conferees support funding for two projects to alleviate water supply and conservation issues in the California Bay-Delta, as proposed by the House. The conference agreement provides \$133 million, \$69 million above the request, for rural water projects to bring clean water to tribal and rural communities in Arizona, California, Montana, New Mexico, and South Dakota.

Total funding for title III, the Department of Energy, is \$27.1 billion, \$318 million above fiscal year 2009 and \$1.3 billion below the budget request due to a score by the Congressional Budget Office of \$1.5 billion for the Department of Energy's budget request for the Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program. This conference agreement, when combined with the \$36.6 billion of American Reinvestment and Recovery Act funding, represents a historic investment into energy and science technology, as well as the cleanup of the nation's nuclear legacy. The conference agreement also supports the national security missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Our nation's ongoing energy crisis affects our economy, security, and environment, and the conferees have taken action with this agreement to develop lasting solutions for our energy challenges. Americans today face rising electricity prices, a transportation system still dependent on foreign oil, and the looming uncertainty of global climate change. A broad

portfolio of approaches across energy technologies at the Department of Energy will be required to transform our energy economy and address this energy crisis. To further diversify this portfolio, the conferees provide a prudent level of funding for Energy Innovation Hubs, Hubs, a new research model that will gather a broad array of researchers around critical energy challenges. The conference agreement provides the Department of Energy with the opportunity to establish three Hubs to research the next generation of clean and safe nuclear power, cutting-edge science and technology to convert sunlight to transportation fuels, and systems to reduce energy use in buildings.

The conference agreement provides a record investment of \$2.24 billion in renewable energy and efficient energy technologies, \$314 million above the fiscal year 2009, to develop and deploy long-term solutions to our energy challenges. By investing in ways to harness energy from solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, and water sources, the conference agreement takes steps to advance technologies that will provide affordable, clean energy from domestic, renewable sources. Although they offer vast, untapped renewable energy resources in the United States, these technologies currently account for less than 3 percent of our electricity generation. Applied research and development for these renewable energy technologies is funded at \$620 million, an increase of 17 percent over the fiscal year 2009, to launch our nation into the next generation of clean and secure electricity generation.

To bring electrical power from these new renewable resources to the population centers that use it, and to reduce energy losses during power transmission, the conference agreement boosts funding by 26 percent over 2009 for electricity delivery and energy reliability. In addition to funding research and development for smart grids, energy storage, and other ways to modernize the nation's power transmission and distribution system, the conference agreement more than triples funding over the fiscal year 2009 for cyber security research and development to secure the nation's electric power system as cyber attacks increase worldwide while the grid is becoming increasingly network-connected.

Chronically high fuel prices and dependence on foreign oil continue to hinder our nation's economy and transportation sector. The conference agreement invests nearly \$950 million in activities at the Department of Energy to permanently reduce our dependence on petroleum fuels. The agreement provides \$311 million for vehicle technologies, \$38 million above the fiscal year 2009, to increase vehicle efficiency, advance alternative fuel technologies for next-generation biofuels, and develop electrified vehicles that can run petroleum-free. Further, the conference agreement provides \$174 million for hydrogen and fuel cell technologies, to continue the work at the Department of Energy, in conjunction with private industry and research institutions, furthering one of a small handful of pathways that may reduce the need for imported petroleum fuels.

The conference agreement invests \$570 million in programs that cost-effectively cut energy consumption now and in the future by developing and deploying efficient energy technologies. Americans will save money and energy in the near-term through \$210 million in funding for weatherization assistance grants, a

5 percent increase over the fiscal year 2009. Further, the conference agreement increases funding for Industrial Technologies and Building Technologies to develop innovative technologies that will help our homes, businesses and industries save energy and money while reducing harmful emissions.

The conference agreement is a measured commitment to positioning nuclear energy to play a role in the nation's energy future. The conference agreement provides \$787 million for nuclear energy, \$5 million below fiscal year 2009 and \$10 million above the request. This funding supports the licensing, research, and development of nuclear reactor technologies.

In addition, the conference agreement supports fossil energy funding to emphasize carbon capture and sequestration—the key to enabling the use of our extensive reserves of coal while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Fossil Energy research and development programs are funded at \$672 million, \$55 million above the request, of which \$404 million is for fuels and power systems and \$37.8 million focuses on natural gas and unconventional petroleum research.

There is a legacy of contamination from the past 60 years of nuclear weapons manufacturing and research. This conference agreement is a major investment in mitigating the environmental effects of the nation's nuclear legacy and, for the first time, meets virtually all of the cleanup regulatory compliance milestones at sites around the country. The conference agreement provides \$6.4 billion for environmental cleanup, which includes national defense and non-defense sites, as well as Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (UED&D). Defense sites are funded at \$5.6 billion, \$147 million above the request. The conference agreement provides non-defense sites with \$245 million, \$7 million above the request, and \$574 million for UED&D, \$14 million above the request. The clean-up projects and activities take place around the country, in places like Hanford, Washington; Savannah River, South Carolina; Los Alamos, New Mexico; Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Portsmouth, Ohio; Idaho; and Paducah, Kentucky, among others.

The conference agreement increases funding for the Office of Science 3 percent from fiscal year 2009, progress in these constrained times. The conference agreement provides \$394 million for advanced scientific computing research, \$25 million above fiscal year 2009. The Office of Science conducts world-leading scientific research and development, both in exploring the fundamental nature of matter and energy, and in laying the technological foundations upon which are found our best prospects of building energy independence and control of climate change.

While the administration is determining national policy regarding how to dispose of high-level radioactive waste and nuclear spent fuel, it is prudent to continue to learn from the investment that has been made to the Yucca Mountain waste repository. For nuclear waste disposal activities, the conference agreement provides a total of \$197 million to continue the licensing process at Yucca Mountain. Within these funds, the conference agreement provides \$5 million to create a Blue Ribbon Commission to evaluate all alternatives for nuclear waste disposal.

The programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA, reduce the threat of

nuclear proliferation overseas, maintain the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, and provide reliable nuclear propulsion for the U.S. Navy. The conference agreement provides a total of \$9.9 billion for the NNSA, which includes \$666 million of construction activities for the Mixed-Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility not funded in the NNSA in fiscal year 2009. Adjusting for the new activities, the conference agreement for the NNSA is \$9.2 billion, the same as fiscal year 2009.

Nuclear weapons or material with nuclear weapons potential, in the hands of terrorists are a priority national security threat to the United States and our allies. The NNSA programs address the full spectrum of the proliferation threat by supporting multilateral agreements, securing nuclear materials overseas, detecting illicit trafficking, and researching and developing the leading-edge technology to support nonproliferation. Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities are funded at \$2.1 billion. The International Nuclear Material Protection and Cooperation program that works in Russia and elsewhere to secure nuclear material and enhance border and port security receives \$572 million, \$20 million above the request and \$172 million above fiscal year 2009. The conference agreement includes funds for the Mixed-Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, Waste Solidification Building, and supporting activities at Savannah River, South Carolina.

Given the serious international and domestic consequences of the U.S. initiating a new nuclear weapons production activity, it is critical that the administration lay out a comprehensive course of action before funding is appropriated. Major transformation of the weapons complex can only be produced with significant bipartisan support, lasting over multiple sessions of Congress and multiple Administrations.

The Nuclear Posture Review should inform an enduring strategy and provide the basis of the underlying complex necessary to ensure the nation's nuclear weapons continue to keep our nuclear weapons safe and reliable. The conference agreement provides \$32.5 million for a limited study of how to improve the non-nuclear components of the B61 bomb. The agreement also includes direction for the NNSA to commission two independent studies to ensure that the B61-12 is both necessary and technically sound. In particular, the second study will examine whether the B61-12 has sufficient technical advantages to constitute a long-term 21st century weapon, or whether it is likely to need near-term replacement or retirement. Should the Nuclear Posture Review confirm the B61-12 as a national security requirement, the agreement includes a provision allowing the NNSA to reprogram funds from other, limited, activities to address technical issues associated with the non-nuclear portion of this program. In the interim, this agreement maintains B61-related technical expertise while evaluating whether the program is essential for national security.

For Naval Reactors, the conference agreement provides \$945 million, \$117 million above fiscal year 2009, in order to support the next-generation nuclear reactor for the U.S. Navy.

Funding for title IV, Independent Agencies, is \$292 million, a decrease of \$16 million from the previous fiscal year and \$27 million below the budget request. The conference agree-

ment funded the Appalachian Regional Commission at \$76 million and the Delta Regional Authority at \$13 million, the same as the request. The conference agreement also provides \$12 million for the Denali Commission, the same as the request. Two new commissions have been funded by conference agreement: the Northern Border Regional Commission at \$1.5 million and the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission at \$250,000. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board is funded at \$3.9 million, the same as the request, and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board is funded at \$26 million, the same as the request. The Federal Coordinator for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects is also funded at the budget request level of \$4.5 million. Finally, the conference agreement provides \$154.7 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, \$29 million below the budget request.

We have a responsibility to do everything possible to address our current energy crisis and the state of our infrastructure. This conference agreement invests in the energy areas that will put us on the long-term path to increased energy independence, reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, and lead global efforts to confront global climate change. Further, it provides funding to build and maintain our nation's navigation, flood damage reduction projects and water supply facilities to strengthen our economy, protect our citizens and provide those who do not have it, clean water.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman BYRON DORGAN, and his Ranking Member, Senator ROBERT BENNETT, for their hard work during this conference. I especially want to extend my appreciation to my Ranking Member, the Honorable RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, for his extraordinary cooperation and insight. I truly value his support and advice, and that of all the members of our Energy and Water Subcommittee. I believe we are all proud of this bipartisan product.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I would also like to thank the staff for their help in shepherding this bill through the House and through conference with the Senate. The Subcommittee staff includes Taunja Berquam, Robert Sherman, Joseph Levin, James Windle, Casey Pearce, and our detailee from the Corps of Engineers, Lauren Minto. I also want to thank Richard Patrick of my staff, and Rob Blair and Kevin Jones of the minority staff, and Nancy Fox and Kathleen Hazlett of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's staff.

I urge the unanimous support of the House for adoption of this conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the Energy and Water appropriations conference agreement for 2010. I would like to recognize Vice Chairman PASTOR for his friendship and leadership—it has been a good working partnership—and all members of the committee.

I would also like to thank all of the staff on both sides of the subcommittee as well as in my office and his for their dedication and hard work. On the majority side, Taunja Berquam, the Clerk Bob Sherman, Joe Levin, James

Windle, Casey Pearce, and Lauren Minto. On the minority side, Rob Blair and Kevin Jones. In my personal office, Katie Hazlett and Nancy Fox; and in Mr. PASTOR's personal office, Rich Patrick. All of these individuals worked tirelessly to put together the product before us which meets the needs of every congressional district in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement totals \$33.465 billion, which is \$928 million below the President's request, and \$167 million, or 0.6 percent, above the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

However, the conference agreement was preceded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and other emergency stimulus appropriations for the fiscal year 2009, which gave more than \$58 billion in new money to the agencies under our jurisdiction. In fact, nearly 39 billion new dollars alone went to the Department of Energy.

So while the growth from the fiscal year 2009 regular appropriation to this conference report is minimal, the Department of Energy is going to have a difficult time spending and accounting for all of the new money it has received.

However, Mr. Speaker, in general, this conference agreement is reasonable and balanced.

I do want to highlight one area in which I have significant concerns: the future of nuclear power in this country and what happens when political science trumps sound science.

During the Republican motion to recommit the House Energy and Water bill, my colleague from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) spoke eloquently about the perils of following the President's plan to terminate our current nuclear waste management plant at Yucca Mountain. My biggest regret with this conference agreement is that we were unable to overcome Senator REID's influence, and consequently, the disposal plan is barely on life support.

The amount of funding in this bill for continuing with the Yucca Mountain license application is now half of what is requested, further delaying the progress on the establishment of a national nuclear waste disposal site.

And what will the results be of this decision? Spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste is being stored on site at 121 locations across 39 States. These are our States; they're our constituents. I am sure this fuel is safe where it is today, but I know many of our constituents want it stored somewhere where the environment will not be affected and where the material will be kept safely.

The President's and the majority leader in the Senate's decision will ensure that the fuel stays where it is for at least 15 or 20 years with each site bearing all of the major costs and responsibilities for management and security of the waste material.

Second, their plan will rob our country of potential jobs and tax revenue. These jobs range from Ph.D.s in phys-

ics to pipe fitters, from welders to plumbers. Operating nuclear power plants can sustain 700 permanent jobs while new plants generate as many as 2,400 construction jobs.

Currently, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has applications for 26 new plants. That's at least 60,000 jobs at stake. I don't understand how the President can push for an economic revitalization and reduce carbon emissions while gutting the single technology which will help accomplish both of those goals.

□ 1315

Our constituents need these jobs and the clean power source that they create.

Third, killing Yucca Mountain would bring billions of dollars of liability against the Federal Government, anywhere from \$11 to \$22 billion. This is money which the Federal Government owes industry because we have failed to live up to our responsibilities. We've signed contracts with these companies to take the waste off their hands. And because of the political arrangement between the White House and the Senate leader, we have failed, taxpayers and ratepayers must now carry that burden for the foreseeable future.

These are not empty threats or dire predictions. They are facts. Last week, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission had a vote that basically denies the go-ahead for the construction of new nuclear power plants because of the administration's plans to terminate Yucca Mountain.

Those 54,000 jobs I mentioned earlier are on hold. The nuclear waste in our districts is still there and not going anywhere. The billions of liability that our children will have to repay? Well, that's another few billion on top of our current \$1.6 trillion deficit.

The one bright side of the conference agreement is that we were able to keep the license application alive, but just barely. Until the American public wakes up to the pitfalls of this political arrangement between the White House and the Senate leader, we will all have to bear the costs.

With that said, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Vice Chairman PASTOR for his leadership and friendship. Overall, this is a great conference agreement, and I intend to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I wish to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

This bill commits \$180 million in Federal funding for critical Everglades restoration projects. While it is less than the administration request and the House-funded level, it represents a firm commitment from this Congress. To be clear, we must move boldly forward in saving this unique national

treasure. Time is our enemy, and we have delayed too long.

In 2000, Congress authorized the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan as a State-Federal partnership to restore the ailing River of Grass. However, to date, the State has outspent the Federal Government by more than 2 to 1.

Finally, after 8 years of inaction, we are beginning to meet our commitment—and I can't thank Chairman PASTOR and Chairman OBEY enough for their steadfast support of funding to restore the Florida Everglades to its once pristine state—with significant funding in the FY09 bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act as well, and now in the FY10 legislation.

Chairman OBEY, Chairman VISCLOSKEY and Chairman PASTOR, your leadership on this effort will not be forgotten. It will preserve a national treasure for years and years to come so that my children and my children's children can enjoy the Florida Everglades. Today's bill is a positive step forward for the Everglades, and I hope it will spur further action in the next fiscal year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the committee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the chairman, and I thank the ranking member and the Speaker. It's my 15th year here. I have been on this committee for 13 years, and I inherited a district that is really heavy in this bill, and I know that. I represent Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

The committee has been incredibly good through the years to recognize the needed investments in science, energy research, national security and environmental management, and yet again this conference report recognizes those critical priorities on behalf of our country, and I'm grateful for that. But much like Paul Revere, I have come to the committee, the subcommittee, and the House again today to say we have a huge problem at the Chickamauga Lock on the Tennessee River.

We began construction of the replacement lock a few years ago. The cofferdam is complete. Inside this cofferdam, we will dry out the Tennessee River in the next few months to test that the cofferdam works. The cofferdam is about the size of this entire building, the Capitol Building, in the middle of the Tennessee River.

We are ready now to begin pouring the foundations in the middle of the river to replace the lock. The current lock will close. I just had the briefing today from the Corps.

Yesterday at the conference committee closing this out, and I signed the conference report, I offered an amendment to put language and up to \$14 million in the bill to make sure we can move the project forward. It failed on a 10-8 vote. I appreciate LINCOLN DAVIS, the only member of the majority for voting "yes." Everyone in the minority voted "yes." This is a critical problem.

I say to the administration, you only made a \$1 million funding request. It's not sufficient to move it along. The current lock will close. The Corps just briefed us again today. They cannot keep it open. It will be the largest inland waterway system in the history of our country to close.

The current lock was set to close at 2014. We are not building the lock yet. The cofferdam is complete. The Kentucky lock only got \$1 million, but their stimulus money allows them to start construction. We could not. I made this case at the subcommittee, at the full committee, and on the House floor Mr. PASTOR helped us. We put \$14 million in, and just like happens in this place, somehow by the time we got to the conference meeting, it was taken back out. We tried to restore it yesterday, change of support, went down virtually party lines.

I'm telling you, we got a problem. We need help. And it's not me. It's the entire eastern system. It's the largest inland waterway system in the country. It is going to close. We've got to do something.

Please, to the committee, to the Senate, to the House, both parties, administration, when there is an emergency supplemental, let's get together ahead of time and fix the Inland Waterway Trust Fund problem. This is a crisis for all the inland waterway system, and the first big failure will be Chick Lock unless we exert the leadership that we are elected to do. It's a can that has been kicked down the road too long.

I plead with you on behalf of the constituents, not just in my district, not just in my State, but in the entire eastern part of our country. From Peoria to south Georgia, you will have truckloads of cargo and goods, 150,000 18-wheelers a year added to carry the cargo that currently goes through this lock, and it is about to close because we're not doing our job. That's the truth. And I hate it. And I have done my best, but I am only one. I need help. Our people need help. Our country needs help. We need leadership.

Let's keep the Chickamauga Lock open. If there's an emergency supplemental that moves, we need to step up and fix this problem before the 2011 cycle. I'm going to do everything I can. I've been here long enough to know how to cooperate, how to get it done and sometimes how to keep the trains from going any further until the right things are done. That's not a warning. I need your help. That's a plea.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I've done this bill, and I have to tell you that one of the lessons I learned is that the inland waterway is of great value to our country, and we have not paid enough attention to it. So I would agree with my colleague that it's a problem that we need to solve.

The Inland Waterway Trust Fund is the vehicle which would construct and maintain these locks. But at this point, we haven't been able to solve

that problem. And the gentleman is right. We did help him here in the House when we passed this bill, but I have to tell him with great regret that in the conference we found very little support from the Senate in this particular lock, and in working out the conference bill, we had to go back to the \$1 million.

At this moment, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill will greatly improve our Nation's water infrastructure, robustly fund vital energy research and help protect our Nation from the threat of nuclear terrorism. The bottom line is that it will create jobs, strengthen our economy and protect our Nation.

The bill provides \$5.4 billion for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to address our Nation's vitally important water infrastructure needs. It moves us forward in funding the construction and maintenance of our Nation's ports and navigational waterways, which are crucial to our economy and international trade.

H.R. 3183 also makes great strides in protecting our communities from natural disasters by providing \$2 billion for flood protection efforts. Also included is \$27.1 billion to fund the Department of Energy's efforts to decrease our reliance on foreign sources of oil and increase our investment in technologies that use energy more efficiently and to expand energy sources right here at home.

While providing \$2.2 billion for research into energy efficiency and renewable energy efforts such as solar, wind, biofuels and hydrogen, this bill also invests in conventional energy sources by providing \$787 million for nuclear energy research and \$672 million for fossil energy research.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important mission for our country, for this Congress, than preventing nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of terrorists, and this bill provides \$2.1 billion for our Nation's nuclear non-proliferation efforts at home and abroad. Why? To keep the American family safe.

Our Nation's communities, national economy and security are strengthened by this bill, which is why I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of our committee.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report that we are considering today addresses a number of issues affecting the energy and water infrastructure of our country. However, when it comes to the ongoing water crisis in California, the conference report comes up short.

The ongoing water crisis in California has exacerbated the economic

downturn up and down my State. Statewide, the unemployment rate has risen to more than 12 percent. In the Central Valley, regional unemployment has now reached 20 percent, with some communities' unemployment now over 40 percent. California's water crisis is the result of severe drought conditions on top of the federally imposed pumping restrictions that have been placed on our State's critical water infrastructure.

While the conference report does provide some funding for a number of California's mid- and long-term water resource management projects, many of the projects are years away from completion and will not provide any assistance to Californians that are suffering today. Many of the most affected communities have made it clear they are not looking for a handout. They want their water and their jobs back.

During the markup of this bill in the Appropriations Committee, I offered an amendment to do exactly that, by ending the federally imposed pumping restrictions. Sadly, most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected my amendment and voted to protect a 3-inch fish instead of protecting jobs and the people of California. Similar efforts by my colleague, Mr. NUNES, have been rebuffed by the Democratic majority.

The fact remains that the flaws and shortcomings of the Endangered Species Act have tied the hands of judges and water resource planners, creating a manmade drought that is killing jobs, destroying livelihoods and hurting families in California.

I realize this issue should be addressed by the authorizing committee, but if the Democratic leadership will not force the committee of jurisdiction to act, the members of the minority have no other option. If this Congress and this administration fail to take the bold steps necessary to address this crisis in the near future, the people of California will know exactly who is responsible for their mounting job losses and economic suffering.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, when we were doing this bill, and in fact, when this bill was on the floor, we assisted, to the best of our ability, in terms of providing authorization and also money, and in some cases we waived matching restrictions so that we would have both the authority and the financial resources to deal with the problem.

