



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009

No. 152

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

ENERGY LEGISLATION: THE SENATE MUST JOIN THE HOUSE IN ACTING SWIFTLY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, despite rabid partisanship, this House of Representatives has successfully pursued a productive legislative agenda this year. Among many important bills, such as the expansion of children's health insurance and passage of economic recovery legislation, we passed the American Clean Energy and Security Act just this past June.

This bill would reduce greenhouse gas pollution, create market incentives for investment in clean energy jobs, invest in green job training for workers, create incentives for farmers to sequester carbon, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and protect trade-sensitive industries from highly polluting foreign competition.

According to prominent economists, it would spur investments in technology that would further stimulate the economy right now.

Since we passed this bill, a growing number of businesses such as Apple Computer, Exelon, Pacific Gas and Electric, Johnson & Johnson, Timberland, Nike, Dominion Virginia Power and so many others from diverse sectors of the economy have called on the United States Senate to act. Many of these businesses believe climate

change legislation is so important to address for American business that they actually have withdrawn their membership or suspended their membership from various committees in the United States Chamber of Commerce to protest its policy of opposition to this legislation.

Now that the House has passed this bill, the Senate too must act quickly to pass it so that the United States can take its rightful place as a leading voice in the effort to reduce greenhouse gas pollution.

Despite widespread business support for the bill, some partisan interest groups vigorously opposed its passage, and I applaud my colleagues, especially those from the other side of the aisle who had the courage to support it, for overcoming the shrill dissent of powerful special interests. Because those same interest groups are preparing a campaign blitz focused on the U.S. Senate, it is an apt time to recall the discredited arguments that they will employ once again when attempting to defeat this bill.

For example, the Republican leadership claims this bill will cost the American family \$3,100 per year. Not true. The Republican leadership cited an MIT study when first releasing that cost estimate. In response, the MIT professor who wrote the study wrote the minority leader here in the House pointing out that his figure vastly overestimated costs by 1,000 percent.

Moreover, the Republicans ignore a central feature of the bill to protect consumers. The American Clean Energy and Security Act distributes carbon allowances to the companies or co-operatives from which Americans buy electricity. And by law, the bill says that they have to use those allowances to protect consumers from any price increases.

Our Republican colleagues also ignore the impact new efficiencies will have on electric bills. The House En-

ergy bill will improve building codes by 30 percent, establish new efficiency standards for appliances and invest billions of dollars in home weatherization and efficiency programs. As a result, consumers will see a reduction in their electric bills as they consume less electricity. According to the nonpartisan American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, those savings will average \$750 per household when the bill is fully implemented.

Another common refrain from the opposition is that a cap-and-trade system is new, complicated and unworkable. As my colleagues will recall, it was a cap-and-trade system that allowed us to successfully stop the expansion of the ozone hole by reducing CFC pollution, and we cut acid rain and smog pollution by reducing emissions from coal-fired power plants with a cap-and-trade program in the 1990s. At the time, those same voices claiming that this would kill the economy said the same thing. And yet in the 1990s, we saw some of the most rapid expansion of economic growth in U.S. history.

Madam Speaker, scientists are observing more rapid climate change than their models anticipated. We do not have the luxury of inaction or delay. Moreover, the welfare of our economy demands that America lead in the clean energy revolution. We cannot allow China, Spain and other nations to profit from the construction of wind turbines, solar, advanced batteries and the like while Americans lose their jobs. Now is the time for the U.S. Senate to join us here in the House in passing a vibrant, clean energy bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, jumpstart our economy and lessen our reliance on foreign oil.

□ 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.

H11463

THE AIG BONUS DEBACLE: THE HEADACHES KEEP COMING

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, Neil Barofsky, recently released an alarming audit which revealed Secretary of the Treasury Tim Geithner's complete lack of oversight and total mismanagement of American International Group's (AIG) distribution of millions in bonus payments following the company's \$180 billion taxpayer bailout.

Just think about this: U.S. taxpayers own 80 percent of AIG, and AIG is using taxpayer money to pay themselves huge bonuses. Let's examine Mr. Geithner's role as Secretary of the Treasury and his role with AIG.

Mr. Geithner, as we will recall, was President of the Federal Reserve of New York prior to becoming Secretary of the Treasury in January of this year. Interestingly enough, on September 29, 2008, during Mr. Geithner's time as president, AIG officials briefed a senior vice president at the New York Fed about the details of AIG's deferred compensation plan, bonuses, and retention payments for its Financial Products group. AIG even e-mailed the New York Fed official copies of its compensation plans. Mr. Geithner was president of the New York Fed at the time the bank knew about the bonuses, and yet he maintains that he was "not apprised of the specifics."

Please, Mr. Secretary, just admit you knew about the bonuses and you were just trying to protect your friends on Wall Street at taxpayers' expense.

Now let's fast forward to March of this year. Mr. Geithner is now Secretary of the Treasury, and the news breaks to the American people about AIG—the company that is "too big to fail," and in need of \$180 billion in taxpayer bailout—would be distributing \$165 million in retention payments to employees of its financial products subsidiary. Now, this unit, I will remind everybody, of course, is the same entity responsible for writing the credit default swap policies that contributed directly to the company's near collapse. Yet again, we have Secretary Geithner claiming that he only found out about the AIG bonuses on March 10, 2009, just 3 days before they were paid.

Please, Mr. Secretary, if a company is in bankruptcy, you don't give out bonuses.