What the previous speaker had asked us to do was to waive the environmental impact statements that were required, and we did not have the ability to do it, and the authorizing committee would not allow us to do it. So we did not have that ability to do it. But we did try, and it was kept in the conference to provide the authorization and the financial resources to continue to, in the short term, deal with the water shortages in central California.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend and a member of

the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

□ 1330

Mr. SALAZAR. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their wonderful leadership on this subcommittee.

I rise today to support what I consider to be my best legislative accomplishment since I came to Congress in 2004, but let me first say how important the investments that we are making in this bill are.

The nearly \$2.5 billion for renewable energies will play a vital role in reducing carbon emissions, creating jobs, and producing clean energy. I especially want to point out the \$225 million included for solar energy. The Third Congressional District of Colorado already has some of the largest solar farms in the world, and my constituents are already recognizing the very benefits of the solar industry.

The \$1.13 billion included for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are so vitally important to the Western United States. As other speakers have mentioned, water continues to be a damper to the livelihood of many Westerners, and this investment in our Nation's water infrastructure from dams, canals, treatment plants, and rural water projects is extremely important to our rural citizens as they face crisis after crisis, from Colorado all the way to California.

This bill included several desperately needed dollars for rural water projects in Colorado. The \$1.75 million for the Jackson Gulch Rehabilitation Project in Mancos, Colorado, and the \$600,000 for the Platoro Reservoir in the San Luis Valley will help provide major assistance to improving these rural water districts.

Lastly, and most importantly, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member and all the staff of the subcommittee for taking a step that has not been taken for 50 years.

The roots of the Arkansas Valley Conduit stretch back to 1962, when President Kennedy signed the authorization by Congress, which was part of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, which included the construction of Lake Pueblo. The Federal project was the end result of years of work by Pueblo and southern Colorado leaders who wanted to make better use of the region's water.

"This is the best news I've heard in a long time," said Bob Rawlings, publisher of the Pueblo Chieftain and an avid fighter for water rights in Colorado.

I am happy to say to the people of southeastern Colorado you will no longer have to wait for clean drinking water. Clean drinking water is on the way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I rise today in support of the Energy and Water appropria-

tions bill. This bill contains support for various projects within my district that will help with the continued restoration and preservation of the south Florida ecosystem.

I'm pleased with the funding for the continued restoration of the Hoover Dike. This earthen dike is currently undergoing a massive rehabilitation project that will continue to ensure the health and human safety of Pahokee, South Bay, Okeechobee, Belle Glade, Clewiston, Moore Haven, and the surrounding communities.

However, while I'm grateful to the committee for its support of these projects, I must express my great disappointment with the Senate for stripping out most of the vital construction funding for the Indian River Lagoon. This project was originally authorized in the 2007 Water Resources Development Act as a component of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.

While some in the upper body argued that the Indian River Lagoon was a new project and a "new start" and therefore not deserving of funding, I argue it's not a new start, as it is a component of the overall ongoing Everglades Restoration project. By cutting the majority of its vital funding, we are only kicking the can further down the road for not getting this vital project started.

It's time for the Federal Government to live up to its financial commitment to this project. My only hope now is that the lagoon will receive funds, however minimal, and our colleagues in the Senate will now agree that this is not a new start and therefore deserves to be fully funded next year.

Every year that goes by, however, without adequate funding, further damage is done to our fragile ecosystem there in the Indian River Lagoon, making recovery that much harder.

I'd like to thank my fellow Florida colleagues, especially Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for their tireless work and support for these projects, and the House committee for including funding in the original House bill. I look forward to continuing the good work that we have started.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. In response to the comment from my friend from Florida, all new starts in this bill—and there were a few, and the Everglades got two. We have the number of 100,000, but that was to signify that a new start is available for this project. By designating the new start for the Everglades, that means that recovery money can be used now for the purpose that you spoke about.

Secondly, the Corps will now be able to reprogram moneys that now you designated as a new start, can reprogram moneys to continue the efforts on this lagoon.

And so we thought that the new start was not a cutback in money but was a vehicle that would make more money available so that the Everglades pro-

gram could go forward. That's how we attempted to solve this problem. Hopefully, that will be the result.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand today in support of the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water appropriations conference report. I'd like to thank Chairman PASTOR and Ranking Member FRELINGHUYSEN for their great work on this legislation, and I praise them for their cooperation and bipartisanship. Because of their work and the excellent work of our subcommittee staff, we have before us a comprehensive, fair, and targeted bill that makes significant investments in our country's future and in the goal of achieving energy independence. They have been able to do this with only a slight increase of \$200 million over last year's funding level; yet these investments will build on the success of the American Recovery and Investment and Recovery Act in developing a clean-energy economy and creating more American jobs.

I'm particularly grateful that this bill increases by more than 10 percent the funding for the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Program. This program, funded at \$2.2 billion, invests in producing cleaner and more efficient energy technologies to produce inexpensive energy from domestic sources.

Included are \$225 million for research to harness the vast amount of solar energy reaching the Earth every day, \$311 million to improve vehicle and battery technology, and \$200 million for research into improving energy efficiency in commercial and residential buildings, which currently consume about 40 percent of our Nation's total energy usage.

As a scientist, I'm pleased to see \$4.9 billion for the Office of Science's basic and applied science research program. Such investments are critical to maintaining America's place as a leader in the world economy.

Additionally, this legislation supports President Obama's historic commitment to nuclear nonproliferation by providing \$2.1 billion for securing vulnerable nuclear material. This will protect Americans from the risk of nuclear material falling into terrorist hands by securing stockpiles in the former Soviet Union. The money will also improve our ability to stop nuclear and radiological materials from being smuggled into the U.S.

Again, I strongly support this bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on final passage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. There was language in this bill that was stripped in the conference report that would have directed the Corps of Engineers to pursue a much safer level of flood protection for the New Orleans region.

Our entire delegation, Republicans and Democrats, were unanimous in support of the language that was in the bill, and the conference report stripped out that language, which would have directed the Corps to pursue a much safer option than the one they're currently pursuing.

If we have learned anything from the lessons of Katrina, it's that the Federal levees that failed us before cannot be rebuilt the same way they were the last time that they failed. There's too much taxpayer money that's been put at stake for us to get this wrong. And so we much more support the option that would have actually made sure that the Corps gets it right for all the money that's being spent as opposed to the route that they're choosing right now.

Option 2a, which was the language that we would have directed the Corps to pursue, is known as Pump to the River. According to the Corps's own report, Pump to the River, this option 2a that's being thrown out by this report, is more technically advantageous than the one they're pursuing. It's more operationally effective than the one the Corps is pursuing. It provides greater reliability, and, most importantly, it further reduces the risk of flooding.

That's the option that our entire State delegation, that our Governor's office, that all the people back home—the city of New Orleans, the parish of Jefferson—fully support; an option that reduces the risk of flooding. That's what we should all support after what we saw happen during Hurricane Katrina; yet that language that we had unanimous support from our delegation that was in the bill is now being stripped out by this conference report.

We need to learn from the lessons of Katrina. And it's time this administration stopped paying lip service to our flood protection needs and actually put its money where its mouth is and do the right thing as opposed to making the same mistakes that were made in the past.

We cannot afford to let them go forward with building an option that, by their own admission, is much less reliable in protecting the people of New Orleans for future flooding, so I rise in opposition.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in response, I have to tell you that the conferees on the House side, the House managers, were united on this front, as well as the chairman of the other body's committee. We felt that the alternative that was desired did not provide additional protection and it would have delayed the permanent protection of New Orleans by anywhere from 18 to 36 months, which we thought

was too long of a period of time to keep New Orleans unprotected. The cost, we believe, would have been \$3 to \$4 billion more.

And so for that reason, we felt that, in fairness, that we should continue with the program that the Corps has for New Orleans.

At this time, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I certainly thank him for his leadership in getting this bill to this point. I appreciate the ranking member and the good work that they have both done in a very fair and nonpartisan way to serve this country, and also the staff of the Energy and Water Subcommittee and what a magnificent job they have done.

This is a very special bill to the First Congressional District of Arkansas. It makes continued investment in our flood protection ability in the operations and maintenance of our flood protection system. It adds money for construction where construction is needed, for investigations where investigations are needed and more study needs to be done.

The Department of Energy has moved forward with the appropriations in this bill. We tried to do what we can to improve the solar energy research, the biofuels research, vehicle technology research, hydrogen technology, energy-efficient buildings, industrial technologies, and weatherization grants. All of these things are an investment in the future of this country and our ability to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. And that's what the committee had in mind. I think our leadership has done a great job with all these things.

We also make a serious investment in electricity delivery and reliability. In the area of the science and the basic sciences, we have made another serious investment.

I think that this is the kind of thing that the Appropriations Committee was created for—to make these decisions, make the necessary investments in the future of this country, and continue to build our infrastructure, protect our people, and provide the opportunity for us to be successful.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

□ 1345

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today unfortunately in opposition to this conference report. I want to point out to this body that something has been added in the original version from the other body that injects itself into something that I don't think the House wants to be involved in, and that is the water wars between Alabama, Florida and Georgia. Unfortunately, there is language here that directs the Corps of

Engineers to calculate critical yields on the two major basins that flow through my State of Georgia and, in particular, involve the basins themselves and the reservoirs, the largest of which is Lake Lanier.

Now I do not think that the gentleman who is handling this bill or the Republican gentleman who is handling this bill has any intention of having this inject itself into a controversy that has been going on for decades in the Federal courts and is still currently under appeal as a result of the latest decision. Now the effect of this is one of two things: since it directs the Corps of Engineers to within 120 days to calculate critical yields of the two major river basins, it will either be used for purposes of the ongoing litigation or it will be used as an argument for why human consumption should not be considered in the resolution of this issue between the three States, or among the three States.

Now to spend Corps dollars calculating something that does not take into account the right of people to drink the water that is in their State is unrealistic, and it is a true waste of Federal money. I find it quite ironic that the gentleman who injected this language into this bill just a couple of years ago was injecting language that directed the Corps not to do these kinds of studies. Isn't it ironic how all of a sudden the positions have flip-flopped? Now if you do not think that this is an issue that involves the so-called water wars, I would invite you to look at the press release for the gentleman who is claiming credit for injecting this in it, and it's referred to as the Water Wars amendment.

Now I would hope that this body would not see fit to get involved in a fight that is going to be resolved, hopefully, by agreement of the Governors of the three States. My Governor has initiated an effort to try to resume those negotiations, and we have had a response from at least the State of Alabama. We are hopeful that the State of Florida will respond accordingly. Ultimately, I think this issue will be resolved by the Governors reaching a conclusion and then bringing that conclusion to this body and to the other body and asking for us to incorporate it into the laws of this country.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in reference to Mr. DEAL, it's our understanding that that is right, the language in this conference requires two studies to determine the critical yield of the Federal projects. But we don't know, first of all, what the outcomes are going to be, so that's why we're having these studies. We don't want to get into the water wars, and we don't think that the consumption issue is an issue that will be part of the studies. Well, the language is report language, and this administration could do what it wants with the Corps of Engineers.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come down to concur with my colleague Mr. DEAL from Georgia. The water situation in our State of Georgia is dire. It's a very delicate situation. We are working towards a very, very good response for the people of Georgia and for our entire region. We've just had the court ruling. It's very sensitive there. Our major concern—and again, this is with great respect to the chairman. He just spoke and we concur with that as well. But we need to be very careful that there is no language in the reporting language or in any of the studies that removes the words “for human consumption” for water. Because if the manuals are not constructed with the measurements by using water that is used for human consumption, that shoots right into our bull's-eye because that's why in metro Atlanta, in the Lake Lanier area where the point of the discussion is, we use that water for human consumption. So we're very sensitive to anything that would disallow that. We are working with the Governors of both Florida and Alabama, jointly with our Governor of Georgia, to come to a conclusion. As you all may or may not know, the judge, when he ruled in his decision, declared that it would be here in Congress that we would have to at some point reauthorize the water use of Lake Lanier and that region for human consumption. So this language would make it very difficult for us. We certainly want to concur with that. I concur with Mr. DEAL and the folks in Georgia, and I would respectfully hope that our words would be taken within the spirit of understanding that we are to deliver those words. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to stand with my colleagues about this language that was put in the conference committee report, and I am looking at the press release now: “Conference Committee Adopts Shelby Water Wars Amendment.” I just want to give a little warning to some other Members of this because, not only would the judges' ruling about the Tallapoosa Basin and the Chattahoochee Basin—it also mentioned that because this drinking water was nonauthorized, and who would ever have thought we would have to authorize the ability for humans to have drinking water out of their water source, it also is going to affect 17 other States with approximately 42 Corps impoundments in their States.

If they do not believe that this will be used as a test case and a model for others to file suit with the Endangered Species Act or whatever for people taking unauthorized drinking water out of those water sources, they are very much confused. This bill needs to be defeated. This conference report needs

to be defeated. We need to go back to conference. We need to get this language out. I hope that other Members in this body who have these impoundments located in their States understand the consequences this language could have for them if this conference committee report is passed in this body and goes to the President's desk for signing. Because if you don't believe this isn't going to be brought up in some of these court cases, you're just fooling yourself. So I would like to ask the other Members of this body to join me and my colleagues in voting against the conference report.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify that the Corps was wanting to do these studies, and defeating this conference report is not going to stop the Corps from doing these studies. I have committed to the gentleman from Georgia that we will work with him because we don't believe that the consumption of water by the residents of Atlanta or Georgia should play a role, and it should be a factor in these studies.

I now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I would like to also thank the ranking member. This is a good conference report. This is a good piece of legislation. I think there are some sound investments in here. I wish some were more, but I think given the stimulus and everything, we are moving in the right direction. We send about \$750 billion a year to oil-producing countries. A couple of years ago the Department of Defense spent about \$115 billion escorting big oil ships in and out of the Persian Gulf. We have got to get away from our dependency on foreign oil. We have got to get away from our dependency on these foreign countries that get us into all of these political entanglements.

I think the investments that are made here on solar energy (\$225 million), biofuels, vehicle technology, hydrogen technology, energy-efficient buildings—for those of us who represent manufacturing States in the Midwest, this green economy is opportunity for us. We have manufacturing. We have great research and development institutions. This is an opportunity for us to revive the middle class in the United States of America through these green jobs. There was a report that was just done for the Midwest Governors meeting that is coming up, and it says, “Regional Report Endorses Clean-Energy Economy for the Midwest.”

“Midwestern States should use their abundant natural resources and manufacturing base to build an economy based on clean energy.” And we have the opportunity to do that if we continue investing in research and development, especially coal.

There is one last point that I would like to mention. I hope that next year we can continue to push these energy hubs. Secretary Chu has made this a

top priority. They're modeled after the old Bell Laboratories. A variety of different universities are going to be involved in the research. They're going to be able to collaborate and focus on the technologies that are working, not focusing on just getting money so you can have a budget for next year. So I hope as we continue to move, we continue to push, these energy hubs are going to be nothing but opportunity for us to get into the commercialization and continue to create jobs.

Again, this is a good piece of legislation. I want to thank the chairman. I would also like to thank the staff. I know a lot of work went into it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. First of all, I would like to thank the chairman, the ranking member and the professional staff of the committee. A wonderful job has been done, I think, dealing with and grappling with the whole set of issues. But in this \$33.5 billion conference report, there are some very significant investments and priorities, \$2.2 billion in energy efficiency and renewable energy, everything from solar to biofuels and hydrogen, weatherization grants. We are very, very pleased that they were able to produce that as part of this conference report.

But I also want to say that on the nuclear side, a continuing investment by the committee, some \$787 million on a whole range of very important efforts related to nuclear energy so they can be safe and environmentally useful to us to continue to expand, both through the loan guarantee program but also through a number of other investments that are being made in the conference report. And to deal with the President's commitment on nuclear non-proliferation, on the weapons side, a \$2.1 billion investment.

I think that Congressman PASTOR, who has led this effort, and the staff have done a great job. We had a good process in negotiations with the Senate in our conference committee, which wrapped up yesterday. I encourage the House to favorably report this. I thank my good friend from New Jersey, who has served as the ranking Member and who has done an extraordinary job. This has been a bipartisan effort and is a bipartisan work product that I think moves the country's priorities forward in terms of energy and energy efficiency. I recommend it to the House.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Energy and Water conference report. By now I suspect all of the Members of the House understand the drought crisis affecting California, particularly in the heart of the

San Joaquin Valley, a large part of my district. If this drought continues a fourth, fifth year, it could impact the entire State of California.

Among many of the items in this conference report are two amendments that Congressman CARDOZA and I have been fighting hard for on behalf of our farmers, farmworkers and farm communities who are at ground zero as it relates to this drought crisis. Communities are having 30 and 40 percent unemployment, the most difficult situation they've ever faced. In July, we offered an amendment to bring drought relief to the San Joaquin Valley by providing funding for two projects. The 2-Gates project and the Intertie project, both of these projects were on the back burner for years. They should have been already implemented. This administration is moving forward to put these into construction next year.

The second amendment addresses impediments to transfers. Transfers are critical during drought conditions, both regulatory and that by Mother Nature. This gives the Bureau of Reclamation the flexibility needed to facilitate, and much more needs to be done.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. This gives the flexibility for the Bureau of Reclamation to facilitate these water transfers. This year, we transferred over 6,000-acre-feet of water that was a critical lifeline. Much more needs to be done. I urge my colleagues to support these two amendments in this conference report. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his support in these efforts.

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

□ 1400

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Tom Beville used to describe this bill as the "all-American bill" because it meets the needs of America. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FY 10 Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report, and I commend Chairman PASTOR and Ranking Member FRELINGHUYSEN for bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor today.

The FY 10 Energy and Water Appropriations bill makes key investments that will drive American innovation, enhance our energy security, clean up our environment, reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and support our water infrastructure.

The conference report provides \$4.9 billion to the Department of Energy's Office of Science, \$1.6 billion for basic energy sciences and \$2.4 billion for applied research. These funding levels, when added to last year's appropriations and this year's stimulus bill, exceed the goals of the America COMPETES Act and meaningfully advance our Nation's innovation agenda.

The \$2.2 billion allocated to energy efficiency and renewable energy represents a 16 percent year over year increase and, in conjunction with continued Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee authority, will strengthen our energy security by accelerating our research, development and deployment of homegrown solar, biofuel, smart grid, and advanced vehicle technologies.

This legislation continues the Nation's half century commitment to mitigating the environmental impacts of contaminated military and civilian nuclear sites by spending \$6.419 billion for that purpose, and it provides \$9.072 billion to confront the global nuclear threat, including \$2.1 billion in support of President Obama's nuclear nonproliferation initiative.

Finally, the FY 10 Energy and Water bill designates \$6.7 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for priority water infrastructure, flood protection, and conservation projects. In that regard, I am particularly pleased with the inclusion of over \$3 million for specific Chesapeake Bay restoration initiatives of particular importance to my congressional district and the rest of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FY 2010 Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. I would like to point out two provisions of the report that help to address the water supply crisis in California's San Joaquin Valley.

California is experiencing its third consecutive year of dry conditions. Our State's water supply outlook is further exacerbated by the "regulatory drought" that has resulted from agency regulatory actions. The Endangered Species Act in particular has proven to be a regulatory hammer, preventing water conveyance, transfers, and storage, even when water supplies have been plentiful. The Departments of the Interior and Commerce developed new Biological Opinions to protect Delta smelt and salmonid species, respectively. These decisions have resulted in significant restrictions on pumping water out of the Delta. These cuts were in addition to the many previous cuts that had already been imposed, including the Bay Delta Accord, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other actions.

The combination of the drought and the regulatory drought has resulted in dangerously low reservoirs and a 10 percent water allocation to farmers on California's westside. Over 400,000 acres of some of the world's most productive farmland have been fallowed, resulting in devastating job losses and high unemployment—as much as 40 percent in some cities on the westside.

It is crucial that the State of California and the Federal Government build new storage facilities and that we develop a better conveyance and water management system. In the meantime, it is important for the Departments to development programs that allow for flexibility as a means of achieving greater water supply. There are two provisions that Mr. COSTA and I added to the House Energy and Water Appropriations bill that do just that.

First, the \$40 million in CALFED funding provides the Bureau of Reclamation with the flexibility to use these funds to help fund crucial projects, such as the Two Gates Project and the Intertie Project, which will help relieve some of the pressure on the water supply in the San Joaquin Valley of California. More funding is needed for these two projects as

well as others, and this report provides a good start on a downpayment toward these projects and others that will help the Bureau, the State Department of Water Resources and our water district to move and transfer water in California to the people and farms that need it the most.

Second, I support the clarification of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992, which clarifies that additional restrictions under the CVPIA on water transfers within certain areas of the Central Valley Project South of Delta are not required. Several years ago, the Bureau of Reclamation changed its interpretation of this statute, and began applying additional and cumbersome requirements to water transfers within the CVP unless they were within the same county. These restrictions on water transfers have prevented the transfer of water from one area to another and have created an impediment to efficient and practical water use. This amendment would clarify that water transfers between Friant and South of Delta agricultural service contractors can occur beyond county boundaries so that water districts within one county can transfer to districts outside the county.