Given that sources at the Federal Reserve have stated that "Treasury staff was informed that the March 15 bonus payment date was upcoming," surely Mr. Secretary, as head of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, you must have known about the payments. It is even harder to believe in light of the Special Inspector General's report which notes "Federal Reserve Board of New York officials e-mailed the Treas-

ury's internal counsel, legal counsel, the amounts and timing of the AIG financial products retention award" plan.

So even his legal counsel knew about it.

Madam Speaker, everybody at the Federal Reserve knew about the AIG bonus issue, and officials at the Treasury surely knew. Yet somehow, the head of our Treasury Department and former head of the New York Fed at the time of the AIG bailout, said he was completely in the dark.

Please, Mr. Secretary, just admit you knew all the about the bonuses.

Mr. Barofsky's audit concludes that "This, coupled with Treasury's subsequent limited communications with the Federal Reserve Board of New York with respect to executive compensation, has meant that the Secretary of the Treasury invested \$40 billion of taxpayers' funds in AIG, designed AIG's contractual executive compensation restrictions and helped manage the government's majority stake in AIG for several months, all without having any detailed information about the scope of AIG's very substantial, and very controversial, executive compensation obligations."

Please, Mr. Secretary.

It should also be noted that former Secretary Paulson was also complicit in the AIG bonus mismanagement. It was under Mr. Paulson's watch, after all, that the government acquired this huge stake in AIG in the first place. And it was Mr. Paulson's decision to bail out AIG, which happened to owe billions to Goldman Sachs, while subsequently letting Goldman Sachs' main competitor, Lehman Brothers, fail.

The American people were rightly outraged when they found out that AIG would be paying out millions in bonuses despite needing a \$180 million taxpayer bailout. But it doesn't stop there. The audit also revealed that even kitchen assistants and elevator operators got bonuses over \$7,000. So clearly, not all of the AIG bonuses were contractually obligated as the company's executives claim. The headaches just keep coming.

This is what happens when high-ranking government officials such as Mr. Paulson and Mr. Geithner have clear conflicts of interest and are trusted to manage billions in taxpayers' money. Mr. Paulson and Mr. Geithner's close ties to Wall Street are just too close for comfort for the American people and their tax dollars.

□ 1245

CONDEMNING ILLEGAL LOGGING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The irreplaceable role of healthy forests as havens for biodiversity, carbon

sinks and renewable resources demands that we reverse a global legacy of environmental pillaging. Illegal logging and resource extraction is not just about environmental decimation, with watershed pollution, biodiversity loss and increased carbon emissions, it's about the human loss as well: the local communities left with a culture of violence and corruption devastated without resources for survival, and beyond, to everybody on the planet.

We all benefit from the medicines, carbon capture and species diversity these forests provide. For years, I've worked to eliminate the illegal logging trade. To make sure the United States can lead by example and stop our own use of illegally logged lumber, I authored the Legal Timber Protection Act whose provisions were signed into law last year. The U.S. Government is now empowered to determine where imported wood and plants actually come from to promote legal harvest. Yet the illegal trade continues.

Last Thursday, with Chairmen PAYNE and FALCONEVAEGA, I introduced a resolution to condemn the illegal logging and extraction of Madagascar's unique and invaluable natural resources. Madagascar hosts some of this planet's greatest diversity. Larger than the State of California, this island nation broke off from the African mainland about 160 million years ago, spawning a biological laboratory with over 150,000 plants and animals found nowhere else in the world: massive moths, towering trees, and a hundred different lemur species. The majority of Madagascar's people live on less than \$2 a day, and protection of these incredible and unique resources, only 10 percent of which remain, could be key to a sustainable and economically secure future. Yet political turmoil is putting the honest livelihoods of many, as well as one of our planet's greatest treasures, in extreme peril.

In March, the democratically elected President was ousted by a political rival with the backing of the military, a move which has been condemned by the United States, the African Union and others as a military coup d'etat. That ushered in a collapse of security for these precious treasures as political instability bred further corruption and mismanagement. Twenty years of partnership with the United States and nongovernmental organizations that has resulted in more effective local management and preservation is being undone in a matter of months. The de facto government uses the nation's endangered resources to boost its regime and has issued sweeping decrees allowing the harvest and export of wood from protected forests and World Heritage Sites.

Reports from Madagascar are dire, detailing rampant illegal logging, mining, and resource degradation as detailed in an excellent report in last Friday's Washington Post. Traffickers smuggle record numbers of one of the

world's rarest tortoises to Asian and European collectors; poachers kill and roast scores of lemurs for restaurants; and armed loggers brazenly plunder protected forests, looting dwindling hardwoods for furniture. These activities not only deny locals access to basic resources, they also degrade the country's thriving eco-tourism industry which brought in almost \$400 million last year.

The United States has condemned this current government and suspended all nonhumanitarian aid and terminated assistance through a Millennium Development Corporation compact. The World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and the Wildlife Conservation Society have all denounced the subsequent wholesale exploitation of some of the world's most diverse forests and the decimation of the local people's resources and livelihood.

As the World Forestry Congress convenes this week, we have an excellent opportunity to raise awareness to stop rampant illegal logging and the harvesting of species. I am pleased that the United States Forest Service chief specifically referenced our resolution, H. Res. 839, during his address to the Forestry Congress as an example of United States commitment. The international community, all of us, must engage before it's too late for these protected species and do all we can to prevent the irreparable harm caused by illegal logging.

This resolution condemns the ongoing tragedy and calls for the restoration of the rule of law and shows that the Federal Government will fight to help the people of Madagascar protect these resources.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring House Resolution 839 so that the House can do its part to stop this outrage.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Together let us thank God for another day of life. Lord, we are truly gifted with another opportunity to praise and thank You for our many blessings. By our being truly present to others today by our work in public service on behalf of others, Lord, may

we lift up their spirits and provide some hope to those most in need.

Open our eyes, Lord, to see Your wonders that surround us. May a faith vision shape our priority of issues demanding our attention and may honest responsibility reveal just how much ability we have to respond to all Your people and the common good of the Nation.

Open our hearts, Lord, that we may trust the wisdom shared and the faith witnessed when we truly listen to one another. May each of us draw closer to one another and so strengthen the union of these United States and give You the glory both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey 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.

GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court said last year that the Second Amendment means what it says: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." There is nothing vague about that personal right. Never mind, Chicago still has a gun ban law.

So the Supreme Court agreed to hear a case where those who believe in liberty are challenging the Chicago antigun law. Gun Grabbers pass a gun ban claiming it reduces crime, but crime actually goes up in banishment areas. So this is not about crime.

The antigun lobby steals individual freedom under the false pretext of providing security by government. In reality, these people want more government intrusion into our personal lives. Obliteration of the Second Amendment is one of the most intrusive methods they use. Gun control is really government control.

The Second Amendment was, among other things, originally designed to protect people against tyranny. Thomas Jefferson said, "Those who hammer their guns into plows will plow for those who do not."

The right to bear arms should apply even in Chicago, whether the paranoid gun control crowd likes it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

DEMOCRATS' HEALTH CARE PLAN WILL KILL JOBS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, having run a small business, I know what it's like to meet a payroll and offer health care benefits to my employees. I know what it's like to create jobs for families struggling to make ends meet. I also understand the consequences for small businesses when Washington imposes higher taxes, new government mandates, and more red tape.

Americans know that small businesses are the engine of job creation in their communities; government is not. And more than ever before, small businesses need solutions from Washington that help create jobs and provide quality, affordable health care for their employees.

Republicans have been offering those solutions all year long: solutions like allowing small business to join together to get health insurance at lower rates—the same way that large businesses and labor unions do today; promoting wellness and expanded health savings accounts to provide additional flexibility to small businesses; and ending junk lawsuits to lower health care costs for small businesses and all Americans.

Under the Democrats' costly government-run plan, however, health care costs are going to go up and countless small business jobs will be destroyed as a result. At the heart of the Democrats' plan is a massive tax increase which will fall most heavily on entrepreneurs that run small businesses. It also includes the harsh mandate that requires employers to provide health insurance or face a steep tax.

It will kill jobs, plain and simple.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF LANCE CORPORAL ALFONSO OCHOA, JR.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Lance Corporal Alfonso Ochoa, Jr., who was recently killed by a roadside bomb in Afghanistan.

A native of Armona, California, Alfonso joined the Marine Corps only after graduating early from Hanford High School. His enthusiasm for his country and his commitments were apparent to all who knew him. It is my hope that Alfonso's strength, valor, and pride in our Nation will serve as an example for all of us.

My thoughts are with his father and mother, as well as his wife, whom he just married 6 months ago, and go out on behalf of all Americans.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention that two other

servicemembers from the Central Valley recently sustained serious injuries overseas, and I wish them and their families comfort and strength during these difficult times and a speedy recovery.

Staff Sergeant Christian Hughes and Senior Airman Phillip Newlyn, both of Fresno, California, are at Walter Reed Medical Center; and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these soldiers, their courage, and their service to their country and wish them a smooth and speedy recovery.

THANK YOU, COMMANDER CARNEY

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I want to praise one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, my shipmate in the Navy, Congressman CHRIS CARNEY.

CHRIS is a commander in the Navy and just completed 2 weeks of active duty. He served as a combat mission operations commander for the Predator and Reaper Hunter/Killer UAVs, as well as the Global Hawk.

Commander CARNEY was the first sailor to be certified as a mission commander, now with the call sign of "Big House." Over the past couple of weeks, his unit flew dozens of missions over Afghanistan and Iraq providing our troops with intel and reconnaissance. They also took out Taliban terrorists with Hellfire missiles and helped with the search and rescue of Americans.

If you see Commander Congressman CHRIS CARNEY back at work today, thank him for his service to our Nation in uniform as one of our citizen-sailors.

WHITE HOUSE ATTACKS FOX NEWS FOR TELLING TRUTH

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with unemployment at a 26-year high, a record budget deficit, and a looming health care bill that punishes taxpayers and bankrupts the government, what is the White House doing? They are attacking Fox News for telling the truth.

The White House spokesman says that Fox News "is not a news organization." We need to fact-check the White House on whatever they say about Fox and any legislation since they are not being straight with the American people.

Separate studies by the Pew Research Center and the Center for Media and Public Affairs found that Fox News coverage is more balanced than any other network. The White House has no problem with other national news outlets because they offer biased reports and give the administration a free pass. In fact, network news programs have favored proponents of the administra-

tion's health care proposal over critics of the plan by a margin of more than 2-1, according to the Business and Media Institute.

The White House, like the national media, should let the American people make up their own minds, not try to control what they hear.

HEALTH CARE'S IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for generations, America's small businesses have been the engines driving our economy, and they remain one of our brightest hopes for economic recovery.