Unfortunately, the House version of the Energy and Water Bill which provided for permanent clarification in the law was not included in this report. Instead, this language clarifying the water transfer provision is limited to a 2-year period. Senator FEINSTEIN, Mr. COSTA and I will be introducing a bill to make this transfer amendment permanent, and we look forward to bringing something to the floor in a short period of time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 788, 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 308, nays 114, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 752]

YEAS—308

Abercrombie	Buchanan	Davis (TN)
Ackerman	Butterfield	DeFazio
Aderholt	Camp	DeGette
Akin	Cao	Delahunt
Alexander	Capito	DeLauro
Altmire	Capps	Dent
Arcuri	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, L.
Austria	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, M.
Baca	Carson (IN)	Dicks
Bachus	Cassidy	Dingell
Baldwin	Castle	Doggett
Bean	Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)
Becerra	Chandler	Doyle
Berkley	Childers	Dreier
Berman	Chu	Driehaus
Berry	Clarke	Edwards (MD)
Biggert	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Bilbray	Cleaver	Ehlers
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Ellison
Blumenauer	Cohen	Ellsworth
Bocchieri	Connolly (VA)	Engel
Bonner	Conyers	Eshoo
Boren	Cooper	Etheridge
Boswell	Costa	Farr
Boucher	Costello	Fattah
Boustany	Courtney	Filner
Boyd	Crowley	Fleming
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Forbes
Bralley (IA)	Cummings	Fortenberry
Bright	Dahlkemper	Foster
Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)	Frank (MA)
Brown-Waite,	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen
Ginny	Davis (IL)	Fudge

Gerlach Lungren, Daniel
 Giffords E.
 Gonzalez Lynch
 Gordon (TN) Maffei
 Granger Markey (CO)
 Grayson Markey (MA)
 Green, Al Massa
 Green, Gene Matsui
 Griffith McCarthy (NY)
 Grijalva McCollum
 Guthrie McCotter
 Gutierrez McDermott
 Hall (NY) McGovern
 Hall (TX) McIntyre
 Halvorson McMahon
 Hare McMorris
 Harman Rodgers
 Harper McNeerney
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)
 Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)
 Heinrich Melancon
 Herger Michaud
 Herseth Sandlin Miller (MI)
 Higgins Miller (NC)
 Hill Miller, George
 Himes Minnick
 Hinchey Mitchell
 Hinojosa Mollohan
 Hiroo Moore (KS)
 Hodes Moore (WI)
 Holden Moran (VA)
 Holt Murphy (CT)
 Honda Murphy (NY)
 Hoyer Murphy, Patrick
 Inslee Murphy, Tim
 Israel Murtha
 Jackson (IL) Nadler (NY)
 Jackson-Lee Napolitano
 (TX) Neal (MA)
 Johnson (GA) Oberstar
 Johnson, E. B. Obey
 Jones Olver
 Kagen Ortiz
 Kaptur Pallone
 Kennedy Pastor (AZ)
 Kildee Payne
 Kilpatrick (MI) Perlmutter
 Kilroy Perriello
 King (NY) Peters
 Kirk Peterson
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Pingree (ME)
 Kissell Polis (CO)
 Klein (FL) Pomeroy
 Kosmas Price (NC)
 Kratovil Quigley
 Lance Rahall
 Langevin Rangel
 Larsen (WA) Rehberg
 Larson (CT) Reichert
 Latham Reyes
 LaTourette Richardson
 Lee (CA) Rodriguez
 Lee (NY) Rogers (AL)
 Levin Rogers (KY)
 Lipinski Rogers (MI)
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Loeb sack Rooney
 Lofgren, Zoe Ros-Lehtinen
 Lowey Ross
 Luetkemeyer Rothman (NJ)
 Luján Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger

NAYS—114

Andrews Coble
 Bachmann Coffman (CO)
 Baird Cole
 Barrow Conaway
 Bartlett Crenshaw
 Barton (TX) Culberson
 Bilirakis Davis (KY)
 Bishop (GA) Deal (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Duncan
 Blackburn Emerson
 Blunt Fallin
 Boehner Flake
 Bono Mack Foxx
 Boozman Franks (AZ)
 Brady (TX) Gallegly
 Broun (GA) Garrett (NJ)
 Brown (SC) Gingrey (GA)
 Burgess Gohmert
 Burton (IN) Goodlatte
 Buyer Graves
 Calvert Heller
 Campbell Hensarling
 Cantor Hoekstra
 Carter Hunter
 Chaffetz Inghis
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kind
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kline (MN)
 Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lucas
 Lummis
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Matheson
 McCaul
 McClintock

McHenry Petri
 McKeon Pitts
 Mica Platts
 Miller (FL) Poe (TX)
 Miller, Gary Posey
 Moran (KS) Price (GA)
 Myrick Putnam
 Nunes Radanovich
 Nye Roe (TN)
 Olson Roskam
 Paul Royce
 Paulsen Ryan (WI)
 Pence Scalise

NOT VOTING—10

Adler (NJ) Maloney
 Barrett (SC) McCarthy (CA)
 Capuano Neugebauer
 Carney Pascrell

□ 1427

Messrs. SULLIVAN, BARROW and POE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. TURNER and PRICE of North Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that I missed four rollcall votes. Unfortunately I missed these votes because I was in my district attending the funeral of my sister-in-law Barbara Gamero who recently passed away this last Tuesday at the age of 73. Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 749, 750, 751 and 752.

COMMENDING HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES AND ANTI-TERRORISM PARTNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOUIL). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 731.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 731.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday there are no votes expected.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills, as is the custom, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition to the suspension bills, we will consider H.R. 2442, the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program Expansion Act of 2009, the conference report on H.R. 2997, the Agricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010, and the conference report on H.R. 2892, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2010.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I’d ask the gentleman if we could turn to the discussion of health care, and as the gentleman knows, he and I have had discussions this week, perhaps, I think, a discussion that could yield the ability for us to work together on the things that we agree on in health care. Obviously, the divide is great when talking about any type of move towards a government takeover of health care. But he and I have spoken about maybe there are some areas of agreement. And he and I have also talked about the fact that we could meet together and discuss that, and I look forward to hearing from him or his office to schedule that. And along those lines, I’d like to ask the gentleman what he expects the schedule to be towards bringing a health care bill to the floor of this House.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, let me say that, as far as I know, we have no premise that we want to pursue of a government takeover of health care, so notwithstanding the characterization, we don’t believe that what’s being proposed does that, any more than Medicare, from our perspective, was a takeover of the health care system. Having said that, we are working, as you know, as the press is reporting, on seeing what alternatives are available. There are three committee bills that have been reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, had full markups, Ways and Means Committee, and the Education and Labor Committee. As you know, they differ in part, and so there are now discussions as to how you meld those bills together with the theory and intention of offering a bill from those three bills.

We would expect the Rules Committee, at some point in time, to effect that objective, as has been done in the past. Our expectation is that we will do that within the time frame that we’re able to do it; that is to say, there’s not yet a resolution of how that is accomplished, so we don’t have a time frame.

And we haven't set a time frame, but we will do it when it's possible to put forward.

Lastly, I would say to the gentleman, he and I talked earlier this week, as he pointed out, and I look forward to sitting down with him next week to see if there are areas where we can agree. If there are, we'd like to do that. And I think the gentleman has expressed his desire to do so as well. On the other hand, as we know, there are areas of substantial disagreement. It's certainly not our view that we can start over again. It is our view that this matter has had over 90 hearings over the last couple of years; that we've had over 2,000 town meetings on this, and we've been really at this for about over a year now, with very substantial discussions during the Presidential campaign from all candidates on both sides of the aisle, as to the fact that health care reform was necessary, and we believe the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that. Obviously, the details are the critical issue, and I look forward to pursuing discussions next week with the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman further as to the timing of a bill. I understand that he's indicated that there is no resolution as to exactly when a bill would come to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I do not expect a bill to be on the floor within the next 2 weeks, if that's what the gentleman's asking. I think we'll have time to have discussions.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman because I was going to ask about the Speaker's commitment prior. So I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, because I think probably—to complete the answer—the Speaker and I are both committed to giving substantial notice, not only of the bill, when a bill is put together, but also of any manager's amendment which may effect the resolution between the three committee documents. It is our expectation that there would be at least 72 hours for either the bill and the manager's amendment or, if they are separate, 72 hours for each.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as to the scheduling of a bill dealing with sanctions on Iran, we've had discussions together on the floor and elsewhere regarding the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. And Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, now, in particular, I think time is of the essence that we act because, as we have seen over the last 10 days, Iran revealing its secret enrichment program, indicating, yet again, that the regime in that country refuses to comply with international law or the will of the world community.

So it is my sense that we should, and we can work together on this issue.

The gentleman had indicated last time we were engaged in a colloquy that he was going to meet with Chairman BERMAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee about moving that bill and bringing it to the floor. So I would ask the gentleman if he could tell us when we could expect that bill to come to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Since I made that representation, I have, in fact, met with both not only Mr. BERMAN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but also Mr. FRANK, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. As the gentleman knows, there are two sanctions bills. One is Chairman FRANK's bill, which passed the House overwhelmingly last year, and provides authority to State and local governments to divest their assets from any company that invests \$20 million or more in Iran's energy sector. That is not as consequential, obviously, as Mr. BERMAN's bill. Mr. BERMAN's bill, as you know, requires any foreign entities that sell refined petroleum to Iran or otherwise assist such sales to be banned from doing business in the United States. Obviously, that has real teeth to it.

As the gentleman also knows, October 1, discussions are underway with Iran for the first time in a long time. Furthermore, significantly, the administration is working with our allies, certainly with, as the gentleman knows, with Britain and France, but also engaged with Germany as well, and with Russia and with China, members of the P-5 plus 1, essentially, members of the Security Council plus Germany, on how we might respond to what the world has viewed as a violation of the U.N. resolutions and what Iran has been doing. The gentleman and I share a view that Iran's process is unacceptable, that Iran's pursuing of nuclear armed capability, weapons capability is unacceptable and dangerous to the region and to the international community.

The administration shares that view, and therefore, with respect to Mr. BERMAN's resolution, we are in contact with the administration, and Mr. BERMAN is prepared to bring that forward at a time when, based upon whatever may occur in the next week—I don't want to put a time frame on it—a week or two, that might indicate that we could get a broader international toughening of sanctions that now exist, with the agreement, particularly of Russia. As you know, President Medvedev has made some pretty strong statements about Qom and the findings there, and what he believes to be Iran's failure to keep the world informed and concern about what Iran is doing, which was a positive sign.

But with those considerations in mind, I know that Mr. BERMAN is very focused on this and ready to bring a resolution to the floor at a time he believes is consistent with the administration's trying to attain, with the international community, the strong-

est possible sanctions internationally, as well as our own sanctions.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I would only add that I believe I'm speaking for our conference here in indicating that it's not necessarily what we would do in terms of trying to wait for China and Russia to move the bill. I'm not saying the gentleman said that, but it sounded as if we've got to wait until there is some collective agreement on the world stage in order for Congress to act. As the gentleman and I have agreed for a long time now, we, in this country, believe very strongly of standing up against the regime in Iran. It has an impact on our allies across that region in the world and particularly for us here at home. So I would encourage the gentleman by telling him that our side stands ready to want to help with moving that bill.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, I appreciate that, and I am confident that, as the gentleman points out, that we will move ahead in a bipartisan and overwhelming fashion on this bill. But I want to make it very clear: We don't have to wait for anybody. Having said that, the judgment of the chairman, in concert with the administration, is that we do want to see what developments occur in the very near term. And I think that's what I meant. Hopefully that's what I said. The gentleman's accurate; we don't have to wait, certainly for Russia or China or for anybody else, to take the action we deem to be appropriate.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, there is a very important debate occurring in our country right now regarding our position towards the commitment we've made in Afghanistan. And it's clear that the Republicans believe, as I'm sure the gentleman does, that this Congress must be devoting attention to this important issue as it relates to the national security of the United States and our interests in that arena, as well as abroad. And I'd like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, whether he, in his leadership, will call on General McChrystal to testify before Congress as soon as possible. And I'd note, as the gentleman well knows, that Chairman SKELTON has been reported to have made such requests of his leadership.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman probably knows, I have also indicated I thought General McChrystal ought to come to the Congress and testify, not only before the committees, but perhaps brief a bipartisan session. I don't mean an address to it, but a bipartisan briefing, either in the Armed Services Committee or on the floor here or in the auditorium. I think that's appropriate. As the gentleman knows, the President has been involved in very extensive consultation with the Cabinet members that deal with the national security issues, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mike Mullen; General Jones, the National Security Advisor; Secretary Clinton; the Vice

President and others who are dealing with this issue.

As you know, there has been no specific request directed to the Congress at this point in time, either by General McChrystal, Secretary Gates, or the President, so that it may well be an issue of timing as to when they're ready to come to the Congress to lay out the specific plans that they believe we ought to pursue. But I think that everyone shares the conviction that this is a critical issue with which the Congress is going to deal, and that General McChrystal, who is the commander on the ground in Afghanistan, needs to come before the Congress and give us his best judgment as to how we can be successful.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I know it's just been reported that in the Senate there was an amendment offered by Senator McCAIN on this very point, requiring there to be some testimony by General McChrystal before Congress by a date certain. And I'm told that that amendment went down on a party-line vote. So I would just tell the gentleman, again, that our side believes it's very important, as I know he does, in terms of our national security and Congress' role that General McChrystal be before us so that we can be informed and conduct our constitutional duty as such.

□ 1445

If I could, Mr. Speaker, turn to the question of jobs.

We have a running debate, the gentleman and I and others, as to the effectiveness of the stimulus bill. And as we all know, back in January it was reported that that bill would arrest the rise of unemployment. In fact, the goal was set that unemployment would not overreach beyond 8½ percent. We know in this country now we're just under 10 percent unemployment nationally.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we should be focusing on this economy while we're trying to deal with so many other issues. And it has been some time now where we have missed the opportunity on this floor to bring up bills that have to do with job creation.

If we look at some of the evidence of the stimulus bill, it is the contention of our side that that bill has not fulfilled its mission. We could go through any list of expenditures that we have noted in the press and elsewhere, where you have got \$2.8 million to fight forest fires in the District of Columbia; you have \$3.4 million to help turtles cross the road in Florida. These are the kinds of items that, frankly, rob the public of their confidence in what we do.

So I would ask the gentleman, is there any effort, is there any hope that we may perhaps have some constructive debate around the rest of the stimulus money and perhaps orient that towards job creation, sustainable job creation and growth in the economy? Because after all, I think that's what all of us are after.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And he's correct: we do have a different perspective on this. Of course, the gentleman supported economic policies in 2001 and 2003 that of course produced the worst job performance of any administration since Herbert Hoover. We lost 3.1 million jobs in the last 14 months of the Bush administration, lost an average of 680,000 jobs during the last 3 months of the administration that President Obama was faced with.

We acted decisively and boldly, in my opinion, under the President's leadership. In point of fact, we reduced the average of some 680,000 in the last 3 months of the Bush administration to, over the last 3 months, 350,000 and only 216,000 jobs lost. I say "only." That relates to 741,000 jobs lost the last month of the Bush administration. That is a half a million fewer jobs. It's not where we want to be, but it is certainly a lot better.

Many economists in our party and, frankly, in your party, Mr. Zandi we refer to, estimate that we have over a million jobs more than we would have had had we not passed the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. There has been a 1.3 percent rise in consumer spending in August. It was the biggest increase since the 2.8 surge in October of 2001. The Labor Department released a report last week showing that during the previous week, the number of newly laid-off workers seeking unemployment benefits fell for the third straight week, evidence that layoffs are continuing to ease at the earliest stages of the economic recovery.

Without going into a lot more statistics, we do have a substantive difference as to whether or not our economy is getting better. The good news, from my perspective, is most economists agree with us that we've bottomed out and we're starting to come up. We're going to have unemployment figures tomorrow that will be announced. Hopefully, they're down even further.

The stock market, I will tell my friend, in the Recovery and Reinvestment he thinks hasn't worked is up from about 7,200–7,300 up to about 9,700. I will tell you that every American that opens their 401(k) or retirement plan thinks that progress has been made. I know I do when I open mine. I am very pleased to see that.

So we do differ. We differ not only on the success of the economic plan that was pursued for 8 years that led to the deepest recession that we have had in 75 years.

But the gentleman stands and asked me a question about adopting more of those policies, and with all due respect, my friend, we didn't think those policies were going to work, we don't think they did work, and, in fact, the policies that your party voted against to a person in 1993 produced exactly the opposite results: high employment, low deficits; in fact, a net surplus at the

end of the 8 years of the Clinton administration, and a reduction in spending which you doubled in terms of percentage, 3.5 under the Clinton years and 7 percent under President Bush's years. So, yes, we have a difference of opinion.

We think we have pursued vigorously policies to create jobs, create economic stability, create growth in our economy, and we think it's working.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I would say in response, I, nor most of my conference, was not here in 1993 on that vote.

I would simply say to the gentleman, as he knows, in the stimulus debate and on down through the rest—cap-and-trade, the health care, the budget debate—the proposals that we are offering, especially as he refers to in the economic arena, are not the same policies. We have proffered an agenda which speaks to small businesses.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would say I don't think it is necessarily a constructive route to take for us to say who was worse because none of us, as the gentleman suggests, likes the fact that we've lost 2½ million jobs in the last 8 months. And if you ask the small business people in our districts if they think things are better, I think there's pretty much unanimity that small businesses are having difficulties still keeping the lights on, maintaining payroll.

Something is amiss. We've got to be focusing on how we can expand the opportunity for those small businesses to grow again. It's very central to the idea of getting the capital markets straight, of getting our fiscal house in order. I am very troubled by the bills that are coming along in the Financial Services Committee, the Consumer Financial Protection Agency, yet more attempts by the majority to impose the will of Washington on the entrepreneurs across this country, restricting ultimately their ability to access credit.

You know, we do have differences, Mr. Speaker. I am just hopeful that we can find a way to work together to promote jobs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his time.

—

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow; and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 6, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

—

THE STIMULUS PACKAGE HAS BEEN PRODUCTIVE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we just had a question raised as to the effectiveness of the stimulus package in creating jobs. Well, I know that Mr. CANTOR from Virginia tries to criticize the package for not being productive, but you can't convince the members of my district of that.

In my district alone, according to the school district, 150 teaching jobs were saved; we are beginning construction on a new facility for our transit system, putting 80 new jobs on the street. Most importantly, we had an announcement from GE, General Electric appliance park, that they are moving a unit back from China building revolutionary environmentally advanced water heaters creating more than 400 new jobs in my district. That's the result of stimulus money being used for an incentive.

And, finally, we've seen housing gains for the first time in a year of 10 percent in both July and August due to the first-time homebuyers' credit that was part of that stimulus package.

So when the American people wonder whether that stimulus package, which is still in its infant stages—20 percent, at most, of the money's gone out—you can look at Louisville, Kentucky, and I'll give you evidence that the stimulus package is working and creating jobs.

THE POST-9/11 GI BILL

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, the most important domestic policy following World War II was the GI Bill which paid for the education of the brave men and women who served in the name of freedom.

Montana has some of the best colleges and universities in the country; but for some returning soldiers, a traditional campus isn't the best fit. The post-9/11 GI Bill provided flexibility for soldiers who wanted to take advantage of distance education benefits.

Currently, five of the 10 colleges with the highest veteran populations are colleges that are entirely online or have significant online course loads. While veterans may receive funds to pay for tuition, fees, and books, distance learners are ineligible for living expenses.

I've introduced the Veterans Distance Education Benefits Act, which reimburses soldiers' living expenses so they can focus on their education. I encourage my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this important legislation so we can get it passed quickly.

OVER 100 DAYS WAITING FOR A REPUBLICAN PLAN

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it has

been more than 100 days since my friend and colleague, Representative ROY BLUNT, the point man for the rumored Republican alternative health reform plan, said, I guarantee you we will provide you with a bill.

Even Louisiana Republican Governor Bobby Jindal urged his party Tuesday to work with Democrats to offer health care solutions.

The time to act on health insurance reform is now. We must act to offer the choice of affordable quality health care to all Americans putting you and your doctor, not the insurance companies, in charge of your health care while we reduce the problem of ballooning health care costs on American families, businesses, and our fiscal future.

"No" is not a solution. Saying you support reform with no evidence of that support and no plan just doesn't cut it. Continuing to say "no" to reform leaves tens of millions of Americans without health insurance, and 45,000 Americans die every year because of this.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle can't run away from the fact that they have no plan.

The time to act on health insurance reform is now.

COAL IS NEEDED

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Bjorn Lomborg, one of the world's leading environmentalists, wrote in Monday's Washington Post these words:

"Today, coal accounts for almost half of the planet's electricity supply, including half the power consumed in the United States. It keeps hospitals and core infrastructure running, provides warmth and light in winter, and makes lifesaving air-conditioning available in summer. In China and India, where coal accounts for more than 80 percent of power generation, it has helped to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.

"There is no doubt that coal is causing environmental damage that we need to stop. But a clumsy, radical halt to our coal use—which is what promises of drastic carbon cuts require—would mean depriving billions of people of a path to prosperity.

"To put it bluntly: despite their good intentions, the activists, lobbyists and politicians making a last-ditch push for hugely expensive carbon-cut promises could easily end up doing hundreds of times more damage to the planet than coal ever could."

I wish we would heed those words of this environmentalist because if we drastically cut back on coal, we're going to hurt millions of poor people in the process.

ARRA IS WORKING

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this week in Congress will be ending, and I have some interesting experiences to relate.

In Transportation Committee today, we had a hearing, and one of our former Members is now the Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, a Republican member from Illinois. Secretary LaHood reported to the committee that the ARRA is working, that much of the money has been spent or utilized in plans by State governments and that lots of employment has been made on building of roads and bridges and airport improvements and on rail programs around the country, that people are going back to work.