These entrepreneurs represent more than 99 percent of all businesses in the country and create more than 72 percent of the new jobs. Yet, under the guise of health care reform, Congress is set to punish these innovators by leveling more than \$200 billion in new taxes. Those are taxes. The result of these new taxes will be the loss of an estimated 5.5 million jobs.

Our economy is in a precarious situation, the Federal deficit stands at \$1.42 trillion, and 263,000 jobs were lost in September alone. Why would we want to push a government takeover of health care inflicting further harm on small businesses—the very strength of our economy?

WHAT HAPPENED TO AUGUST

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion over Fox News, but last night I watched ABC News as they talked about the new poll put out by ABC and The Washington Post. And I scratched my head as I listened to them talk about the fact the American people now support a public option. The American people are rallying to the side of ObamaCare. And I wondered how much out of step with America would my constituents be, could all of these people who showed up at these town hall meetings be; and then I had a chance to look at the questions.

You ought to examine those questions. I mean, they put the public option in a box and tied a red ribbon around it. I might have even voted for it. And if you look at the difference in the responses of those questions as we had through this entire year, it shows there hasn't been that much of a change.

Now, I guess ABC News has joined the White House and the Democratic leadership in having us ignore August. What happened to August, Mr. Speaker? The American people spoke, and yet the leaders in this body and the

White House pretended it didn't happen.

We cannot ignore the American people despite what ABC and The Washington Post may try to tell us.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 19, 2009.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, October 16, 2009 at 2:18 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he makes a determination and certification of Haiti's compliance with HOPE II requirements under PL 110-246.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

HAITIAN HEMISPHERIC OPPORTUNITY THROUGH PARTNERSHIP ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 2008—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-69)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act of 2008 (HOPE II) (the "Act") (Public Law 110-246), amended the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA) to make certain additional products from Haiti eligible for preferential tariff treatment. Under HOPE II, these imports from Haiti will continue to be eligible for preferential treatment after October 18, 2009, if I determine and certify that Haiti has met certain eligibility criteria set out in the Act.

Since enactment of HOPE II, Haiti has issued a decree establishing an independent labor ombudsman's office, and the President of Haiti has selected a labor ombudsman following consultation with unions and industry representatives. In addition, Haiti, in cooperation with the International Labor Organization, has established a Technical Assistance Improvement and Compliance Needs Assessment and Remediation (TAICNAR) Program. Haiti has also implemented an electronic visa system that acts as a registry of Haitian producers of articles eligible for duty-free treatment and has made participation in the TAICNAR Program a condition of using this visa system.

In light of these actions and in accordance with section 213A of CBERA, as amended, I have determined and hereby certify that Haiti: (i) has implemented the requirements set forth in sections 213A(e)(2) and (e)(3); and (ii) is requiring producers of articles for which duty-free treatment may be requested under section 213A(b) to participate in the TAICNAR Program and has developed a system to ensure participation in such program by such producers, including by developing and maintaining a registry of producers.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 2009.

□ 1415

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 19, 2009.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, October 16, 2009 at 2:18 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia first declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAF-
FICKERS CENTERED IN COLOM-
BIA—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant nar-

cotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2009.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause an extreme level of violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property and interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 2009.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to make an announcement regarding decorum in the Chamber.

The Chair must remind all Members that under clause 5 of rule XVII and the resolution adopted by the House on July 17, 1979, as implemented by Speakers under clause 2 of rule I, the standard of dress on the floor of the House is proper business attire: for gentlemen, coat and tie. The donning of a lab coat or other attire in the nature of a distinctive uniform of another occupation is not proper.

The Chair expects the cooperation of all Members in upholding this standard of decorum.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT
AMENDMENT

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3763) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide for an exclusion from Red Flag Guidelines for certain businesses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN SMALL
BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 615(e) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN BUSINESSES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘creditor’ shall not include—

“(A) a health care practice with 20 or fewer employees;

“(B) an accounting practice with 20 or fewer employees;

“(C) a legal practice with 20 or fewer employees; or

“(D) any other business, if the Commission determines, following an application for exclusion by such business, that such business—

“(i) knows all of its customers or clients individually;

“(ii) only performs services in or around the residences of its customers; or

“(iii) has not experienced incidents of identity theft and identity theft is rare for businesses of that type.

“(5) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION FOR BUSINESSES NO-LONGER ELIGIBLE.—To the extent that a business can no longer demonstrate that it meets the criteria under paragraph (4) that permitted its exclusion from the term ‘creditor’, such exclusion shall no longer apply.

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) EMPLOYEE.—With respect to a business, the term ‘employee’ means any individual who works for such business and is paid either wages or a salary.

“(B) HEALTH CARE PRACTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘health care practice’ means a business that’s primary service is providing health care via health care professionals employed by the business.

“(ii) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘health care professional’ means an individual engaged in providing health care and licensed under State law, including physicians, dentists, podiatrists, chiropractors, physical therapists, occupational therapists, marriage and family therapists, optometrists, speech therapists, language therapists, hearing therapists, and veterinarians.”.

(b) PROCESS FOR EXCLUSION APPLICATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall issue regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, that set forth the process by which a business may apply for an exclusion under section 615(e)(4)(D) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank Representatives MICHAEL SIMPSON from Idaho,

PAUL BROUN from Georgia, particularly CHRIS LEE from New York, as well as DAN MAFFEI from New York for helping me draft this bipartisan bill to help protect small businesses from overreaching Federal regulations during these tough economic times. In addition, I would like to thank Jon Leibowitz, chairman of the FTC, for delaying enforcement of the Red Flag Guidelines until Congress passes this commonsense fix.