I also have an opportunity on Tuesday to attend the National Institutes of Health for a briefing, which I plan to do with other colleagues. President Obama announced that \$5 billion has been spent on cancer research through NIH. I offered an amendment to the ARRA in the House for a \$10 billion improvement. That didn't make it through the House, but a similar proposal made it through the Senate. It will be interesting to see where those moneys are creating jobs and finding cures for cancer and other catastrophic illnesses like Parkinson's, diabetes, and Alzheimer's.

The ARRA is working.

□ 1500

PROTECT OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, for many immigrant families like mine, the struggle to preserve our culture and heritage and to contribute to the rich cultural fabric of our Nation assumes center stage. We make efforts to ensure, for example, that our children speak their native language and are familiar with their customs and traditions.

One of the tools most often used by immigrant communities is multimedia through which cultural traditions are exhibited and transmitted. In the Vietnamese American community, for example, music and videos produced and distributed throughout the United States have cultivated and instilled in the minds of our children the love and respect for the heritage of their parents and grandparents.

Unfortunately, organizations that produce these cultural expressions are being forced to close their doors due to significant financial losses from copyright infringement both here and abroad. Often, these organizations have lesser means and cannot survive this theft.

Today, I call my upon my colleagues in Congress to join me in tough oversight of the Federal agencies responsible for prosecuting copyright infringement because enforcing these

laws is critical for the survival of our cultural diversity.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, everyone here knows that we have spent the past several months working to craft legislation that will bring much-needed health insurance reform to the American people. Costs and premiums are spiraling out of control, and more and more families, working families, are being priced out of health insurance.

While Democrats have debated the best way to produce a reform package that will cut costs and ensure quality and affordability, our colleagues across the aisle have been playing hooky with their responsibilities to the American public.

It has been over 100 days now since Congressman BLUNT told us his party would be offering an alternative health reform bill. We've heard nothing yet. Representative CANTOR recently suggested to a constituent that she find "charity care" for an unemployed family member in need of surgery. Find a charity? Is that the full extent of Republican health care reform?

So I ask again, where is the GOP plan for health insurance reform? Or is it just to maintain the status quo?

IN PRAISE OF THE "BUDDY WALK"

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the "Buddy Walk" being held this Saturday in State College, Pennsylvania. It is sponsored by the Centre County Down Syndrome Society. The society exists to be a resource for families with a child with Down syndrome and for those who are expecting a child with Down syndrome. Their goal is to educate friends, relatives and even communities that individuals with Down syndrome are energetic, capable and loving people who play, work and go to school just like the rest of us.

The statistics on their Web site change some of the preconceived stereotypes many people have. For example, half of all Down syndrome children go to mainstream school classes, one out of every five plays a musical instrument, and three out of five know how to operate a computer.

I am a member of the Congressional Down Syndrome Caucus who supports legislative activities that would improve Down syndrome research, education, treatment and promote public policies that would enhance the quality of life for those with Down syndrome.

The Centre County Down Syndrome Society does a great deal to educate

people that those with Down syndrome do lead productive lives, and they deserve to be commended.

POLANSKI EXTRADITION

(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, the laws of the United States should stand for all. No one is above the law, whether it is the criminal laws or the extradition laws. That's why I ponder why some of the elites in Hollywood are now telling us that Roman Polanski should not be subject to the laws of the United States, the State of California or the international law that recognizes extradition.

What is it that suggests that fame excuses criminal conduct? What is it that allows some people in our society to say that a rape is not really a rape, or to suggest that because someone is a great film director that therefore they ought not to be brought to the bar of justice?

Thirty some years ago in the State of California, a crime was committed. Thirty years ago, someone admitted to that crime, and 30 some years ago, that person did not show up when his sentence was to be given to him. And now it is time for the laws of the State of California and the United States and international law to be followed.

Mr. Polanski should come home, and he should meet his justice.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN: COMMIT 100 PERCENT OR GET THEM OUT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we know that in the 1960s and 1970s we committed our troops to Vietnam. But we found out at the end of the war, after 2 weeks of constant carpet bombing of Hanoi when SAM JOHNSON was leaving the Hanoi Hilton, he was told, You silly Americans, if you'd kept bombing us for 1 more week like that, we would have had to surrender unconditionally.

The message of Vietnam should be either commit 100 percent or get out. Don't leave people out there to die without full commitment.

Now we have people on the left saying, get out of Afghanistan now. We have people on the right saying, do whatever it takes to win. And I'm here to say, Mr. Speaker, the President should not keep going on talk shows and going around the world while he has a report suggesting what to do. He needs to commit 100 percent to the war in Afghanistan, give them everything they need, or get out now.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IT'S TIME FOR MORAL LEADERSHIP IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has often said that America must restore its moral leadership in the world. He took a very important step toward doing that last week when he spoke at the United Nations. In his speech, the President called for a new era of engagement and diplomacy. He called for international cooperation to address such critically important issues as nuclear nonproliferation, climate change and economic recovery. He also spoke about banning the use of torture and his decision to close Guantanamo as examples of America's new desire to abide by the rule of law.

I welcome the President's words. They show that President Obama is committed to peace and human rights. Those are the foundations of moral leadership. But now the President is facing the greatest test of his moral leadership as he reviews his strategy in Afghanistan.

The generals are urging him to pour in more troops. I'm sure there are others who are telling him to escalate the fighting just so he can look "tough on terrorism." But as the President makes his next decisions about Afghanistan, I would urge him to make the tough choices. I would urge him to base his decision-making on the following facts: the American people do not believe the war in Afghanistan is worth fighting and want to draw down the numbers of troops there. Sending in more troops will cause the Afghan people to see us as occupiers. And history has told us that the Afghan people always resist foreign occupations and always succeed.

America cannot afford to pour billions of dollars more into a futile occupation when we are going through the worst economic crisis of the past 70 years. We cannot, in good conscience, ask our brave troops to take more casualties without a clear mission, and we don't have one. We cannot ask our military families to continue to sacrifice when they have already suffered so very much.

And finally, we have no exit strategy. After the disaster of Iraq, the American people will not stand for another endless foreign occupation, one that will cost many lives and not make our country any safer.

Afghanistan is a difficult problem, but the President still has good options. He can order the Pentagon to develop a troop redeployment plan and a timetable for withdrawal. At the same time, he can be bold and shift to a new mission that will be far more likely to succeed because it will actually have the support of the Afghan people.

This new mission in Afghanistan would include economic development, education, infrastructure, humanitarian assistance, better governance and improved local policing and intelligence to hunt down extremists. This is what the Afghan people want from America so that they can have hope for a better future and reject violent extremism.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama deserves credit for reviewing his decision earlier than expected to send more troops to Afghanistan. He is showing political courage, and he is showing an open mind by considering other alternatives. I urge him to choose a new course, one that will make our country proud and the world a much safer place.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, for 60 years our country has been trying to come up with a better way to deliver health care. Despite the lingering differences of opinion over how to achieve this goal, we really have come along further than we ever have before.

We all agree we need to put an end to insurance companies' most egregious practices. We need to lower the costs of health care for everyone. We need to better incentivize preventive and primary care.

These are all accomplished by the bill which has now passed out of our three House committees. Of course, it's much more interesting for the media to talk about the few areas where disagreements still exist rather than the accomplishments we have made so far. But the legislation before us means so much more security for America's hardworking families.

Right now, when you lose your job, it can mean your entire family loses access to health insurance. And if you are unfortunate enough to have a pre-existing condition, which in some States can be defined as having been the victim of domestic violence, then you may not qualify for any affordable health insurance coverage. Worse yet, when you buy health insurance on the individual market, there is a team of people ready to comb through your records to find a reason to drop you if you are ever diagnosed with a condition that is costly to treat. Now a few States have protections against these practices. But don't we agree that all Americans deserve access to these protections?

Ironically, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have often touted a supposed "solution" to our health care troubles by allowing insurers to sell across State lines. If anything, their proposal would essentially allow insurance companies to continue their very worst practices because insurers would simply begin a race to the bottom. They would move their operations to whichever State affords the least consumer protections and sell those policies across State lines.

I'm especially concerned because I come from California, a State with some of the strongest consumer protections from health insurance company abuses. Here are some examples: California law requires that insurers cover a minimum stay in the hospital after a mastectomy. Our neighboring States of Nevada and Arizona do not. California law requires that patients have the right to appeal decisions by insurance companies and receive an external review. Idaho and Mississippi do not. And California has stricter laws defining what may and may not qualify as a preexisting condition. In Florida and Georgia, there are no definable conditions that insurers may classify as "preexisting," which means that a pre-existing condition could mean pretty much anything.

So to my friends on the other side of the aisle who believe that selling insurance across State lines will solve all of our problems, I remind you that your suggestion would do just the opposite. It would strip away vital consumer protections that exist for many patients now at the very time our focus needs to be on increasing consumer protections for American families.

□ 1515

We also agree that we need to lower costs. I'm very heartened by provisions in this bill that will achieve this shared goal.

For seniors, we're taking immediate steps to reduce their prescription drug costs by closing the doughnut hole. Since the rollout of Medicare part D, my constituents and seniors across the country have begged for relief from the doughnut hole. The doughnut hole is the period of time during which you pay an insurance company to not cover the cost of your medications. I have objected to this policy from day one.

Under our plan, seniors will see relief immediately. As we begin to close the doughnut hole, prescription drugs will be available at deep discounts. Eventually, the doughnut hole will disappear completely. This is the relief that America's seniors need, and we all can agree that they deserve it.

We will bring down costs by introducing a public option to compete with private insurers. Currently, private insurance companies have every reason to increase costs for patients and to reduce reimbursements to physicians in order to line their pockets.

Why? Because there's no competition. There's no one else in the market

offering consumers a choice. But the public option will finally bring greater choices to consumers in the individual insurance market. Once that happens, premiums will become more affordable as insurers compete for customers. Insurance companies will be enticed to reimburse physicians better in order to retain them in their networks. The necessity for more affordable choices is something we can all agree on.

We can also agree that we need to do a better job of improving preventive care and giving people the tools they need to be more personally responsible for their health and well-being. As a public health nurse, I spent decades educating people about the importance of adopting healthy habits. But too many people in this country don't have access to primary care and never see a health professional until an otherwise preventable disease has worsened. How tragic is this?

H.R. 3200 encourages better primary and preventive care. It does away with copays for preventive services. It increases primary care service reimbursements under Medicare and Medicaid. It makes smart investments in community-based prevention and wellness programs. These are the things we can all agree upon.

I urge my colleagues to join me in enthusiastically supporting H.R. 3200, supporting these principles on which we all agree.

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.)

YEMEN

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

Mr. WOLF. I want to talk about an issue dealing with our national security. CNN reported this morning that the security situation in Yemen is rapidly deteriorating, making a dangerous new haven for al Qaeda and terrorists.

This report is just the latest in a series of warnings about the security situation in Yemen. Earlier this week, Time magazine reported that "two-thirds of the country is out of government control," and that "al Qaeda is turning the lawless mountain areas of Yemen into a new staging area."

According to press reports today, U.S. counterterrorism officials believe that al Qaeda's "presence in Yemen threatens to turn the country into a dangerous base for training and plotting attacks."

In September 2008, al Qaeda terrorists in Yemen attacked the U.S. Embassy with vehicle bombs, killing 10 guards and civilians. Since that time, al Qaeda's posture in Yemen has grown

stronger with the merger of the Saudi and Yemeni arms of al Qaeda into one group—al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—with Yemen as its base for training and operations.

We have seen the consequences of these developments. Last August, a Yemeni al Qaeda loyalist detonated a suicide bomb in an attempt to kill Saudi Prince Mohammed bin Nayef. He was able to gain access to the prince by pretending to be an al Qaeda defector before detonating the explosions.

Despite this deteriorating situation, it was reported—and it's hard to believe—in Reuters on Monday in an article I'm submitting for the RECORD that at least one detainee from Guantanamo Bay has been released to Yemen—released to Yemen, where you can't control the country—and at least 26 others have been cleared to return, according to a list at the detention facility posted in Arabic and Pashto.

What kind of policy is this that the detainees—some who have killed American citizens—at Guantanamo Bay have a list of those that are being released, but not one Member of Congress or the American people know anything about it and are kept in the dark.

Most of these detainees were captured in Afghanistan and Pakistan in 2001 and 2002. They have spent 8 years living among the most dangerous terrorists in the world, including Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks and who beheaded Daniel Pearl.

In an attempt to meet this self-imposed deadline to close Guantanamo Bay next January, Eric Holder and the administration are prepared to release perhaps a third of its cleared detainees to Yemen, a dangerously unstable country that is clearly unprepared to accept and monitor and rehabilitate these detainees.

Given that more than 15 percent of released detainees have returned to terrorism, this release will have a dangerous consequence for the American people. It's not beyond the imagination that there will be an article in the paper several months from now that somebody who was at Guantanamo, from Yemen, released by Eric Holder, goes back to Yemen and kills an American citizen or is involved in an act of terrorism.

Combined with al Qaeda's growing strength and presence in Yemen, this release is concerning. As our State Department noted in its 2008 Country Reports on Terrorism, "The security situation in Yemen deteriorated significantly over the past year as al Qaeda and Yemen increased its attacks against Western and Yemeni Government institutions."

What is Eric Holder and the Justice Department—what are they thinking about? Surely, there must be a better solution, one that won't release detainees from Guantanamo who are involved in activities against American military, who have served time with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, to send them back to Yemen.

Earlier today, I wrote Attorney General Eric Holder to urge that no additional detainees be released to Yemen or other unstable countries. The deadline to close Guantanamo Bay is no excuse to expedite the release of Yemeni detainees, especially if the country, as it is, is unprepared to take responsibility for them. The decision to release the detainees requires due diligence. It cannot be undone.

While we may have a difference of opinion on how best to deal with the situation in Guantanamo Bay, I think, I hope, I believe that we can all agree that a rush release of terrorist detainees, people who have served with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, should not be expedited back into Yemen when it is so destabilized.

What is this Obama administration thinking? What is Eric Holder thinking? I urge Members of Congress to have hearings and for Eric Holder to cease and desist any returnees back to Yemen.

[From Reuters, Sept. 28, 2009]

OBAMA TEAM CLEARS 75 AT GUANTANAMO FOR RELEASE

(By Jane Sutton)

MIAMI.—An Obama administration task force has so far cleared 75 of the remaining 223 Guantanamo prisoners for release as part of its effort to close the detention camp, a military spokesman said on Monday.

The review team is examining each prisoner's case to decide who will be held for trial and who can be sent home or resettled in other nations.

President Barack Obama had set a January 22 deadline to shut the detention camp although Defense Secretary Robert Gates told ABC News in an interview broadcast on Sunday that "it's going to be tough" to meet the deadline.

As the review team makes its decisions, military officials at Guantanamo post an updated list in the camps to let the prisoners know how many from each nation have been judged free to go.

It was an opportunity to just provide better communication," said Navy Lieutenant Commander Brook DeWalt, a spokesman for the Guantanamo detention operation. "There's a lot of information out there and you get a lot of things from a lot of different angles. It helps put it in a more succinct context for them."

The prisoners are well aware of Obama's announcement that the camp would be closed and have heard piecemeal information from their lawyers and relatives during phone calls arranged by the International Committee of the Red Cross, he said.

The list is posted in Arabic, Pashto and English. The latest list of 78 prisoners includes two Uzbeks sent to Ireland and a Yemeni returned to his homeland on Saturday, an indication that some progress is being made in thinning the camp population of those who are not considered a threat.

"We are not focused on whether the deadline will or won't be met on a particular day," White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said. "We are focused on making . . . the most progress that is possible."

Some on the list are among the 30 ordered freed by U.S. courts but still awaiting transfer, including 13 Chinese Uighurs. The Pacific island nation of Palau has agreed to accept most of them.

Also on the list are 26 other captives from Yemen, nine from Tunisia, seven from Alge-

ria, four from Syria, three each from Libya and Saudi Arabia, two each from Uzbekistan, Egypt, the West Bank and Kuwait, and one each from Azerbaijan and Tajikistan.

Most were captured in Afghanistan and Pakistan after U.S. troops invaded Afghanistan in 2001 to oust al Qaeda in response to the September 11 hijacked plane attacks on the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 1, 2009.

Hon. ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr.,

Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: It has come to my attention that at least 27 detainees held at Guantanamo Bay have been cleared for release to Yemen. I received official notification about the release of one of these transfers, Alla Ali Bin Ali Ahmed, but was only made aware of the additional 26 Yemenis allegedly cleared for release after reading a Reuters report titled, "Obama team clears 75 at Guantanamo for release" on September 28, 2009.

I urge you to reconsider any pending or future releases of detainees to Yemen, particularly in light of the country's deteriorating security and growing al-Qaeda presence. Earlier this week, Time magazine reported that "about two-thirds of the country is out of government control," and that "al-Qaeda is turning the lawless mountain areas of Yemen into a new staging area." According to an AFP report today, U.S. counterterrorism officials believe that al-Qaeda's "presence in Yemen threatens to turn that country into a dangerous base for training and plotting attacks."

You will recall the September 2008 al-Qaeda attack on the U.S. Embassy in Yemen using vehicle bombs, rocket-propelled grenades and automatic weapons to mount a coordinated assault, killing 10 guards and civilians. Since that time, al-Qaeda's posture in Yemen has grown stronger with merger of the Saudi and Yemeni arms of al-Qaeda into one group—al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—with Yemen as its base for training and operations.

We have seen the consequences of these developments. Last August, a Yemeni al-Qaeda loyalist detonated a suicide bomb in an attempt to kill Saudi Prince Mohammed bin Nayef. He was able to gain access to the prince by pretending to be an al-Qaeda defector before detonating the explosives. This case is particularly concerning because it demonstrates an evolution and sophistication in the type of attacks being planned and launched by al-Qaeda leaders in Yemen.

While I continue to be troubled that, according to the Reuters report, the detainees at Guantanamo Bay currently have more information about their release than do members of Congress or the American people, it is of particular concern that detainees who have spent the last eight years living among the most dangerous terrorists in the world, including Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks and who beheaded journalist Daniel Pearl, would be released into countries with a strong al-Qaeda presence. Such a disposition is only adding kerosene to a fire.

Although we have clear differences of opinion on how best to deal with the situation in Guantanamo Bay, I think we can both agree that a rushed release of terrorist detainees to countries with a strong al-Qaeda presence is not in America's best interest. I strongly urge you to halt all transfers of detainees to unstable countries, including Yemen, Afghanistan, and Algeria, until evidence is provided to this Congress demonstrating that the detainee can be properly received and monitored in the receiving country.

I look forward to your response, as well as your responses to my letters to you dated March 13, April 23, May 13, June 8, July 7, July 10, July 17, July 22, and July 31. Please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff member, Thomas Culligan.

This is very important for the safety of our country.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 3611, THE LIMITS ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Counterterrorism officials have warned mass transit systems around the country to increase patrols after they discovered that a group of individuals within the United States were allegedly planning to detonate backpack bombs aboard New York City trains.

In the past month, we have once again been reminded that terrorists are still targeting U.S. mass transit systems and other major landmarks. We have to continue to be proactive against those seeking to do us harm and minimize our vulnerabilities, especially vulnerabilities on U.S. soil.

I'd like to discuss one continuing threat that needs to be addressed. In

2002, 2003, and 2004, personnel from Iran, a designated state sponsor of terrorism, were caught photographing and videotaping the New York City subway and other popular landmarks.

I ask my colleagues and the American people to think about why Iranian personnel would photograph and videotape the New York subway system and other popular sites. I'm referring to individuals from state sponsors of terrorism that are here with diplomatic immunity, supposedly in the United States for official business at the United Nations.

Let me be clear. Personnel from a state sponsor of terrorism have been caught on numerous occasions spying. What do you think they intended to do with that information, the videotapes and the photos? These are not our friends. A few, but not all, of these individuals were expelled by the U.S. Department of State. Between 2004 and 2009, the State Department issued over 8,600 visas to delegates and representatives from countries designated as state sponsors of terrorism.

Through the 1947 United Nations Headquarters Act, the United States is required to allow diplomats and personnel into the United States for official business at the United Nations headquarters complex in New York City, including personnel from countries who otherwise would be ineligible for U.S. visas.

We can't afford to take these threats lightly. The presence of hundreds of individuals with diplomatic immunity from countries designated as state sponsors of terrorism is an overwhelming and expensive task for U.S. counterterrorism and counterintelligence resources.

Michelle Van Cleave, the U.S. National Counterintelligence Executive from 2003 to 2006, put it well when she said, "While the FBI—by far, America's premier counterintelligence agency—is assigned responsibility for countering all foreign intelligence operations in the United States, it lacks the manpower, the resources, the training, and probably the public support to venture into the complex grounds of analyzing the vast foreign presence in the country to identify the intelligence operations embedded therein." . . . "The counterintelligence problem is not one of sheer numbers, though by any measure there are far more intelligence operatives in the United States than we have personnel to address them. The larger and more compelling issue is the scope of their activities. Historically, embassies and other diplomatic establishments within the United States have served as a hub for foreign intelligence activities because of the operational security that they afford."

Why are we helping state sponsors of terrorism gather intelligence information within the United States? When and where will we draw the line?

If we can't stop these people from coming to the United States, the least we can do is limit their access to our

country by dramatically limiting the radius that personnel from state sponsors of terrorism are permitted to travel.