American small businesses are struggling. They are often forced to comply with burdensome regulations that significantly increase their expenses. I am committed to helping small businesses, because the key to our economic recovery is tied to their ability to thrive. Today, my bill will clarify the intention of past legislation so that it isn't blindly enforced against America's small businesses.

The Federal Trade Commission went too far and went beyond the intent of Congress by considering non-financial, service-related industries to be "creditors" under the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003. Its ruling would force thousands of small businesses to comply with burdensome, expensive regulations by forcing them to develop and implement an identity theft program.

My commonsense bill would exempt health care practices, law and accounting firms from the FTC's Red Flag Guidelines. In addition, it would create a system where the FTC has some flexibility to waive implementation of the regulations for other industries.

During these tough economic times, the Federal Government should not be placing burdensome regulations on small businesses. Small businesses are the backbone of New Jersey's economy, and they shouldn't be included under a random definition interpreted by a Federal bureaucracy. Failure to pass this bill today will hurt America and the hardworking, innovative entrepreneurs that manage and operate small businesses across this great country.

Again, I applaud the bipartisan way we crafted this legislation and urge the rest of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3763, which will exempt small businesses from cumbersome government regulations regarding identity theft, and I appreciate the leadership of my friend from New Jersey.

There is no question that identity theft is a serious problem in this country. Millions of Americans every year have their credit affected by identity thieves, prompting previous Congresses to enact measures to increase awareness and education about the issue. These actions have played a significant

role in decreasing the number of Americans impacted by identity theft each and every year. Additionally, a policy change enacted in 2003 required large financial institutions and creditors to develop and implement identity theft programs to increase consumer protections.

Unfortunately, however, the Federal Trade Commission, the government body responsible for enforcing these guidelines, has gone too far in defining the intent of the law and has chosen to apply the guidelines to all businesses, large and small. While these reporting requirements are no doubt necessary for large businesses and corporations with thousands of customers, FTC has issued rules that it will soon begin to impose, forcing the same regulation requirements for small businesses as well.

Small businesses know their customers, and they have a more personal relationship with those they do business with. If not addressed by this Congress, small businesses will soon be mandated to follow these excessive requirements that will place an undue burden on them while not providing any real increase to consumer protections.

Specifically, the bill before us today will exempt accounting, legal and the health care practices with 20 or fewer employees from the reporting requirement. Importantly, it also provides FTC with the option of excluding other small businesses that know all its customers individually and perform services near where its customers live. By passing this fix today, Congress can provide the FTC a clear definition of how Congress intended the policy to be enacted and protect small businesses and their customers from unnecessary government intervention.

As a cosponsor of this important legislation, I urge its immediate adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEE of New York. With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, CHRIS LEE from New York, for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to come before you today to speak in favor of this bipartisan, commonsense bill which will help so many of our small businesses in our country. In my opinion, the manner in which this legislation was crafted, with input from both sides of the aisle, with the FTC and with the various sectors that would be adversely affected if we had not acted, is the model for how this House can work to actually solve the problems facing our country.

I wish very ardently that we could get together, Republicans and Democrats alike, and find some commonsense solutions to the health care financing in this country the same way that my friend, Mr. ADLER, and the rest of the Democratic colleagues and

those of us on our side came together on this. And I think that's the way that this House ought to operate.

I congratulate Mr. ADLER for what he has done and other colleagues on both sides for bringing forth this commonsense legislation. I would personally like to thank my colleagues, Mr. ADLER and Dr. SIMPSON, for their tireless efforts as we worked to put this very effective, commonsense legislation together. I also want to thank the committee staff that helped in this process.

This legislation is a very specific exemption without which it would cost so many small businesses thousands of dollars to unnecessarily implement. But it also allows the FTC the ability to exempt other businesses that aren't one of the three industries outlined in this bill. And that just makes sense, also.

When enacted, H.R. 3763 will truly reflect the original intent of the FACT Act and codify an exemption for health care providers, accounting firms and law firms that were never meant to be wrapped in this overarching Red Flag legislation.

So, again, I would like to thank Mr. ADLER, Mr. LEE and Dr. SIMPSON and each and every person who helped bring this legislation to fruition. This is the way we ought to operate. And I think it is just a great day for this Congress as we, as Democrats and Republicans, came together on this commonsense legislation.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I will close by encouraging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this much-needed legislation that will ensure that small businesses are not encumbered with more burdensome Federal regulation and ensure that we can get this economy back and moving forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Before I close, I would like to reiterate the importance of this bill. Many of America's economic problems are not the fault of small businesses, but they have borne the brunt of the economic downturn. My legislation, Mr. LEE's legislation, Mr. BROUN's legislation, Mr. SIMPSON's and Mr. MAFFEI's, a bipartisan piece of legislation, will prevent one more layer of Federal regulations that would add another cost on the backs of small businesses across America.

Again, I urge all Members of Congress to support this bill. I thank Mr. BROUN for his comments about the bipartisan nature of this bill. This is my and Mr. LEE's second bill together. I hope it's the second of many to try to serve the process of this House and to serve the people of our great country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 3763, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide for an exclusion from Red Flag Guidelines for certain businesses. This bill is a bipartisan, common-sense approach to protecting our nation's small businesses from needless, burdensome government regulation. This legislation would exempt certain businesses, including health providers, from complying with the Red Flags Rule, which requires financial institutions and creditors to develop and implement a written identity theft program.