Congressman DAN BOREN and I have introduced H.R. 3611, the LIMITS Act, Limiting the Intrusive Miles of International Terrorist Sponsors, which would limit personnel from state sponsors of terrorism to a half-mile radius of the U.N. complex. A half mile is more than enough space for personnel from state sponsors of terrorism to obtain lodging, food, and other necessities, and will be an easier and more cost-effective use of U.S. counterterrorism and counterintelligence resources, as well as the New York Police Department.

The FBI's top two priorities are to: number one, protect the United States from a terrorist attack; and, number two, protect the United States against foreign intelligence operations and espionage.

□ 1530

When it comes to state sponsors of terrorism with diplomatic immunity in our country, it is past time to make the FBI's job a little easier. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the LIMITS Act and restrict access of State sponsors of terrorism on U.S. soil.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I thank my leadership for allowing me to take this Special Order hour to discuss what has certainly become the most important issue that has been going on in this Congress over these last couple of months, and that is the issue of health care reform or, as the Democratic leadership and the President himself have rephrased that now, reform of our health insurance industry, rather than reform of our health care system. But we're going to spend a little time, Mr. Speaker, talking about where we are with regard to this and what are some of the alternatives. Particularly from our side of the aisle, we are often criticized, I think unjustly, about being the party of opposition without having any sufficient alternative ideas to present. In other words, the accusation of being "the party of no."

My colleague from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, is here with me on the floor today, this afternoon, and he and I laugh about that a little bit. We both agree, yeah, we are the party of "know"—it's spelled K-N-O-W. So I would like to take this opportunity to share with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle just what it is we do know and what are some of those suggestions with regard to health care reform or, indeed, health insurance reform, that

the minority, loyal minority wants to present.

We want to make sure that our President, who said his door is wide open as he spoke to the Nation from right here, from your seat, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, saying, Look, if anybody—whether it's the Republican Party or doctors out across the Nation or some of the many men and women who have attended these town hall meetings throughout the month of August—If you've got ideas, bring them to me. My door is always open.

Certainly we have tried to do that, Mr. Speaker, in the way of writing letters, making calls to his staff and to say to the President, We do have some good ideas, Mr. President. In fact, just today within the last hour and a half, a group of physicians from across this country—they call themselves the Million Med March group, were here out on the Mall, talking about this be very issue and bringing ideas. Yes, there were some physician Members of the House with them to speak to the group that had a symbol. It is a grassroots effort, and there are lots of ideas, Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Mr. Majority Leader. I say to Ms. PELOSI, the Speaker of the House, and to Senator REID, Senate majority leader, we have lots of good ideas, and we want an opportunity to be heard.

So we are going to take this next 45 minutes or so to talk about some of these ideas. My friend from Georgia is not only a colleague here and a fellow Georgian but also a fellow physician. And while I specialize, Mr. Speaker, in OB/GYN, Dr. PAUL BROWN from Athens, Georgia, his specialty is family medicine, primary care. You talk about somebody whose voice needs to be heard, and I hope the President will also acknowledge the fact that Dr. BROWN has some great ideas. I will yield to him right now and hear some of those ideas as we colloquy and so forth.

Dr. BROWN, thank you for being here, and I would like to yield to you.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Dr. GINGREY, thank you so much for yielding to me. I, indeed, went down to the park where all these physicians were. I know Dr. GINGREY and our colleague Dr. TOM PRICE, also from Georgia, was at that same meeting with the physicians. This was a group of physicians from all over the country that are very concerned about ObamaCare, about the direction that they perceive that the Congress is going. They see H.R. 3200, the ObamaCare bill here in the U.S. House, as well as the bill that MAX BAUCUS has over in the U.S. Senate, as being a tremendous attack on their ability to practice medicine, to be able to make the decisions along with their patients of how health care is delivered within their offices and how they can deliver surgery, prescriptions, and the tests and procedures that they need.

I think they're exactly right. Dr. GINGREY, I know you spoke with them before I did. But Mr. Speaker, when I

was down there, I spoke to these physicians, and I told them that they and their patients around this country are what's going to stop this steamroller of socialized medicine that's going on here in the House of Representatives. I reminded them that if we can generate enough grassroots support all over this country to ask particularly the leadership here in the House and the Senate as well as the President to open up this process, to listen to all of the second opinions that Dr. GINGREY and others are putting forward.

I know you are going to talk a little while tonight about your health care bill of rights and the 10 Prescriptions for a Healthy America. I applaud you, Dr. GINGREY, for bringing this forward, but the only thing that's going to slow down this process of the Federal Government taking over the health care system is the "We the People." The Constitution of the United States starts off with three very powerful words, "We the People." Up here we're supposed to be representatives, not rulers, and we, the people, need to stand up and say, Whoa, this is an issue that is too important to rush through. We should not have any deadlines. The Speaker and the President have talked about trying to get a bill on his desk before Thanksgiving. This is too complex of an issue to rush it.

What we, as physicians here in Congress, are trying to do is to offer a second opinion. Actually, we've got many opinions that Republicans have introduced. Dr. GINGREY, you have been very instrumental in fostering the idea of health information technology, digitizing electronic medical records and that sort of thing, which would help save money. We have to find a way to lower the cost. In my private practice of general medicine, I couldn't afford to buy health information technology for my patients. We've got to lower the cost of that, but we have got to lower the cost of everything in health care.

The Republicans have many ideas. I, as well as you and the other people on our side, want to see us open the process so that all the ideas are put on the table, and unfortunately, neither the President nor Speaker PELOSI are allowing that to happen. The American people just need to stand up and say "no" to ObamaCare. Let's put these ideas all on the table. Let's discuss them, find ways to lower the cost of health care without creating a big Federal debt, which ObamaCare, H.R. 3200, will do. The President said it wouldn't, but that was not true. He also said that it would not give free health care to illegal aliens, and that is not true. A lot of things that he said that night were not true. In fact, the only person who said the truth that night in that speech was JOE WILSON, our dear colleague from South Carolina.

But the thing is, the American people are in charge. That's what I told the doctors, Mr. Speaker, when I was down there is that the physicians in this

country and everybody who is concerned about where we're going in health care—and particularly the elderly—need to say no to this H.R. 3200, which is going to be disastrous for everybody. And let's open up the process, and in a bipartisan way, in a bicameral way use the House and the Senate together, let's find some commonsense market-based solutions that lower the costs for health care.

And in doing so, let the doctor-patient relationship dictate how health care decisions are made, not through some government bureaucrat, as in the House bill right now. The ObamaCare bill here in the House will put a government bureaucrat between a doctor and a patient. Let's find ways of lowering the cost of medicine in the drugstore. Let's find ways of doing the things that make sense economically without stealing our grandchildren's future. We can do that, and we can do that in a bipartisan way if the leader of this House and the leader of the Senate would just open it up and let us do so.

Dr. GINGREY, I applaud your effort, because you've been a leader, right on the forefront in this process of trying to offer second opinions. You've been here week after week, as well as many others. A lot of physicians in the House have been here on the floor week after week offering second opinions. Republicans are the party of K-N-O-W. We know how to solve the health care financing crisis here in America. We know how to solve the energy problems in America and make America energy independent without having this huge energy tax that the cap-and-trade—I call it the tax-and-cap bill—will put on the poor and elderly, those on limited incomes who will really be hurt by that energy bill. We know how to stimulate the economy without creating a bigger government and without bailing out Wall Street. We need to bail out Main Street.

So we are the party of know. We have got about 10 physicians and medical personnel who are a part of the Republican Doctors Caucus, and we are offering many second opinions, really. So Dr. GINGREY, I applaud your effort. I applaud everything that you're doing. You're the chairman of the House Doctors Caucus on the Republican side, and I am honored to be one of your two cochairmen on that group. The American people should know, need to know, that there are alternatives beside the ObamaCare bill, and the American people need to stand up and say, Let's do this in a bipartisan way. Let's stop all the partisanship, the bickering, the discord and all the things that are going on in this country, and let's do it so that people can manage their own health care along with their doctors.

Dr. GINGREY, I will yield back, and I thank you for what you're doing.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. BROWN brings up a couple of points that I think we need to elaborate on. He mentioned two things.

He mentioned the need for electronic medical records, and he also mentioned the need for medical liability reform. Mr. Speaker, these are two things that the President has said. In fact, in his speech to the Nation a couple of weeks ago from this Chamber, he mentioned both things. Of course there is money set aside in the stimulus package, the American Recovery Act 2009, toward electronic medical records. But what physicians know which maybe a lot of Members of Congress don't know, don't have any real way of knowing, is what are the impediments to practicing medicine and to getting fully integrated in an electronic medical records system.

Even though doctors realize that it would save time, it would save money—most importantly though, it would save lives with regard to electronic medical records—it's something that's very expensive. It's like trying to—you know, your old jalopy car is falling apart, and you need a new car. Let's make that analogous to this old medical records, keeping paper records, charts where records are falling out all over the place, and you can't find things in a timely manner when the patient maybe comes in with an emergency condition.

That's the old car. The new car, of course, would be a laptop or a notebook computer that you go into the exam room or go over to the emergency room, and you've got it, and all of a sudden you just with a punch of a key, you have that entire record of the patient. Maybe the patient happens to be a patient of an associate or a partner that you're covering for. But that information is there, and it's accurate. Well, that's the new car. Unfortunately the cost of the new car, the sticker shock, a lot of times is going to keep people driving the old jalopy that's polluting the Nation and putting people at risk—in this case, patients at risk.

I have introduced a bill for 2 or 3 years in a row that would incentivize even a small country doctor. Maybe he's got a partner or she's got a partner or two. But it's a small group, and they're seeing 75, 80 patients a day each. They can't afford to come up with \$30,000, \$40,000 per doctor to purchase an electronic medical records system, a computer, the hardware, the software, the maintenance program. They know—they're convinced that over a period of time that it's the thing to do and that eventually it would pay for itself. But by golly, they just can't afford that front-end sticker shock.

□ 1545

So we are, Mr. Speaker, continuing to introduce H.R. 1087 that would give them a break under the Tax Code. No free grant necessarily, but let them write off the expense in the first year to help them be able to do what Mr. President and what the majority party and minority party and all the doctors in the House and two in the Senate fully agree that we need to do: fully in-

tegrate electronic medical records by the year 2014. Indeed, former President Bush said the same thing. So that's an area in which we have full agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I really study this. I follow this. I go to the HIMSS meetings on an annual basis and usually speak to that group, the Healthcare Information Management Systems Society. It's an organization of people that are in this industry, in this business. And I know from talking with them that we're talking about maybe \$150 billion-a-year savings because you cut down on medical errors, you cut down on duplication of not ordering very, very expensive things like CAT scans and MRIs; and, even more importantly, of course, not making the mistake of prescribing a medication that would be contrary to the patient's health based on other medications that they're having or conditions that they are suffering from. So this is something where we could save a lot of money. You're talking about \$120 billion a year, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe if we did that, then we wouldn't have to try to pay for this health care reform, or is it health insurance reform, by taking \$500 billion out of the Medicare system and literally gutting Medicare Advantage, a choice of fully 20 percent of our seniors.

Some 10 million of the 45 million Medicare recipients choose Medicare Advantage because for them it's better. They're able to go in and have an annual physical. They're able to have a lot of screening procedures done that are covered under Medicare Advantage and that are not covered under your typical Medicare fee-for-service.

There is a follow-up program usually provided by the insurance companies that offer Medicare Advantage where within a few days of your appointment, a nurse, a nurse practitioner, or maybe even a doctor herself, Mr. Speaker, will call the patient and make sure that they got that prescription filled, that they're not having any side effects.

We keep saying we need to go to a whole new paradigm. That word has become kind of trite, but a whole new paradigm where we incentivize our health care teams to provide wellness rather than just treat illness. It is a more compassionate way to deliver health care, but it also is going to save lives and save money.

So for me to look at these bills that are out there, whether it's this 1,200-page bill that I have behind me, H.R. 3200, that has been passed by three committees in the House, mainly by the committee that I sit on, Energy and Commerce, where we're going to reform the health care system by gutting Medicare of \$500 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I heard someone, and I believe it was an official of the AARP, suggest that, well, you know, this is just a little cut in Medicare; \$500 billion, with a "b," is a lot of money even for Washington, D.C.

But when you look at what we spend every year on Medicare, I think in 2008 the total expenditure for Medicare was about \$480 billion. Well, if you cut that \$500 billion over 10 years, do the math, Mr. Speaker. It's fairly simple, my colleagues. We're not all math majors, but this is arithmetic; this is not calculus. That's something like a 13 or 14 percent cut every year. Actually, it's closer to a 10 percent cut. But it cuts Medicare Advantage about 17 percent a year.

And 10 percent is a lot. If you don't believe it, ask those who are among that group of unemployed in this country right now, those 10 percent that are without a job. For them it's 100 percent. It's not a recession; it's a depression. It's a depression mentally and physically and actually.

So we can do these things like electronic medical records, and we could save a lot of money. We don't have to gut Medicare, and we don't have to raise taxes \$800 billion, \$900 billion and, further, cause small businessmen and women to lay people off or not hire new employees because they just can't afford to.

And, golly, how many jobs has it been, Mr. Speaker, since we passed the economic stimulus package that was going to save the country back in February? I think we've lost 2 million jobs since then. And when we passed that bill, the unemployment rate was 7 percent, 7.5 percent; and now it's 10 percent. We have got real problems here in River City, and it's not just the need to reform our health care system. We need to put people back to work.

I heard the President of the United States say we are in a crisis; we're losing 14,000 people every day; 14,000 people are losing their health insurance. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason for that is because they're losing their jobs. And I think, yes, they have a concern about health insurance, but they also have a great concern about feeding their children and clothing them and providing shelter for their family. And then, of course, let's make sure that they get affordable health insurance.

Again, it's all about priorities. I think that we can do this, and I think we can do it without spending \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years or \$2.5 trillion over the next 15 and running up an additional at least \$250 billion worth of red ink and long-term debt. We can do it by adopting electronic medical records.

We also can save, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount of money by medical malpractice reform, medical liability reform. The President has acknowledged it. He said it to the AMA at their annual meeting in his hometown of Chicago back in June. He said it again right from this dais 2 weeks ago when he spoke to the Nation. He has acknowledged the need. He has said, If you've got an idea on either one of these things, medical records, medical liability reform, my door is open, I want you to call me. I want you to come see me.

Well, we are trying, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, and we will continue to try because I believe the President. I take him at his word. I'm going to be patient on this. Hope springs eternal because we do. It's not just me, but Members on both sides of the aisle, not just physician Members but all Members have ideas, and they need to be listened to just as in the amendment process that we went through when we marked up H.R. 3200.

Why was every Republican amendment rejected, and why was it done almost completely along party lines? That's something the American people, Mr. Speaker, want us to get away from. They want us to cooperate. It's fine for the President to say that if you don't agree with him that you're just bickering and complaining and griping and being untruthful. There's no corner on truth by the President of the United States or the majority party. Let's all be truthful. And if we disagree, that doesn't mean one side is being, shall we say, a serial disingenuous person, rather than using more inflammatory language. No, it's a fair and honest difference of opinion. And if we come together and share those differences of opinion and pick the best of both, then we come up with, I think, a bill that the American people can accept.

Mr. Speaker, these town hall meetings, people all across this country, whether they be of the Democratic or Republican persuasion or independent voters, whether they are young or old or African American, Asian, it doesn't matter. They're United States folks. They are hard working and they want and deserve us, their Representatives, to do it in a way that helps them, that we are not constantly in gridlock up here.

So, Mr. Speaker, my opportunity today to talk about some of these things is heartfelt and it's a commitment, and I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle feel the same way, and we are going to work toward this solution.

Now, I particularly wanted to talk about a second opinion that I have. We talk about that in a lot in medicine about getting a second opinion and how important it is. Maybe the first opinion is not the best opinion. Maybe it is, but oftentimes a second or third opinion, you need that. You need that. So the second opinion that I want to talk to my colleagues about today, Mr. Speaker, is what I call a Health Care Bill of Rights, or, to put it another way, 10 Prescriptions for a Healthy America. And this is a bill that I introduced just today, and it's H.R. 3700.

Now, H.R. 3200, here it is. It's about 1,200 pages. The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee has been a Member of this body for a long time. He still looks young and healthy to me, thank God, but he's been here a long time. And he's an attorney. That's his profession. He's not a doctor; he's a lawyer. Somebody questioned him about whether or not he'd read the

whole bill, and he said, I don't know. I mean, I need two lawyers to help me read it. And he is a Member of the majority party and an attorney himself and I think has been a Member of this body for at least 35 years. That's the problem with bills like this.

Now, my colleagues, I want to hold up for you H.R. 3400. H.R. 3400 is a bill that Dr. TOM PRICE is the original author of, Dr. PRICE on our side of the aisle, an orthopedic surgeon, chairman of the Republican Study Committee. And many of us, including myself, co-sponsored H.R. 3400. It's a little bill. It looks like maybe about 260 pages instead of 1,200 pages. And it does many things in a way that is economically sound, that brings down the cost of health care, that makes health care affordable and accessible so that individuals can own their policy and the marketplace works, and we don't have any government takeover in this bill.

I want to commend my colleagues to go online, get a copy of this bill, read the summary, read the Cliff Notes, whatever, and understand that this is just one of, I would say, three or four Republican bills, alternatives to H.R. 3200 or the health bill that's come out of the Senate, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee that was chaired by Senator DODD, CHRIS DODD, in the absence of Senator Kennedy while he was struggling with his illness. But this is a good bill, and I think the President needs to look at it and needs to consider it and keep that door wide open.

But what I am going to talk about in regard to H.R. 3700 is it's really a statement of principles. But it's a bill, and as I say, we just introduced it today. Mr. Speaker, I have it on a little card almost like a contract. Well, we call it 10 Prescriptions for a Healthy America or the Health Care Bill of Rights, similar to the Contract with America of maybe 15 years ago, that people can put in their front pocket and they can pull it out and they can look at it. But I'm going to take a little time to go through some of the principles in this bill because I think this is important. I think this is a guideline for whatever we ultimately adopt. And let's go through some of these posters, Mr. Speaker.

The number one principle of this health care bill of rights is to say this, and it does in the bill:

□ 1600

There will be no government-run health care plan.

That is what the American people are saying. They do not want a Canadian-style system or a U.K. system, or any system where the Federal Government interferes and makes decisions and tells the doctor and the patient that you are going to have to do it this way, my way or the highway. We don't want that. The American people don't want that, and they said that loud and clear during the August recess.

So number one in this Health Care Bill of Rights is no government-run health care system.

The second item in the Bill of Rights is no cuts to Medicare. Mr. Speaker, I have already talked about that in the \$500 billion, those Medicare cuts. It is something like a \$10 billion cut to the hospice program. I think we all know what the hospice program is. In the last weeks, days, months of people's lives, we are going to cut that program to provide access to health care for 5 percent of the population, many of whom prefer not to have health insurance and we are going to end up forcing them to? No cuts to Medicare. Medicare needs to be shored up. It needs to be improved.

Today, unless you are in a Medicare Advantage program, you cannot go and get an annual physical examination. You can when you first turn 65 and get on Medicare, that is called an entry-level physical exam. But how about when you are 68 or 72? You absolutely on an annual basis need a physical examination as you age to make sure that nothing has happened. And yet a lot of seniors don't go and get a physical because it is not paid for, and they are on a fixed income. For goodness sake, this year there is no increase in COLA for Social Security. How are they going to pay for these things? Yet, instead of solving that problem and putting more into Medicare, we are going to take \$500 billion out of it. It makes no sense.

So under this Health Care Bill of Rights, my bill, H.R. 3700, no cuts to Medicare. And no new deficit spending.

You know, the President said, Mr. Speaker, and he said it very clearly, I will not sign any bill that adds one dime to the deficit. I think I am quoting him word for word. Well, Mr. President, you will like my bill because it says no new deficit spending. We can do this without any additional deficit spending. My colleagues, look at H.R. 3400 and you will see, it can be done without adding to the debt and spending into red ink.

Colleagues, number four is a good one and it is important to people across this country. Number four on the Health Care Bill of Rights, no new taxes. No new taxes. These bills, whether we are talking about H.R. 3200, the House bill, or the bill that is coming through the Senate, there are new taxes all over the place. The Joint Commission on Taxation has attested to that. That is a bipartisan group. The Congressional Budget Office has attested to that. Again, a creation of the Congress, they work for us, and their director is chosen by the majority party, indeed, by the Speaker of the House.

And you ask the question: Are there new taxes in here? Absolutely. There is going to be a tax on every insurance policy. The Senate bill is coming along that is being marked up this week and maybe next week as well, taxes some health insurance policies 40 percent. You put a 40 percent excise tax, Mr. Speaker, on these insurance policies, who pays that? I guarantee you the

premiums go up, and John Q. Citizen, who is not making \$250,000 a year—the President promised when he was campaigning when he became President, if he became President, and of course he did, that nobody making less than \$250,000 a year would see any increase in their taxes, not one dime, just like he said there would be not one dime of deficit spending for this health care, oh, excuse me, health insurance reform. So no new taxes. H.R. 3400, no new taxes.