The bill recognizes that many of our nation's small businesses, particularly health providers, are not financial institutions and therefore do not present the same level of risk as financial institutions in cases of identity theft. In fact, many of these medical and dental offices were considered creditors under the rule simply because of the fact that they are willing to work with patients on developing flexible payment plans for those patients that can't afford to pay at the time of service. Thus, this rule actually appeared to discourage efforts to improve access to care for people who can't afford to pay, which runs contrary to all of Congress's efforts, on both sides of the aisle, to improve our health system.

When Congress expressed those concerns to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), they delayed the implementation of the rule twice, in April and again in August, as they worked with providers and other small businesses in an effort to minimize the burdens of compliance and address their concerns with the program. I would like to recognize and thank the FTC for their efforts. However, as this bill demonstrates, Congress believes that entities such as health providers, accountants and others were never meant to be included in the definition of creditor. This legislation is an appropriate next step to better defining who is a creditor and protecting our small businesses from needless costs and regulations.

I would like to thank Chairman FRANK and Ranking Member BACCHUS for working with us to craft a balanced bill to address all parties' concerns. In addition, I would like to thank Congressman ADLER and Congressman BROWN—I have greatly enjoyed working with you on this legislation. In addition, I would like to thank the FTC for their willingness to work with us to address the concerns of medical providers and small businesses alike. They have been a true partner in this process, and I would like to recognize their efforts to address our concerns with this rule.

Mr. Speaker, during these difficult economic times, it is more important than ever that government push forward legislation to promote small businesses in America. In addition, we should be working with America's dentists and doctors to promote policies that improve access to care instead of burdening them with unnecessary rules and compliance measures. This legislation does exactly that.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3763.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1430

ARMY SPECIALIST JEREMIAH PAUL MCCLEERY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3319) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3319

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ARMY SPECIALIST JEREMIAH PAUL MCCLEERY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, shall be known and designated as the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am very proud this afternoon to present H.R. 3319 for consideration. This measure, if passed, will designate the postal facility located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building."

Introduced by my colleague and friend Representative TOM MCCLINTOCK of California on June 23, 2009, and favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on September 10, 2009, by unanimous con-

sent, H.R. 3319 enjoys the support of the entire California House delegation.

A native of Portola, California, Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery proudly served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom with the United States Army's 1st Battalion, 12th Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division out of Fort Hood, Texas. Regrettably, Specialist McCleery and his friend and fellow Californian, Army Specialist Jake Velloza, died on May 2 from wounds sustained after those two soldiers were shot by enemy forces in Mosul, Iraq. Specialist McCleery was just 24 years old at the time of his death.

Specialist McCleery's heroic commitment to the United States military began at the age of 4 after his father, Joe McCleery, took his young son to Twentynine Palms, California, to watch the homecoming of a unit of United States Marines returning from the 1991 Persian Gulf War. The opportunity to witness the triumphant return of those brave American soldiers prompted Specialist McCleery's lifelong desire to serve his country.

Even as a young boy, Specialist McCleery was passionate about becoming a member of America's military. As a child, he spent hours in his backyard playing the role of soldier, and soon enough he joined the Boy Scouts of America and subsequently the Civil Air Patrol.

While he intended to enlist in the United States Army following his graduation from Portola High School in 2004, Specialist McCleery delayed his enlistment after his beloved mother, Mrs. Collette McCleery, was diagnosed with cancer during his senior year. Specialist McCleery decided to stay with his family during his mother's battle with cancer, and only went on with his life's desire of enlisting in the military after his mother passed away in 2005. So, in addition to his dedication to the United States Army, Specialist McCleery will be equally remembered for his steadfast devotion to his family, especially his father, Joe, and his sister, Chastity.

Specialist McCleery enjoyed the outdoors, and specifically loved hunting, riding four-wheelers, and sport shooting with his friends, but without a doubt his favorite outdoor pastime was always fishing with his dad. Although he is no longer with us, Specialist McCleery's memory will live on with his friends and family and all those who were fortunate enough to know this great young American.

Mr. Speaker, Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery's life stands as a shining example of the bravery and dedication of the heroic men and women who serve our great Nation at home and abroad. I urge all my colleagues to join me in honoring this fine American soldier by designating the postal facility at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, in his memory.

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

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

I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his tribute to Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery and to urge support of H.R. 3319 that names the United States Post Office in Portola in his memory. Miah McCleery grew up in that town, and to that town he returned as a fallen hero at the age of 24.

Let me tell you a little bit more about him. His best friend was his father, Joe. A high school friend, Josh Rogers, was asked when Jeremiah was the happiest. Josh replied, He was happiest whenever he was doing anything with his dad.

As my friend from Massachusetts said, when Jeremiah was 4 years old, his dad took him out to see the returning American soldiers from the first Gulf War; as Shakespeare said, "This story shall the good man teach his son." It was from that moment in 1991 that Jeremiah wanted, more than anything, to serve his country.

Joe and Collette moved their family to the little town of Portola in 1996, where they built their home themselves as a family. It was in Portola where Miah McCleery grew up.

If you want a sense of the character of this young man, just spend a few minutes with those who knew him. His older sister, Lynette Flanagan, tells of how Miah would take on much older boys at school—not in his own defense, but in the defense of others. She said, "He once got sent to the principal's office for getting into a fight. When my mother arrived at school, Jeremiah was not sorry for his actions. He explained with pride that he had stood up to a bully who had slapped a little girl. Jeremiah was never afraid to stand up for what he believed in, even if that would get him into trouble. It didn't matter if the bully was twice his size, he wouldn't back down."

Jeremiah was a Boy Scout, he joined the Civil Air Patrol, and he planned to enlist in the Army as soon as he graduated from Portola High School in 2004, but that year his mother, Collette, was diagnosed with cancer and he stayed there with his family until she died. In 2007, he finally enlisted. When his sister, Chastity, begged him not to go, he said that he felt that by going into the military he was protecting his family.

By all accounts, he was an exemplary soldier who commanded the friendship and respect of his colleagues. While at Fort Hood, he became close friends with another Californian, Jake Velloza, and they shipped out to Iraq together. Before that, he had fallen in love with Amanda Harazin while stationed at Fort Hood. Amanda is known as "A-J" to her friends, but Jeremiah called her the "love of his life." They were to have been married on May 30, but on May 2, outside of Mosul, Iraq, at a combat outpost in Hammam Alil, American soldiers were attacked by two gunmen wearing Iraqi police uniforms.

Two U.S. soldiers—Jeremiah McCleery and his best friend, Jake Velloza—were killed in that attack and three others were wounded. So on May 14, the day before he was supposed to return to a happy homecoming and an impending marriage, Jeremiah McCleery returned to his hometown to be buried beside his mother in Portola.

The local paper described his return with these words, which speak volumes about the community which helped to mold this American hero. They reported, "Across the Sierra Valley people lined the highway, some with their hands over their hearts as a mark of respect. In Portola, streets were lined with flag-waving citizens. Shopowners left their stores to join in, temporarily suspending business as usual."

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share a little of what I have learned about Jeremiah McCleery because it helps to answer the question that James Michener first asked, "Where do we get such men?" Well, we get them from the heart and soul of America. We get them from good and decent families like the McCleerys. We get them from little towns like Portola, California.

Over the summer, I had the honor to visit the men and women who guard the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery. The painstaking care and the meticulous precision with which these young men and women discharge their duties in withering heat and in freezing cold 24 hours a day, 365 days a year is legendary. I asked them why they did it, and one of them told me, "We do it to tell our country that we will never forget."

For that reason, I bring this bill to the House today with the unanimous support of the Portola City Council, the entire California congressional delegation, and the entire community that watched Jeremiah McCleery grow from a boy to a man and, ultimately, to return as a hero. We ask that the Congress name the local post office in honor of Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery to tell our countrymen that we will never forget, and also to express our awe and our gratitude that humanity has, within itself, a small band of brothers like Jeremiah McCleery who step forward not for treasure or profit or even to defend their own freedom, but, rather, to win the freedom of a people half a world away. And they do it because their country asks them to and because it is virtuous and noble.

We owe these men and their grieving families a debt that we can never repay, except to honor their memory and to keep their sacrifice always in mind, those who gave up everything to proclaim liberty throughout all the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again, I encourage our friends on both sides of the aisle to join with Mr. McCLINTOCK in

honoring Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery through the passage of H.R. 3319.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt support for H.R. 3319 which will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building."

Jeremiah McCleery was born in Glendora, California, to parents Colette and Joe McCleery on April 5, 1985. Jeremiah grew up in a very close family and was well known for telling jokes and seeing the humor in life. He enjoyed the outdoors and spent a great deal of time fishing, camping, working on his truck, and sport shooting.

Jeremiah wanted to join the Army since he was 4 years old when his father took him to watch the triumphant return of U.S. soldiers from the 1991 Persian Gulf War. The outpouring that greeted American forces during that homecoming made a lasting impression on the young Jeremiah and set him on a path to serve his country. Since that day, he was a Boy Scout and joined the Civil Air Patrol. Later Jeremiah enlisted in the Army on June 2007. Jeremiah was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 12th Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division at Ft. Hood, Texas, and was deployed to Iraq. Tragically, on May 2, 2009, Jeremiah was shot and killed at a combat outpost in Hammam Alil, Iraq, north of Baghdad. Spc. Jeremiah McCleery gave his life while defending his country in Iraq.

My family and I extended our heartfelt sympathy and condolences to Jeremiah's father who lives in Sparks, Nevada, who has suffered this deep loss. We are committed to providing full support for their needs. I also remain dedicated to fulfilling all of America's promises to those who faithfully serve our nation and to their families. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3319, which will honor Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery for his sacrifice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3319.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXTENSION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION LIABILITY REGIME

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3819) to extend the commercial space transportation liability regime.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION LIABILITY REGIME EXTENSION.

Section 70113(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31, 2009.” and inserting “December 31, 2012.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3819, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 3819, a bill to extend the current commercial space transportation liability regime.

First established by Congress as part of the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988, the commercial space transportation risk-sharing liability and insurance regime has been extended four times since its original enactment. The current extension expires on December 31 of this year, and it is therefore important for Congress to act now so that there is sufficient time for this legislation to make its way to the President before the current authority expires.

The liability and insurance regime that would be extended by this legislation is three-tiered and was originally modeled on the Price-Anderson Act that governs liability risk-sharing under the nuclear power industry. Under the regime, commercial space launch providers licensed by the U.S. Government are required to provide third-party liability insurance to compensate for maximum probable losses from third-party claims up to a level of \$500 million. For claims above those maximum probable losses, the U.S. Government may pay successful liability claims up to \$1.5 billion in 1989 dollars above the insurance level, subject to funds being appropriated by Congress for that purpose.