The fifth thing on the group of ten, no rationing of health care. This may be one of the biggest concerns that our citizens have. As a former physician, OB/GYN doctor for 26 years, I can assure you that people worry about this. If we had this public plan, this public option, the government competing with the private marketplace, as H.R. 3200 calls for—and the Speaker and all three of the chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MILLER, they all want a strong government hand to really ultimately squeeze out the private marketplace. What happens is, and this is not just PHIL GINGREY predicting this, Mr. Speaker, this is the Lewin Group, a well-respected group which says that within 3 to 4 years, probably 100 million people who today get their health insurance through their employer and they are happy with it, they will end up losing that because the employer will be in a position that it will be cheaper for them to just pay a fine and let them go into the government plan.

Well, so much for the President's promise that if you like what you have, you can keep it. Until you can't. You know, this is something that I think we need to hold the President's feet to the fire and say, look, let's promise the American people that they truly can keep what they have if they like it.

So you get the situation where everybody is on the government plan, well, that's when you get to the business of rationing when maybe the party in power has made a pledge of no new taxes, they are not going to raise taxes, and yet you have all these additional people, millions, maybe 100 million that have morphed off of their employer plan into the government plan, and we can't pay for all of them. So what are you going to do? You are going to have to raise taxes and cut reimbursement to the providers, to our rural hospitals who have a disproportionate share of the poor that they are trying to treat and people who can't pay, so you are going to lower reimbursement to them.

And finally, you are going to say to the patient, you know what, we would love to be able to fix your hip, but you are 85 years old and we just can't afford it. You are just going to have to take a little Advil or aspirin. And by the way, we will pay for a walker and an alarm that you can wear on your belt if you happen to fall. But we will not fix your hip or replace your knee. That happens in other countries that have

single payer, government-run systems. That will happen here unless my bill passes which says no rationing of health care.

Number six on the Health Care Bill of Rights, no employer or individual mandate to provide or have health insurance.

Now look, colleagues, Mr. Speaker, of course I want employers to continue to provide that health insurance benefit for their employees. I think that is something that people have come over the last 75 years in this country to expect. A decent job includes health care coverage for you and hopefully your family, and that your employer pays the bigger percentage of that, and the amount you have to pay is a smaller amount. And I want employers to continue to do that and provide that benefit and not whittle away at how much they pay versus how much the employee has to pay.

I would encourage every person in this country, every adult who is working, whether they are 21 years old or 72 years old, to have health insurance. I think it is important especially to have catastrophic coverage, even if you think you are 10 feet tall and bullet-proof and you are 26 years old and you don't smoke or drink alcohol and exercise on a regular basis, nobody in your family has ever suffered from cancer or heart disease, and your grandparents and great-grandparents lived to be 100 years old, and you think, I don't need this. I can't afford it, for one thing. I am paying for a car and rent on an apartment. I have \$125,000 in student loans with interest that I am trying to pay off. I can't afford this.

And then you convince them, yes, but what if you get hit by a truck? What if you are the person who comes down with insulin-dependent diabetes or high blood pressure or heart disease and you are not covered? So at least purchase a health care insurance policy that gives you catastrophic coverage in the event of a catastrophe.

In the halls of the hospitals I worked in, we used to refer to those as "horrendoplasties," when something horrible happens to a person, and it could, any motor vehicle accident. Have that catastrophic coverage. Get an insurance policy where you have a high deductible and maybe you have to pay \$3,000 or \$4,000 out of your own pocket before insurance kicks in, but we want to encourage people to at least do that.

But this bill, the big fat one, H.R. 3200, actually allows the government to say, no, that is not good enough. You have a mandate. You have to have health insurance, but this high deductible, low premium that you can afford, that gives you that catastrophic coverage, that doesn't count. We are not going to count that as health insurance. And so we are going to mandate that you have coverage and we are going to mandate that you have high first dollar and very high premium that you can't afford, and you are prob-

ably not eligible for Medicaid or some safety net program or a government subsidy. And yet we are going to hold a gun to these people's head, Mr. Speaker, and say you have to have health insurance, and if you don't, the IRS is going to fine you \$25,000 and you could be charged with a misdemeanor and spend a year in jail.

My colleagues, is that America? I mean, you know, I try to always keep a copy of the Constitution in my pocket, and sure enough, here it is, the Constitution of the United States. If you go to the glossary, you are not going to find anything in here about mandatory health care. No. You talk about the Bill of Rights and freedom of speech and press and religion, but there is nothing in here about forcing people in this country against their will, even though it is good public policy for them to have health insurance, and we would encourage and try to provide, as we do in H.R. 3400, the 250-page bill, to help them be able to get an affordable policy, but to force them to buy something they can't afford, no.

So number 6 in the Health Care Bill of Rights, no individual or employer mandate. Just encourage them and help them to be able to do that.

Number 7, and this is what created all of the controversy, Mr. Speaker, when the President was right here at the dais giving yet again a fantastic speech, as he always does, and talked about, made the comment that in his health care reform plan, that no illegal immigrant would be eligible for any government subsidy, and then the comment was made, and you know the rest of the story.

But truth in fact is, and that's the reason for number 7, no taxpayer funded coverage for illegal immigrants in my bill, H.R. 3700. No taxpayer funded coverage for illegal immigrants.

□ 1615

I think the President realized though, after he made that speech here a couple of weeks ago, and maybe his crackerjack staff told him, said, Mr. President, you know, there is this problem in the bill where it doesn't make people verify who they are. You know, they don't have to show a photo ID or a secure Social Security number to attest that truly they are here in this country legally. And if you don't require that, as we do, by the way, Mr. Speaker, in other safety-net programs like Medicaid and like the SCHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, if we don't require that in this new reform bill, you are going to have—let me tell you, that's just—you might as well point a strong electromagnetic to the southern border and say, you know, Come on, hey, have we get a deal for you. We've got a great education system. We've got a great health care system, the best in the world and, you know, you too can enjoy that.

No, the American people don't want it. I don't want it, nobody in this

Chamber should want it. So no taxpayer-funded coverage for illegal immigrants. Number 7. Now, the last three items in this Health Care Bill of Rights, we've spent a little time here, Mr. Speaker, talking about what my bill would prohibit in any health care or health insurance reform. Now, I want to talk about the next three items, 8, 9 and 10, which would assure what we have in any health care reform bill or health insurance reform.

And Number 8, and the President has been very firm on this, and I agree with him completely. The Democratic majority has been very firm on this, and I agree with them completely. Pre-existing condition coverage. Insurance companies would not be allowed to deny coverage to people because of pre-existing conditions. And that denial can take two shapes, Mr. Speaker. It can be an outright denial of saying, No, I'm sorry, you know, you've got high blood pressure or you've got diabetes or you've had a coronary bypass and we're not going to offer you insurance. You're just not insurable. You're too big a risk for us.

Or they could do it another way and say, oh, yeah, heck yeah, we'll cover you. We're a great, good company and want to get some good PR out of this. But oh, by the way, your premium's going to be four times standard rates.

Well, that's pretty much a denial too. People can't afford that, so Number 8 is very important. Preexisting condition coverage. You know, you think about somebody that—I talked about young people and wanting to encourage them to have health insurance. Let's say you are 19 years old, straight out of high school and have your first job, or 25 years old, right out of college or graduate school, have your first job, and you're one of those people I described that's in good health and you think, gee, you know, I'd rather just kind of go bare and pay my own way. And I'll put money aside each month in an escrow account. I'll have a special savings account, and I'll save this money, and when I need it—hopefully I won't. Maybe I'll have an annual physical and spend \$175. But I'm not going to get sick because I'm taking care of myself. I'm not like a lot of people who show no personal responsibility in regard to their own health.

And so you know, they really don't want to spend \$400, \$500, \$600 a month paying a premium when they're not using it. But they do it anyway. They do it anyway. And they work for a company for 20 years, and for the first 15 they're paying that same premium that everybody else pays. They have to because of the Federal law, called HIPPA, and they're paying those premiums but yet the insurance company is not having to pay out any claims for them.

But during that time, you know, all of a sudden they get a little skin cancer that has to be removed. Or maybe they have a little chest pain and it turns out they've got some coronary

blockage or their blood pressure goes up. And you know, here they've been paying, and then all of a sudden we get an economy like we have today and they lose their job, and then they try to get insurance after COBRA runs out, if they're even eligible—they have to work for a company that has more than 20 employees to be eligible for COBRA. And let's say that runs out. And then they're out of luck. Mr. Speaker, they can't get coverage.

Well, that's not fair. That's absolutely unfair. And I would say, under Number 8, to the insurance companies, you need to cover that person for the rest of their life, or at least until they go on Medicare, and you need to cover them at standard rates because you have made a really good profit off of them and now, when they need you, you should not be allowed to abandon them. These are the kind of things that we can agree on. And I think we do. And quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, I think the insurance industry, the health insurance industry, they're ready to do that. They have already made commitments and they're ready to do that. And these are some of the things that we can do. And that's Number 8 in my Health Care Bill of Rights.

The ninth thing, we've already talked about a little bit, medical liability reform. You know, there are a lot of different ideas out there, not just mine, although I've introduced a bill every year since I've been here for the last 7 years, calling on certain specific things. I won't get into the details today, Mr. Speaker, but it's called the Health Act. And it's a fair bill that guarantees that patients that get injured by a health care provider or hospital where they're practicing below the standard of care for that community, they've just messed up, that patients do not lose their right to a redress of their grievances to be compensated for their lost wages and for any health care that they need for the rest of their lives, quite honestly. In some cases you're talking about a compensation or a judgment in the millions of dollars.

So we don't deny that in wanting liability reform. What we try to do is cut down on frivolous lawsuits so that doctors are not spending so much time worrying about this and running up the cost of health care for everybody else by ordering needless, cover-your-back tests that, in some cases, could be downright detrimental to the health of the patient. And of course, so many doctors in high-risk specialties, at a fairly young age, before they turn 50, they give it up. They stop delivering babies. They won't go to the emergency room. So surely the President means what he says when at least he promises pilot projects on medical liability reform.

Please, Mr. President, please, it could save \$120 billion a year. You would not have to tax people, the small business men and women \$800 billion and cause us to lose more jobs, and you would not

have to gut Medicare if you'll do these things. And Number 10. And this is the last in the list of the 10 prescriptions for a healthy America, called the Health Care Bill of Rights, H.R. 3700, the promise to reduce health care cost. Why should we do anything if it doesn't bring down the cost? And so far, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office is just saying repeatedly, it doesn't.

What this bill, H.R. 3200, no matter how you slice it and dice it and combine it with the one out of the Ways and Means Committee and the one that came through the Education and Labor Committee and you shake it all around and let it come through the Rules Committee; it doesn't bring down the cost. In fact, it bends the curve in the wrong direction. So my bill would assure that we reduce health care cost. H.R. 3400 does that. Senator Dr. TOM COBURN's bill that he cosponsored with Representative PAUL RYAN from Wisconsin, our ranking member on the Budget Committee here in the House—that bill brings down the cost of health care.

So that's my pledge. That's the bill that I wanted to talk about today to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that they will look at it. You know, I've got a—I carry this around in my pocket. And colleagues, you can go to gingrey.house.gov and look for the Health Care Bill of Rights or 10 Prescriptions for a Healthy America. That's what we've talked about here over this last hour, almost an hour. And I commend it to my colleagues, and I welcome their ideas. My door's open, just as the President said his door's open and he welcomes our ideas. It's a sharing. It's a bipartisan thing. Yes, let's stop bickering and let's get the job done. I thank you for the time, Mr. Speaker, and I will now yield back.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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 the privilege and honor of addressing you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I also appreciate the opportunity to listen to my good friend and colleague, Dr. GINGREY from Georgia. I think he's actually putting out a few more words per minute than he usually does. This is a passionate subject matter for him, and the bills that he's introduced and the foundation that he's laid, I think, is an excellent rebuttal to the statement that was made earlier in the 5 minutes by the gentlelady from California who said, Republicans, where is your plan on health care?

Well, we have many, many plans on health care. And we have many, many ideas on how to address this. And they are consistent. They are consistent with human freedom and the instincts of humanity. They're consistent with

the marketplace, consistent with the foundation of what has made this a great country. And on the other side of the aisle they seem to be consistent with managed economies and managed societies, the kind of societies that have always failed, the kind of societies that have drained away human ambition and put countries, entire nationalities in a position where, I believe it was Ronald Reagan that said, In the Soviet Union they pretend to pay people, and in the Soviet Union, people pretend to work.

There's something about human nature that we understand over here on this side of the aisle, and we want the best out of all of us. And so I'd take us back to the broader structure of what has been delivered here on the House. There's really only one bill out here that has passed out of committees and is before the American people as the subject matter to be discussed, and that is, here in the House, H.R. 3200. And I have, first, Mr. Speaker, a diagram of the previous bill that came out in 1993 and '94 that was known in many ways as HillaryCare. And so I have an observation here that I will post. This, Mr. Speaker, is the flow chart of HillaryCare. This is out of the archives of the New York Times. And it also is very close, if not identical to the flow chart that was on the wall of my office back in the early and mid-nineties, actually all the way through the nineties.

This is the flow chart that was laid out when the previous attempt to take over health care, for the government to take over the American health care system, was made. Here, on this floor, a few feet behind where I stand now, at the time President Bill Clinton came to the floor, September 22, 1993, and he did the unprecedented thing. He asked to address a joint session in Congress to speak of a subject matter that wasn't about war. That was the unprecedented component of it. But it was about the Federal Government taking over 100 percent of the health insurance and health care delivery system in the United States of America. That is a huge reach, and it was something that mobilized the American people in opposition. There were good reports on President Clinton's speech immediately after he gave it, because he, like our current President, had an ability and retains that ability to be a compelling speaker and to move people with the force of his words and not necessarily the force of ideas, but the tone and the force of the words themselves.

So President Clinton, in the aftermath of that September 22, 1993, speech right here to this joint session of Congress, his numbers moved and it looked like he had perhaps broken the dam and there was going to be a National Health Care Act that would transform and take over the entire health insurance industry and the health care delivery system in the United States.

□ 1630

We know how that came out, Mr. Speaker. We look back on that 15 years ago, we know how it came out. And that was there was a push-back across the land. I don't know that we actually used that expression in those days. But I recall Harry Louis and I recall Senator Phil Gramm, who, right down this hallway at the other end of the doors that you and I are facing, Mr. Speaker, at the other end of this Capitol Building, stood on the floor of the United States Senate and he said, This National Health Care Act will pass over my cold, dead, political body. That was Senator Phil Gramm. And a lot of people thought that his political body was going to be cold and dead and that we would have HillaryCare in America.

It didn't take 15 years to find the results of that, Mr. Speaker, because the American people rejected the idea that the freedom that they had to purchase their own health insurance and the freedom that they had to make many of their own decisions with their doctor in the marketplace would be taken away, and it would be government run and government owned.

This is the flowchart that described it better than anything else. I would submit as we look at these stacks of bills, an 1,100-page bill in H.R. 3200, the health care bill that has passed out of committee and is here waiting to come to the floor of the House, you can't understand the language; I don't care how good a lawyer you are if you have some diagrams. And you have to be able to look at the flowchart and track through the diagrams to find out what the language does, draw some pictures, so to speak. And even then I believe it is impossible for a single individual to analyze this legislation and be able to predict the pitfalls that are created by the vagaries in the language. There are many.

But this was enough to scare the living daylights out of the American people and me. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, this flowchart was one of the significant components that drove me to take time away from my private business, the construction business that I started in 1975.

And, Mr. Speaker, I seldom tell the story about that background, but I think for the sake of those who are listening—and we all want to evaluate the background of the people that are making recommendations for all 306 million Americans. For me, Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a lower-middle class family. My father was a law enforcement worker, a manager of the State police radio station, middle-level management. So he had pressure from the Governor on down and then he had some people who worked underneath him. Great reverence for the rule of law, a profound work ethic that something had to be going on all the time and you had to constantly be making progress.

That was my background. No business background.

But by 1975, Mr. Speaker, I had concluded that if I were going to control my destiny, it didn't pay for me to sit back and wait for the government to send me a check. The eagle wasn't going to fly for STEVE KING unless I did something to make the nest and get the eggs laid and hatch those eggs out. I had to take care of my own destiny.

So one day in June of 1975, I decided that I didn't have a lot of alternatives, but one of those was to take a risk and a chance and start a business. And I decided it was the best alternative. And so by August of that year, I had borrowed a hundred percent and gone out and bought a bulldozer, and that was the business, it was the foundation of the business. I don't know how many hundred pounds of welding rods I burned on that machine and how much repair work I had to do just to put it out on the job for the first hour. By the way, it broke down again in the first half a day and back to the shop it went, and I had to tear it completely down, rebuild it again and try again.

Many of us who have started businesses got knocked down over and over again, picked ourselves up again, and in the process of doing that were forced to learn the components of running a business. And anybody that started out with—I'll say for me it was a negative net worth in a highly capital-intensive business and had to meet payroll and meet the government regulations. And by the way, back then—I did a count. I had 43 government agencies that regulated my business. I had to answer to 43 government agencies, and if any one of them stepped in at any time and declared me to be out of compliance, they could either levy a fine or shut me down.

Government was then the biggest fear that I had when I started the business. I wasn't worried so much about whether I could do the work or I could repair the machines or whether I could drive the truck. I wasn't even so worried about whether I could market the service that I had decided to provide. All of those things were going to take time and effort, and all of those skills had to be improved upon. But the one I was most concerned about was how do I possibly meet all of the government regulations that I don't even know.

And there isn't any one single contact go-to point that any person who is starting a business to find out how many regulations you're going to have to meet, what will be the nature of that regulation. If you just stacked it all up, stacked up all of the paperwork and the regulations for 43 agencies that regulated me at that time, if I had known that, that would have been enough to scare me completely out of business before I ever went into business.

I lay this background to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I met payroll for over 28 years, over 1,400 consecutive weeks, and I paid myself last, if at all; and I paid my employees first and then I fed the kids. But we got through those

years, and we had our ups and downs. And I would never categorize it as a magnificent success except that being a business owner, a founder and a manager had laid the groundwork for me to understand the components of the other businesses in the country and gave me the tools that I had the flexibility to raise my family in a fashion that I thought was far more constructive than it might have been if someone else were telling me when and where I was going to show up to work. And it also gave me a burning desire to try to clear some of the path for others that might want to do the same thing.

So regulation has always been, I'll say in the last couple of generations anyway, the number one concern of business. What will government do not for us, but what will government do to us.

So this was 1975 when I began. We had our ups and downs, Mr. Speaker. I had barely gotten a position that I was even there to be a target of the farm crisis in the 1980s. But I went through all of that, and many of us got hammered flat over and over again and got back up. And some of my neighbors didn't make it. And some of them, their spirit was destroyed even though they made it. Those were tough years.

And the floods in 1993 and the other experiences along the way that I could chart on my financial statements, the ups and downs, all are triggered with some kind of an event.

But the experience of dealing with government and the experience of having to be my own accountant, mechanic, truck driver, my own sales manager, my own human resources manager, my own equipment operator, sometimes my shovel operator, sometimes the wrench operator, sometimes just the person who is the superintendent that steers everybody else when things are working and it's all in tune, that's when you're the least busy. I went through all of that.

I had to also deal with lawyers and insurance men and also, of course, our bankers. All of that laid a background and I think a knowledge base that's been so very useful here in public life.

But of all of the things that I mentioned, the one that's concerned me the most from the beginning, and the greatest impediment to people who might be entrepreneurs that want to establish and found a business, are government regulations. And this spider web of government regulations that were created by HillaryCare was enough to—didn't scare me out of business because it didn't pass over Senator Phil Gramm's cold, dead, political body, but it was enough to scare me towards politics, if not completely into politics. And I think it was enough to scare the living daylights out of the American people, and they killed HillaryCare.

Now we have the modern era. Fast forward 15 years, Mr. Speaker. The previous chart, Mr. Speaker, was black and white. This is in full living techni-

color. This is a 2009 version, the most recent version of a government takeover of the health care industry; and I mean, Mr. Speaker, the health insurance industry and the health care delivery industry in America. This 17½ percent of our Nation's economy and this flowchart with this full color is scarier yet.

Now, I don't mean that it's actually scarier by functionality, because marginally it at least leaves the opportunity for health insurance companies to survive for a while. But, Mr. Speaker, it certainly sets the scene for the destruction of every private health insurance company in the United States and the elimination, potentially, of every health insurance policy in the United States. In fact, H.R. 3200 compels that every health insurance policy within 5 years be approved by the health choices administration commissioner.

This bill sets up a new health choices czar. It calls him a commissioner because Americans are full up to here with czars, but this is a health choice administration commissioner. I don't know that he's a czar; I don't know that he's a commissioner; I don't know if he's a commissar. So I have called him the Health choice administration's commi-czar-issioner. And he would be the person who heads up this commission through which every health insurance company here, the private insurers, everything in white on this are existing. Those in color are newly created agencies, departments, and functionalities.

Thirteen hundred private health insurance companies. That sounds like a big number. Some of those companies have names for the different States that they operate in. But, Mr. Speaker, 1,300 health insurance companies here and the 100,000 potential, I'll say existing, policy variations here, the traditional health insurance plans, would all have to be qualified by this new commi-czar-issioner's board in order to provide through this period of 5 years to qualify, in order to provide the qualified health benefits plans.

So every health insurance policy in America would have 5 years to be approved by the new health choices commi-czar-issioner. And the regulations would be written by them. So we have a piece of legislation that sets up a commission that would write new regulations, the commission to be named later, to write regulations that would be named later that would control the destiny of 1,300 health insurance companies and 100,000 health insurance policy varieties, options that the American people have.

All of that would have to jump through the hoops to be created later after the legislation has passed by people to be appointed later, including the health choice administration commi-czar-issioner.

So for the President to make the promise to the American people that if you like your health insurance policy

and your doctor, don't worry, you get to keep it—if you noticed, he had to change the language when he stood here and gave his address to the joint session of Congress—I believe that was September 8. That's within a day, Mr. Speaker, and his language changed to actually be: "Nothing in this bill will force you to give up your doctor or your health insurance policy."

Well, I don't know that that's true because something in this bill may force those companies out of business and may disqualify your health insurance policy, and it may discourage your doctor to the point where he decides that he wants to go drive a taxi cab like they do in Cuba. If you want to meet a doctor in Cuba, take a taxi. You'll get in the back seat of a 1954 Chevy with a five cylinder Russian diesel in it, and the guy behind the wheel might be a doctor. They have a lot of doctors in Cuba. It pays better to drive a taxi cab.

So this reach that we have of taking the private insurance companies, 1,300, and force their 100,000 policies to go through new regulations to be written—and we know there are going to be fewer than 100,000 policies—so people will lose their policies.

I hope the President, Mr. Speaker, turns on C-SPAN and understands what I'm saying. He can't say it any more, Mr. President. If anything more like this passes, people will lose their policies, and they're likely to lose their doctor.

And you haven't told the Speaker of the House that she can't support something like this if she's going to be consistent with the intent of the language that she used herself.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll submit that this, the recharacterization, needs to revert back to the language of the bill. And we need to understand what happens when bureaucrats make decisions. And by the way, we sometimes just need to listen to the people on the other side of the aisle. They're for single-payer government takeover. A hundred or more of them have signed a letter saying they would vote against a health care bill if it didn't have a "government option." Excuse me, that's not the right quote. The quote is a "public option."

Mr. Speaker, a public option is a government option. It is a government takeover of the health care industry eventually. And, by the way, this is the purple circle of the 100,000—it won't be 100,000—but those that are left of the original 100,000 policies and the 1,300 companies. This purple circle, the qualified health benefits plans, that will be the private sector that actually meets the regulations after 5 years.

Fewer companies, fewer policies. We don't know how many, but we do know this: the government then would produce a public health plan. That's the second purple circle here. They would be under this health insurance exchange. So envision that as maybe an Internet site you would go to that

had a series of bureaucrats behind there that would make recommendations, evaluate policies, and let you look at the government option versus the private sector option.

□ 1645

But this public health plan, this government option, has to be set up with Federal taxpayer dollars. You can't start an insurance company without capital. Where is it going to come from? The American taxpayers. And where does our money come from now after we have long past burned through the tax revenue for the 2009 fiscal year? It comes from the Chinese and the Saudis. And we are borrowing money from foreign countries. We are borrowing money to buy things from them, and now we would be borrowing money to start up a health insurance company. In any case, it would be national debt money, billions that would be the capital foundation to set up an insurance company so that there would be conceivably 1,301 health insurance companies. One more company.

The President's view was, we need more competition in the health insurance industry. So, if 1,300 companies is not enough, set up a Federal company. That will be the difference. And we will borrow money and put billions into it. And now this enterprise, this Federal enterprise that is in direct competition with the private companies has to succeed.

Well, if it can't sell policies, it can't succeed. So how does the government go about doing this? Well, they set the premiums low enough and the benefits competitive enough that they can get people to buy the policies, otherwise they are an irrelevant entity.

So I guess you would say that's fine, except we need to understand this. The regulations that would be written for the government plan would be regulations that are written so the government plan can compete with all of these private plans, which means that the regulations would be written to favor the government plan. And the premiums the government would charge would be premiums that are designed to be competitive, and I'm going to say likely cheaper than can be offered in the private sector. And so the result of that will be that either we are going to have to subsidize the government plan health insurance company, or we are going to have to regulate these private sector businesses out of business.

It's how government operates. We have several models that we can look at.

The simplest and most stark of them all is the National Flood Insurance Program. If you want to know, Mr. Speaker, how health insurance will go if we have the government option, look at the National Flood Insurance Program. We had a government option on Federal flood insurance. In 1968, this Congress passed legislation that established the National Flood Insurance

Program. We had property and casualty insurance companies in the private sector that sold flood insurance. But when the government got involved, they set new premiums and new regulations, and they still couldn't crack into the market well enough. And so then they passed a regulation that required that a real estate loan through a national bank had to include flood insurance. And when they put that mandate on the national banks, they required the flood insurance to be purchased—from where? The Federal Government. With premiums set by? The Federal Government.

Today, it is impossible to buy flood insurance in America from anyone other than the National Flood Insurance Program because the Federal Government has squeezed out all of the competition, and the Federal Government owns the entire territory.

We have today—I say “we,” the Federal Government has a monopoly on flood insurance. And their operation is pretty wobbly because they are \$19.2 billion in the red. That's billion with a B, Mr. Speaker. The National Flood Insurance premiums don't reflect the risk. They've pushed out all the competition. They've lowered the premiums. And now what are we doing as a result? We are building more and more and developing more and more real estate in floodplains because the premiums for the flood insurance are cheaper than the risk. And so people can do that, and we create more risk accordingly.

The markets, Mr. Speaker, can restrain and bring about rational decisions. Bureaucrats make mistakes over and over again. That's the Federal flood insurance. That's what will happen to this Federal health insurance if it should get passed.

In addition, we have the school loan program. Twenty-five years ago, that was completely private. The private lending institutions set up the school loan program. But today, thanks to some very liberal Members of Congress, it looks like the steps have been taken that will, within a very short period of time, squeeze out what is left of the private school loan program, the school loan program, where I will predict that within 5 years from today, if there isn't a dramatic difference in the elections that are taking place in this country, there will be nothing but government student loans. There will no longer be any private student loans.

This is a country that was built on free enterprise. We are a proud and independent people. We are slowly settling into dependence.

We have handed over the private sector flood insurance. And by the way, in the State of Florida, they have State hurricane insurance now that owns that market, because they decided government could do it better than the private sector.

Over and over again, we give up our freedoms and we forget about the underpinnings of American exception-

alism and the markets and personal responsibility. I heard the gentleman from Ohio say last night, I believe it was, that if you get sick, you may have to go into bankruptcy to pay your bills. He then asked the question, is that freedom? Well, yes, actually. This is a country that if you're going to have freedom, you have to be willing to take some risks. You have to have the freedom to succeed, and you have to have the freedom to fail.

Now, I'm all about, and many of us are about reaching out to our neighbors and our friends, and we don't want people that have been responsible to have to pay a consequence because they happen to be very unfortunate. But by the same token, I don't want to take away the personal responsibility from the American people.

I remember when Jimmy Carter was running for President. He said this profound thing. Well, for Jimmy Carter, this was a profound thing. He said, the people that work should live better than those that don't. Now I don't know whether he actually lived by that or set policy by that. But I remember when he said that because it caught my attention. This was maybe 1976 or so. The people that work should live better than those that don't. The people who step up and take responsibility should at least have a modicum of benefit for taking that responsibility.

But the effort over on the Democrat side of the aisle seems to be take all the responsibility away from the people because I think they disrespect the ability, the work ethic, the character, the morality, the discipline, the education, the intellect and the core values that we have as American people.

We can rise above anything. Mr. Speaker, we are not a regular people here in America. We're Americans. We're not just an extension of Europe. That was the base of our original population. We are far different from that. We are a people that are the recipients of all the best that came from Western civilization. But we have got also the cream of the crop from every donor civilization.

The vitality that it must have taken and the dreams that it must have taken to be able to get on a ship and find a way to barter your way for passage or pay the passage to come across here. My great grandfather multiple times over came over here in 1757 from England. He served as an indentured servant in a livery stable and paid off his passage. He was the father of 17 kids, and their dreams were realized. And multiple generations arrived here that way. That's part of what is the core of who it is to be an American. It is not a normal, regular thing. We're not just an extension of Europe or any other country. We have a special vitality, because it has been hard to get here, and you had to have a dream to come here. The people that didn't have a dream stayed home in their own country. And some of them sat back and didn't work and didn't excel.

Many came here for religious freedom. Many came here for economic freedom. And many more came here for religious and economic freedom. That beacon of the Statue of Liberty was in the minds of the American people and an inspiration for the world long before the statute was put up at Ellis Island. We are a unique people that have relied upon this freedom. Our vitality has been an inspiration for the world.

We sit in the Congress and we begin to erode these freedoms one after another after another and trade them off for a dependency. If we take this false clarion call that somehow we can push the expenses for this, the debt for this, off on to the succeeding generations, what moral standard would anyone have to make a declaration to the little kids growing up in America and those children not born, that we, our generation, in our time, have somehow a right to put them in debt in the first place? And secondly, what right do we have to put them in debt because we want to give everybody in America not health care—not health care—because everybody in America has access to health care. The argument is we want to give everybody in America a health insurance policy created by the government.

Think how this works. This single-payer national health care plan is the goal of the President of the United States, the goal of the Speaker of the House and the goal of the leadership here. And I know that there is reference made to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS. I went back and pulled a bill that he had introduced on health care in 1981. It's getting to be a while back now, 28 years ago. I know Mr. GINGREY referenced him in his earlier speech. But I read the bill. That bill I read. It was about 167 pages. It sets up a United States health services department, an agency.

It says in there that every human being, every person, in the United States, legal and illegal, whatever their status might be, whatever their proclivities might be, has a right to quality, timely and respectful health care, a right to this in 1981. It's pretty astonishing to read that.

Now you can have that concept, I guess, and that is the concept of the chairman. But to follow this thing along, he also declares that everybody has a right to this health care, legal and illegal, but in addition, all health care workers will be salaried employees. So he sets up a national company to manage all the health care in America, and no worker can be there working off a fee for service. The brilliant surgeons that are creating new ways to save lives and improve the quality of lives, and new surgical techniques and new equipment, they would all have to be paid at the end of the month just like the person who is, let me say, maintaining the building.

It takes away the incentive. You have forgotten completely about the

difference between being an American and being a regular dependent soul in a social democracy in Western Europe, for example.

We have got to remember: We are Americans. We are a distinct group of people. That kind of idea of socialized medicine is anathema to freedom-loving, freedom-breathing people. If we bargain it away, it's never to be retained again, not in this generation, not in any other.

I will conclude and go to the gentleman from Missouri.

There's a lot at stake here. The future of America is at stake. And it is not just this national health care act. It is the socialized medicine that lies underneath it. It is the cap-and-trade which pushes our industry to India and China. It's the comprehensive amnesty policy that they are preparing to deliver. If any combination of these three should become law, they will try to ram the rest of them through. And that, Mr. Speaker, sounds to me like the end of American freedom.

I will stand and fight it every step of the way, as will my friend from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) to whom I will be very happy to yield whatever time he may consume.

Mr. AKIN. It's my pleasure to join my good friend. And as you talk a little bit about freedom, you have spoken in somewhat general terms about the effects of the government taking over paying the doctors and what that would do. But I would like to get a little bit more into the details, because I think we have to remember the results of what that freedom has done in the area of medicine.

The level of innovation that has occurred in medicine in a free society such as ours is just incredible. And it is America that drives all of these new developments of various drugs. It is America that is driving all of these things like laser surgery for eyes.

We see examples now of something that was considered a very risky and strange procedure that wasn't covered by insurance company, called Lasik surgery for your eyes, which now is tremendously common. My wife had some 10 years ago, and her vision was terrible. It's much better than mine now because of the fact we had this innovation. We have innovation in terms of heart surgery and the way that we deal with that. My dad just had a seven-way heart bypass. That was something that wasn't available 30, 40 years ago. And he is surviving and doing well at 88 years old. There are so many different kinds of innovations, use of radiation which is now focused in a very, very tiny area to be able to destroy cancer, and different types of drugs and things. All of this innovation is the product of freedom, because as people take risks and try new ideas, new and better ways to do things are born.

It struck me, my good friend from Iowa, that it was said that it wasn't until about the First World War that when you got sick and went to a doctor

that you came out ahead. In other words, if you went to see a doctor before World War I, it was certainly after the Civil War, but if you got sick and went to see a doctor, at least 50 percent of the time you would leave the doctor worse than where you started. And that is, of course, kind of a grim situation to be very sick and have to see a doctor knowing you have got less than a 50 percent chance to do better than when you started.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, how would you compare those results to the results of dealing with the Pelosi Congress today?

Mr. AKIN. I'm afraid that America is probably less healthy under the results of the Pelosi Congress. If you were to judge in economic terms, you would be talking in trillion-dollar measurements of less healthy. You would be talking about excessive spending and excessive government control.

I think sometimes history is so close to us we fail to grasp the significance. Did you ever stop to think that the President of the United States fired the President of General Motors? That is an incredible intrusion that our forefathers would say, What? I can't believe that.

And now we are talking about this isn't just a sort of semi-benign Lyndon Baines Johnson war on poverty. He figured out there were people that were hungry out there, so he decides to hand out some food stamps, which has turned out to be a very corrupt program.

□ 1700

So he decides to hand out some food stamps, which has turned out to be a very corrupt program, but he didn't try to have the government take over every supermarket and every farm in America.

You've got 100 million people that have got good health insurance, good relations with their doctors and hospitals, getting good medical treatment, and for what he started saying, 30 million, and then your chart I see coming up is going to explain about how small this is.

So we're going to basically have the government take over the entire system and mess everything up for 100 million people in order to try and help 15 million? I mean, just the common sense of this. And you're talking about the Pelosi Congress. I will tell you, the patient is a lot sicker than they were 6 months ago, my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Missouri, and I hope we can continue this dialogue. You've inspired me to go with this other chart. Some say 50 million uninsured. The highest number I generally hear is 44 million to 47 million, but this is the 47 million uninsured chart.

Now, the President has said there are two things that are very compelling that cause us to have to go down this path of a national health care plan.

One is we spend too much money. We spend about 14.5 percent of our GDP on health care. The average of the industrialized world is 9.5 percent.

So we may spend too much. We could fix almost all that with tort reform and allowing people to buy insurance across State lines. The too much question, spending too money can be fairly easily resolved. The other component of this is too many uninsured.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Now, who is it that should allow the Federal Government to tell American citizens whether they're spending their money in the right place? Isn't that kind of this Big Government top-down mindset that comes up with something as dumb as that?

If you're sick, you're going to spend as much money as you need to try and get well. Who's to tell you you spent too much or too little? Even the very sniff of that speaks of this Big Government mindset.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'd suggest it's probably the predecessors to Merkel, Sarkozy, and Gordon Brown, or maybe even they, themselves. In fact, I heard an actual dialogue with Chancellor Angela Merkel. We spend too much on health care. They have that look-over-our-shoulder tendency, as if global norms would be right. I remember one of those contributors to global norms would be the health care industry in Iraq. When we went in there in March of 2003, the average annual expenditure for health care per person in Iraq was fifty cents per year. So I suppose you could add that into the global average.

We do spend a lot of money. We get great results. And I haven't heard the American people complaining all that much about their results, because they are great results. But if we want to take the cost down, then we take care of medical malpractice.

I talked to an orthopedic surgeon—and my days blend together, but I believe it was yesterday—that out of his small little operation they spend more than a million dollars a year in premiums for malpractice and in unnecessary—unnecessary tests in order to avoid the litigation. Defensive medicine, over a million dollars a year out of what he considers to be a small practice; what I consider to be he's a great contributor to our society and to our civilization. That's multiplied across the country.

When I hear numbers that come from representatives that are part of the health insurance underwriters in America and they tell me that 8.5 percent of the overall health care costs are malpractice premiums, litigation, and defensive medicine, those three things in that category, and I multiply .085 times the gross receipts for the cost of health care, that comes to \$203 billion a year unnecessarily spent because the trial lawyers have that corner of the market fixed, and there's no will on HARRY REID's side of this Capitol building or NANCY PELOS's side of this Capitol building. In fact, there's a

huge will to resist addressing malpractice and the reform of lawsuit abuse. That's the best and most important thing we could do.

We evaluate these bills on the part of a 10-year plan; \$203 billion a year. If we could fix it all, that's over \$2 trillion. The President, in fixing the health care industry that he says costs too much money, only proposes to fix it by putting another \$1.6 trillion into it. So we simply fix the malpractice and we have been able to fund all the other ideas which I don't agree with. That's a component of this. It needs to happen.

And then we have the uninsured, Mr. AKIN. I would like to raise the issue about the uninsured. These 47 million—now, this chart has got somebody else's software that did it, so I will tell you the numbers that I remember that I have vetted to be accurate.

Starts out with 47 million uninsured. We need to fix this because there are too many uninsured in America. So what are they comprised of? All people who don't have affordable options? No is the answer, and here's what it's comprised of.

These are the illegal aliens. This chart says 6 million. Mine said 5.2 million. Then you have those that are here in the country legally that the law bars from benefits. That's the 5-year bar. It's a matter of solid Federal practice. They add up to 10 million—10.2 million, actually.

Then you have those who earn more than \$75,000 a year. That's about 9 million people. And, presumably, they could write a check and buy themselves at least catastrophic insurance. They are not in a position where we need to tax somebody that makes less to take care of those people that are making more.

Then you go on down the line. Those that are eligible for government programs; that number is actually 9.7 million. Most of that is people that qualify for Medicaid but don't bother to sign up. And then you have those that are eligible for employer insurance, roughly 6 million people, that either opt out or don't opt in to their employer-offered plan.

So once you add up all of these people and you subtract these numbers that I believe are not the target of this dialogue and rhetoric or the bill, you end up with 12.1 million Americans that don't have affordable options. That's less than 4 percent of the population.

This is what it looks like, Mr. Speaker. This is the entire population of the United States here, 306 million people, maybe 307 million by now, and these are the categories that I have mentioned: illegals/immigrants; those with \$75,000 a year; those that qualify for, generally, Medicaid; those under an employer's plan. But over here, this little sliver in red, those are the Americans without affordable options. Less than 4 percent; 12.1 million people.

All of the rest of these people, not only are they insured, but they're happy with what we have.

Mr. AKIN. So what we're doing, gentleman, is we're saying we're going to scrap the whole system, have the government take it over, because of that little 4 percent thing. I came from the engineering world, and there's one thing about solving a problem. There's another one to have a solution to just try to force your solution on something that doesn't make sense.

It appears to me that the solution is we want the government to run everything. We want the government running health care, so we're going to force a government solution just because of that little red—that isn't even a decent piece of pie. You couldn't even gain any weight on that amount.

Mr. KING of Iowa. A tiny little sliver. Even though 12.1 million people are a lot of people, they're still a small percentage of the American population. And to upset a hundred percent of the health insurance industry, perhaps destroy a hundred percent of the health insurance industry and change the delivery system for the best health care delivery system in the world, all of that—this is an excuse for a government takeover. It's not a reason.

And if there's anything that my father taught me, he said, you know, Son, there's a difference between reasons and excuses. And I'm your dad and I will tell you I know the difference. And I don't have to explain it to you. I will just label them as such.

Well, this is an excuse, and I will label it as such. It's not a reason, not a reason to upset the entire industry, but an excuse because the people on this side of the aisle believe in Big Government. They don't believe in the American people, and they are sapping our vitality.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, the truth of the matter is we're not standing here defending everything about the American health care system. There's things that need to be changed, and we've talked about those things. You have mentioned on the floor that tort reform has to be a big part of it because tort reform is just using up a whole lot of money that doesn't need to be spent, which could be spent on good medicine. So that's one item.

But there's some other things that I think almost any American, if you heard about it, would say, Oh, yeah, that's right. For instance, there are some people in America who get to buy their health insurance using pretax dollars; whereas, small business men and self-insured people have to use the money they pay after they've paid taxes on the money.

So that's not just justice. People are not equal before the law. We say we're a Nation of laws, but that's not a just solution. What we should do is that everybody should use the same equation. I think you and I would agree that we just pay for health insurance with pretax dollars. That would be making everybody consistent.

There's a second thing that we could do. Another thing is the idea of a medical savings account. You could allow

people with pretax dollars to set money aside. They could use that money to buy health insurance or to pay medical bills. And if they don't use it, they can keep it earning interest in an uninsured account. If they up and die, they can pass it on to their kids. That makes sense, too. That allows us to allow Americans having their own money, buying health care, and that equation starts to get people to shop for prices. So that's another good idea. And there are quite a number of other ones that we've proposed.

You mentioned another one which makes a whole lot of sense. People say, Oh, well, you're trying to help the big insurance companies. No. What we want is reasonable competition. And that idea of being able to shop for health insurance across State lines is a very effective and competitive mechanism, because if one State has got laws that allow the insurance to be purchased at a lower price, then why can't a citizen, particularly where we have a big metropolitan area that bridges two different areas, get their health insurance from places less expensive?

So there's another idea that's been proposed. And there are other ones. I don't want to run too long on your time, gentlemen, but there are a number of things that we can do to make medicine better in our country.

Let me tell you. You know who votes with their feet? You get some sheik in Bahrain or some other place or some other part of the world that's loaded with millions of dollars and they get sick, guess where they come to get their medical care? They come to the good old USA. That's because our medical system is not bad. It's producing very good results. It's just that there's a lot of cost shifting going on.

Here's an idea, gentlemen. I just toss this out for you to think about it. Somebody summarized, if there is a problem with American health care, the problem is this: that is that one-third of Americans are paying nothing for it and the other two-thirds are paying for it, and that that cost shift is the problem, that one-third are paying nothing. And that's part of what's causing our cost shift problem.

I'd yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. Initially, I put this concept out here, Mr. Speaker, that the circumstances that are going on this way are that for a long time those that are in the income-earning and productive years of their lives have been paying for the health insurance, the health care of those that are retired. We've decided to do that. It's a matter of public policy. And I don't hear an objection on the part of the people that are paying their taxes on their payroll to support Medicare. In fact, I don't hear a complaint very much on the funding that goes into Medicaid at the lower-income side. And, generally, the younger people are beneficiaries of Medicaid.

So you have on the low-income side Medicaid funded by the working, pro-

ducing, tax-paying Americans, and on the senior citizen side you have Medicare funded by the working, producing, tax-paying citizens. But in the middle, those working, producing, tax-paying citizens today at least have the freedom to choose a policy of their choice, buy a policy of their choice or not buy a policy of their choice. And this bill, H.R. 3200, takes that away.

And the subliminal message that I have not heard articulated that seems to be viscerally understood is that the people that are paying for Medicaid and Medicare out of their paycheck because they're going to work every day and managing and planning, now the government is saying, You no longer have the freedom to choose your own. You have to pay for everybody else's. You've been doing that a long time, but now we want to take away your right to buy your own health insurance policy. And that sticks in the craw of the American people because it diminishes freedom.

Mr. AKIN. That strikes me a little bit as, first of all, you run over them with a car and then back over them to say you're sorry. I mean, you're getting them coming and going.

First of all, they're doing what we would say is the right thing as a responsible citizen—having a job, buying health insurance, and trying to take care of their own bills—and now you're going to tax them for doing the very thing that you wanted them to do in the first place.

There's a basic rule of economics, and that is what you tax, you get less of, and what you pay for, you get more of. The more people you pay for free medical care, you're going to get more and more people signed up for it. And the more you tax people who are working and paying for their own health care, you're going to get less of it. So why in the world would we want to adopt a policy like that?

The interesting thing is, gentleman, this proposal, the Pelosi health care proposal, in spite of the fact that a lot of major media is pushing it and the President is pushing it and all kinds of people like that are pushing it, the American public is not buying this thing. And I was just kind of thinking in my mind, Who would be against this? Why is it that the polling data shows that this is not popular with the American public? And I'm thinking, well, it's almost like politics, in a way.

□ 1715

How many groups of people does this Pelosi plan antagonize? Well, let's see. First of all, if you're on Medicare, you're going to take \$500 billion out of Medicare. Well, the people who are on Medicare are thinking, I don't want you to take \$500 million out of the place where I'm getting my health. So the older people—who are pretty regular voters, by the way—they don't like this thing.

Well, then you've got other people. Gentleman, you were a successful

owner of a small business. Well, the small business guys are going to get soaked to have to pay for this plan, so they're not too enthused about it. Then you have some other people. They call themselves pro-lifers. They don't like this plan very well either because there was an amendment offered in committee making it clear that we weren't going to use this government socialized money to pay for free abortions. That amendment was defeated in committee. It is very clear that this money is going to go for abortions, and that's why National Right to Life says, This is the biggest threat in the pro-life area since Roe v. Wade.

So the pro-life people don't like this, small business people don't like it, older people don't like it. Then you have got the 100 million people that have their insurance, doctors that they like and a system that's giving them good health care, and basically you're creating something that's going to destroy that, and they're going to have to change to a government system within some number of years, so they're not liking this.

After you start adding those people together, it starts to make sense why people don't like this. And particularly, most Americans at a fundamental level understand that good health care has to start with a patient-doctor relationship. It has to start with the doctor and the patient deciding what is the right health care alternative. We don't like it when some big insurance company sticks their nose in that relationship, and we like it a whole lot less when it's going to be a government bureaucrat.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming again, I completely agree. As I'm listening to the gentleman from Missouri, the engineer who sees things in black and white and finite formulas that work out or else they can be checked and balanced, a logical approach is, let me say, that's the engineering approach. As I'm listening to this, it's triggering in my memory some of the things about what it was like to start and run a business for 28 years and what the motivations are. Now my business, a construction business, seasonal business. I looked at it, and I look at it from this concept: I wanted to have people that I could rely on. I wanted it to be a career. So I set things up where we would keep people on all year long, even though it was a seasonal business. And when things freeze up in Iowa, and it gets cold, there is frost and the temperatures go down, we move people into the shop where we would rebuild our equipment.

Sometimes we would take on some custom work, fixing somebody else's, but we kept them around. I kept people around 12 months out of the year. I want them to have a health care package. I want them to have a retirement plan. I want them to have a vacation plan. That's all fine when you pay the payroll, but when the government

interferes—for example, the unemployment tax, and if they would offer unemployment benefits and sometimes they gave unemployment benefits to somebody that just didn't want to work. But it was sometimes impossible for me to fight it.

So even though I had my reading at zero, if you're not willing to fight that, many others would see it go up to 9 percent, and they'd pay the percent of their payroll to unemployment because government regulation had decided they knew better than the marketplace. As I said, the year-round work part of this, keep people working year round. Well, the incentive is, if you're going to pay unemployment at the top rate anyway, you might as well lay people off rather than keep them working when you don't really need them. So instead, they become piecemeal workers rather than career employees.

Then the Federal Government decided, you shall pay union scale, Davis-Bacon wage scale, and we'll decide what those categories are. Now you have people jockeying for a position, undermining the efficiencies, and the Federal Government looking over your shoulder, telling you how to run your business. All of that still has created inefficiencies by government regulation that bring about the illogical, irrational business decisions until you consider the government regulation. Then it becomes rational within those rules.

To throw this health care thing on top of it, employers that have capitulated and decided they're going to use people as piecemeal workers rather than career employees because of too much regulation, they're going to also decide, I'm not going to pay this health insurance. I am just going to pay the premium. I'm going to add it on to the price of the work I'm doing, and it undermines the relationship between employers and employees. That's a component of all this.

I wanted to throw out before our time ticks down, in what I believe is about 6 minutes, a little subtle segue, Mr. AKIN. I think most of America should know what this little subtle segue is. This is a pervasive influence of the corrupt criminal enterprise ACORN. ACORN has developed since 1970, 39 years, to be this insidious operation of now, according to a Government Reform report issued by Mr. ISSA of California on July 23, 361 affiliations, affiliations that have been engaged in shaking down lenders across this country in 120 cities.

Put this in your mind, Mr. Speaker. This of Chicago, Chicago politics, Chicago hardball politics. The make-a-deal—this is shakedown. The head of ACORN who recruited President Obama and is proud of their relationship has bragged about going into lenders' offices and shoving the banker's desk over against the wall and surrounding him with ACORN people and intimidating that lender into making bad loans in bad neighborhoods.

Mr. AKIN. You know, you talked about a lot of corrupt and illegal practices, gentleman. And when I think of ACORN, maybe as an engineer, I'm thinking cause and effect. ACORN is more closely associated with the central nerve center and hub of what created the housing crisis and the housing bubble in America. They're the ones that basically started all of these bad loans which Wall Street then lied about, saying that they were good loans, packaged them up and sold them all over the world, creating the current economic crisis. So if you want to look at the epicenter of what created, for many of us who lost 30, 40 percent of our life savings in this economic mess, you're looking at the symbol of that ACORN. I'm glad you've got a line through it because we don't owe them any favors.

Mr. KING of Iowa. These are the people that are undermining American freedom more aggressively than any other. They're in many, many walks of life. Their influence is pervasive. They are at the core of the mortgage meltdown crisis. The intimidation factors, the shakedown in the cities of the lenders and at the same time the lobbying effort where they spent millions in this Congress to push to lower the underwriting standards on the secondary market of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. The chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. FRANK, has been engaged in lowering and fighting off the increased capitalization requirements of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, and that was lobbied by ACORN. If you look back through the financial crisis in the community level, it is ACORN at the core of that. The President of the United States has been at the beginning of this. His entire political career he has been part and parcel, tied to ACORN, and he has said so, and the videotape is available.

Mr. AKIN. The interesting thing is, our judicial system should be punishing lawbreakers, and yet what we saw just a few weeks ago was a couple of courageous—I don't know if they were college students—some gal with some pretty legs going in with a hidden camera at ACORN and getting all of the financial information necessary and the legal information, how they could set up a house of ill repute, bring in underage illegals to work, to write them off as dependents so that the taxpayer is paying some of the tab so that this guy could run for Congress because he started this illegal brothel.

This whole thing is on tape, and yet we've got the Justice Department and all of these institutions of law in America that should have been cracking down on this organization; instead, you've got a couple of courageous kids that are barely out of college, taking some videos and capturing the attention and building the rage of the American public. It is just mind-boggling that our government is so inefficient and so unable to stop this organization that passed out money like it was water down here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The crimes that they were promoting and supporting in those five major cities, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Brooklyn, San Bernardino, California, and San Diego, California. All of that at an organization, and the President claims that he is not paying attention to this. I will submit, he knows who Joe Wilson is. He knew who Professor Gates was. He got involved in Officer Crowley's law enforcement up near Harvard, but he says he doesn't know what's going on in ACORN, even though I have seen the videotape of the President speaking to ACORN, telling them, We walk this walk together. ACORN was involved in promoting a whole series of crimes within these five cities, including: promotion of child prostitution; illegal immigration; violations of the Mann Act; helping to facilitate mortgages for a house of ill repute and telling them how to avoid taxes, report only 10 cents on the dollar and then qualify for the earned income tax credit, tapping money out of the taxpayer; and the child care tax credit for little children prostitutes.

And were these mothers that were sitting behind the desk at ACORN when we saw the face of them? I heard children playing in the background. They're recruiting girls to be prostitutes while girls are being raised in the background. Those things happened, and there are some similarities in five cities across America. And that's not the full spectrum. The voter-registration fraud, the voter election fraud. Today in the State of Nevada, ACORN, as an entity, is under prosecution right now. The trial is going on right now about ACORN's fraudulent voter registrations, and Troy, New York, fraudulent votes—Mr. Speaker, this has got to stop.

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 Mrs. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOHMERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 8.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 8.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 6, 7 and 8.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, October 6, 7, and 8.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on September 30, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3593. To amend the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 to extend by one year the operation of Radio Free Asia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2131. To amend the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 to reauthorize the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

H.R. 2918. Making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3614. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3607. 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3877. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Farm Storage Facility Loan and Sugar Storage Facility Loan Programs (RIN: 0560-AH60) received September 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3878. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ametryn, Amitraz, Ammonium Soap Salts of Higher Fatty Acids, Bitertanol, Coppers, et al., Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0251; FRL-8431-7] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3879. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0624; FRL-8431-1] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3880. A letter from the Secretary, Securities & Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of the Temporary Exemptions for Eligible Credit Default Swaps to Facilitate Operation of Central Counterparties to Clear and Settle Credit Default Swaps (RIN: 3235-AK26) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3881. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Education Programs [Docket ID ED-2009-OPE-0002] (RIN: 1840-AC97) received August 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3882. A letter from the Director, OSHA Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating OSHA Standards Based on National Consensus Standards; Personal Protective Equipment [Docket No.: OSHA-2007-0044] (RIN: 1218-AC08) received September 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3883. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Energy Conservation Program for Certain Industrial Equipment: Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Commercial Heating, Air-Conditioning, and Water-Heating Equipment [Docket No.: EERE-2008-BT-STD-0013] (RIN: 1904-AB83) received September 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3884. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Area Source Standards for Aluminum, Copper, and Other Nonferrous Foundries—Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0236; FRL 8954-3] (RIN: 2060-AP85) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3885. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Telemarketing Sales Rule Fees (RIN: 3084-AA98) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3886. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Health Breach Notification Rule (RIN: 3084-AB17) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3887. A letter from the Program Manager, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Breach Notification for Unsecured Protected Health Information (RIN: 0991-AB56) received August 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3888. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3889. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3890. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3891. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3892. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to

the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3893. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3894. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3895. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3896. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3897. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3898. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3899. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3900. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3901. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3902. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3903. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3904. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3905. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3906. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3907. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3908. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3909. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3910. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3911. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3912. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3913. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3914. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3915. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3916. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3917. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3918. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3919. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — EPAAR Prescription and Clauses-Government Property-Contract Property Administration [EPA EPA-HQ-OARM-2008-0817; FRL-8956-4] (RIN: 2030-AA98) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3920. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf — Technical Corrections [Docket No.: MMS-OMM-2009-0008] (RIN: 1010-AD52) received September 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3921. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [FWS-R9-MB-2008-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) received September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3922. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [FWS-R9-MB-2008-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3923. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2009-10 Early Season [FWS-R9-MB-2009-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) received September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3924. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands [FWS-R9-MB-2008-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) received September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3925. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [FWS-R9-MB-2008-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) received September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3926. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final "Major" rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2009-10 Late Season [FWS-R9-MB-2009-0124] (RIN: 1018-AW31) received September 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3927. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Action Plans [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0032; Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-AC05) received September 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3928. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, -100B, -100B SUD, -200B, and -300 Series Airplanes; and Model 747SP and 747SR Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0477; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-16003; AD 2009-18-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3929. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0622; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-034-AD; Amendment 39-15999; AD 2009-18-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3930. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-802 and AT-802A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0489; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-025-AD; Amendment 39-16000; AD 2009-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3931. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA), Model CN-235, CN-235-100, CN-235-200, and CN-235-300 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0386; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-184-AD; Amendment 39-16002; AD 2009-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3932. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0622; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-034-AD; Amendment 39-15999; AD 2009-18-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3933. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.27 Mark 050 and F.28 Mark 0100 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0496; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-16001; AD 2009-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3934. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. CFM56-5B1/P; -5B2/P; -5B3/P; -5B3/P1; -5B4/P; -5B4/P1; -5B5/P; -5B6/P; -5B7/P; -5B8/P; -5B9/P; -5B1/3; -5B2/3; -5B3/3; -5B4/3; -5B5/3; -5B6/3; -5B7/3; -5B8/3; -5B9/3; -5B3/3B1; and -5B4/3B1 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0174; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-15997; AD 2009-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3935. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disregarded Entities Excise Taxes [TD 9462] (RIN:1545-BH91) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3936. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modifications of Commercial Mortgage Loans Held by a Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduit (REMIC) [TD 9463] (RIN: 1545-BG77) received September 16, 2009, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3937. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modifications of Commercial Mortgage Loans Held by an Investment Trust [Notice 2009-79] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3938. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2009-45) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3939. A letter from the Director, Child Nutrition Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing and Sale of Fluid Milk in Schools [FNS-2005-0009] (RIN: 0584-AD83) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve procedures for the collection and delivery of marked absentee ballots of absent overseas uniformed services voters, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3687. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program and to re-allocate those visas to certain employment-based immigrants who obtain an advanced degree in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARCURI (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 3688. A bill to encourage programs of health promotion or disease prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 3689. A bill to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. to establish a Vietnam Veterans Memorial visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FALCOMA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 3690. A bill to establish a Commission on Recognition of Indian Tribes to review

and act on petitions by Indian groups applying for Federal recognition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 3691. A bill to extend to 2010 the program for economic recovery payments established under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations, 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. INSLER (for himself, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KIRK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HARE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WU, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NYE, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. FARR, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WATT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KILROY, Mr. MASSA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KIND, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DELAHUNT,

Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 3692. A bill to protect inventoried roadless areas in the National Forest System; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 3693. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify Medicare physician reimbursement policies to ensure a future physician workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 3694. A bill to establish judicial procedures for causes and claims relating to any action or decision by a Federal official regarding the leasing of Federal lands (including submerged lands) for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, or any other source or form of energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3695. A bill to authorize funding for, and increase accessibility to, the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System, to facilitate data sharing between such system and the National Crime Information Center database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide incentive grants to help facilitate reporting to such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3696. A bill to prohibit recipients of TARP assistance from funding ACORN, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 3697. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 3698. A bill to authorize grants to State and local law enforcement training centers to provide training to State and local law enforcement agencies and officers to communicate with telecommunications carriers in emergency situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms.

WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 3699. A bill to prohibit any increase in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 3700. A bill to establish requirements for any health reform legislation enacted by the Congress or the President during the 11th Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 3701. A bill to establish the More Books for Africa Program to facilitate the donation, processing, shipping, and distribution of text and library books to African schools, libraries, community centers, and other centers of learning in partnership with United States-based entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

H.R. 3702. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide enhanced penalties for marketing controlled substances to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 3703. A bill to require the President to call a White House Conference on Autism; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 3704. A bill to authorize a Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility lease in Atlanta, Georgia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to increase the number of children eligible for free school meals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 3706. A bill to require borrowers under FHA-insured mortgages for single-family housing to make downpayments of at least 5 percent and to prohibit financing of closing costs under such mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 3707. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude combat zone compensation of members of the Armed Forces from employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income the earned income of a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MINNICK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3709. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to authorize noncompetitive leasing of certain areas adjoining other lands for which a qualified company or indi-

vidual holds a preexisting legal right to develop geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STARK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 3710. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER of New York:

H.R. 3711. A bill to authorize States or political subdivisions thereof to regulate fuel economy and emissions standards for taxicabs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 3712. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of and to commemorate the 1863 invasion of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg, and President Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BUYER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 3713. A bill to provide bipartisan solutions to lower health costs, increase access to affordable coverage, and give patients more choices and control; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Appropriations, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information about freedom of the press in foreign countries, establish a grant program to promote freedom of the press worldwide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr.

PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SESTAK):

H.R. 3715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the rehabilitation credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3716. A bill to make certain adjustments to the price analysis of propane prepared by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 3717. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require a provider of a commercial mobile service or an IP-enabled voice service to provide call location information concerning the user of such a service to law enforcement agencies in order to respond to a call for emergency services or in an emergency situation that involves the risk of death or serious physical harm; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr.

PIERLUISI, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need to pass meaningful legislation to protect commercial and government data from data breaches; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 789. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2, 2009, as World MRSA Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HARE, Mr. KIND, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H. Res. 790. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a national day of remembrance on October 30, 2009, for American nuclear weapons program workers and uranium miners, millers, and haulers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARROW, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr.

HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. REYES, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 791. A resolution congratulating the Aldine Independent School District in Harris County, Texas, on winning the 2009 "Broad Prize for Urban Education"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

H. Res. 792. A resolution honoring Robert Kelly Slater for his outstanding and unprecedented achievements in the world of surfing and for being an ambassador of the sport and excellent role model; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REYES (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FOSTER):

H. Res. 793. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 794. A resolution calling for a runoff election in Afghanistan between the two top finishers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Res. 795. A resolution honoring the people of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and the Flight 93 Ambassadors for their efforts in creating the Flight 93 temporary memorial and encouraging the completion of the National Park Service Flight 93 National Memorial by the 10th anniversary of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. Harper.
 H.R. 32: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 124: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 213: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 227: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 268: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 275: Mr. WOLF and Mr. KRATOVL.
 H.R. 391: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 422: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 442: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 471: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 503: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 510: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 571: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 579: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 690: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 718: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 836: Mrs. HALVORSON and Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 868: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 932: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 953: Mr. CHILDERS.
 H.R. 1067: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 1132: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 1233: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1245: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1310: Mr. DRIEHAUS.
 H.R. 1351: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1352: Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 1378: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1569: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1596: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1618: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1623: Mr. INGLIS.
 H.R. 1677: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1695: Ms. FOXF.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1792: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 1800: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1826: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 1829: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1831: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1908: Mr. KRATOVL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1941: Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 2000: Mr. SCHAUER and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2001: Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2017: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2054: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2109: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2136: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 2139: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2149: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 2176: Mr. MASSA and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2227: Mr. INGLIS and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 2246: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2266: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WATT, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2267: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2336: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2366: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2369: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2393: Ms. FALLIN.
 H.R. 2398: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 2404: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2406: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2421: Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2452: Mr. KRATOVL.
 H.R. 2493: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2499: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

H.R. 2541: Mr. KIRK and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 2556: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. MASSA.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 2584: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2597: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 2672: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 2699: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2727: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2788: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2817: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2842: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 2852: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2879: Mr. TEAGUE.
 H.R. 2891: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 2935: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. TEAGUE.
 H.R. 2936: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
 H.R. 3002: Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 3015: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUYER, Mr. DENT, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 3018: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 3044: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3046: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 3070: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3116: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 3140: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3174: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 3227: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 3251: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 3375: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 3400: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 3407: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 3420: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3421: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3427: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 3463: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. HODES and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
 H.R. 3501: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3510: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 3519: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3524: Mr. KIND, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 3554: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 3569: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WITTMAN.

- H.R. 3582: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3586: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 3608: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3610: Mr. LATTA and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3611: Mr. McMAHON.
H.R. 3612: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 3613: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 3621: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3636: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3674: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 3680: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. SABLAN.
H.J. Res. 26: Mr. KIRK.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 129: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. Thornberry.
H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. KRATOVIL.
H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 150: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Res. 159: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 504: Mr. KIRK.
H. Res. 510: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 554: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. PENCE.
H. Res. 567: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MACK, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 603: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MASSA.
H. Res. 605: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Res. 611: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 649: Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 660: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 700: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 708: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 709: Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 715: Mr. KIRK.
H. Res. 719: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H. Res. 736: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 740: Mr. SHULER.
H. Res. 747: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H. Res. 749: Mr. INGLIS.
H. Res. 752: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 754: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H. Res. 759: Mr. UPTON.
H. Res. 773: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 783: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHAUER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 786: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SIREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. COSTELLO.