□ 1445

Finally, for successful claims above those amounts, the licensee assumes responsibility for payment.

To date, not a single dollar has had to be appropriated by the U.S. Government to pay third-party claims, but the existence of the liability risk-sharing

regime has enabled the development and sustainment of a commercial space launch industry in the U.S., including the emergence of several new companies in recent years.

In addition, the regime has allowed U.S. companies to remain competitive with their international counterparts, almost all of whose governments provide similar or more generous risk-sharing liability regimes to that of the U.S.

I should note that, in the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act of 2004, we directed that there be an independent review of the current risk-sharing regime to see whether or not it was working and whether it needed to be continued or passed, and that review was completed in 2006. I think a number of the review's findings bear mentioning; and, therefore, I will quote a couple of those.

First of all: “Private liability insurance capacity remains fragile and far below what would be needed to compensate for government indemnification if it were eliminated.”

Secondly: “Foreign competition has increased, and all credible international competitors have risk-sharing schemes rivaling or surpassing that of the U.S.”

Finally: “The current regime has become the industry standard. Its elimination could send the wrong signal to international customers and competitors and would be a negative factor in the competition for global launch business.”

In sum, the commercial space transportation liability and insurance regime has worked. It has not cost the American taxpayers a single dollar in claims payments to date. It has strengthened U.S. competitiveness in commercial space launch, and it is not a blank check, since any potential claims payments must be subject to prior congressional appropriation. The bill before us today extends the liability risk-sharing regime for a period of 3 years.

As Members may know, there currently is debate on the potential role to be played by would-be commercial providers of crew transportation to the international space station. At present, no such commercial crew transportation systems exist. Before a meaningful decision can be made on the potential role of commercially provided crew transportation in meeting governmental needs, important policy and safety issues will have to be addressed.

The most optimistic projections of the would-be commercial providers are that it will be at least 3 years before such crew transportation systems could be developed, and many independent observers argue it will be longer than that. Therefore, the duration of the extension contained in this bill is limited so as not to prejudice the outcome of the deliberations on those policy and safety issues or to take a position on the role to be played by commercial crew transportation systems.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Ranking Member RALPH HALL, Space and Aeronautics Chairwoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, and subcommittee Ranking Member PETE OLSON for cosponsoring this important legislation. I want to extend my thanks to Dick Obermann, who is the staff director for our subcommittee, and his very good team.

This is a good bipartisan bill, and I urge Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3819, extending the current commercial space transportation liability regime through the end of 2012.

The economic competitiveness of the U.S. commercial launch industry is vital to our national interests. Domestic commercial launch services are an integral part of our Nation's infrastructure and high-technology economy. Commercial launch services are used to launch a variety of U.S. civil and national security payloads, including communications, weather, remote sensing, GPS, and other systems. We can scarcely imagine a society today which does not need to have those particular devices available.

The current commercial space launch indemnification regime has been in place since 1988 and has been renewed four times. It has helped protect U.S. commercial launch providers against catastrophic third-party liability when conducting FAA-licensed launch activities. Since its inception, there has never been a loss that would trigger this regime, and Congress has never had to appropriate any funds.

By ensuring adequate liability coverage, this system has strengthened U.S. competitiveness in a global space launch market, and it has enabled private-sector investment to develop new entries into the market. In other words, this regime has worked well by not being used. It has cost nothing, and it has given our space enterprises a big boost.

Over the last 20 years, competition from foreign launch providers, including China, France, India, and Russia, has grown significantly. At the same time, the overall number of launch opportunities has decreased. The commercial space transportation liability regime enables U.S. launch providers to operate without “betting the company” with every launch. In a competitive market with narrow returns, this has been a vital link in strengthening this vital industry.

I join with the Chair of the Science Committee in urging my colleagues to support the U.S. commercial launch industry and to vote for H.R. 3819.

Mr. EHLERS. I have no other speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3819.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 793) supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 793

Whereas chemistry is a vitally important field of science and technology that has transformed the world and improved the quality of life around the globe;

Whereas the chemical sciences have created an infrastructure that delivers the foods, fuels, medicines, and materials that are the hallmarks of modern life;

Whereas the contributions of chemical scientists and engineers are central to technological progress and to the health of many industries, including the chemical, pharmaceutical, electronics, agricultural, automotive, and aerospace industries, and these contributions boost economic growth, create new jobs, and improve health and standards of living;

Whereas, in order to foster the innovation that will ensure the Nation's global competitiveness, schools must cultivate the finest scientists, engineers, and technicians from every background and neighborhood, with a particular focus on increasing access to science, technology, engineering, and math education for Latinos, African-Americans, women, and other underrepresented students in these fields;

Whereas National Chemistry Week was established in 1987 by the American Chemical Society, the world's largest scientific society, to enhance public appreciation of the chemical sciences and to educate the public, particularly school-age children, about the important role of chemistry in everyday life;

Whereas 2009 marks the 140th anniversary of Dmitri Mendeleev's creation of the Periodic Table of the Elements;

Whereas the theme of National Chemistry Week in 2009, "Chemistry—It's Elemental", was chosen to raise public awareness about the importance of chemistry and the chemical sciences by emphasizing that the elements, forming the basis of the universe, play an integral role in daily life;

Whereas many common elements, such as copper in electrical wires, neon in lights, sodium in table salt, and aluminum in soda cans, are tangibly present in everyday life;

Whereas more than 10,000 volunteers from industry, government, and academia will observe National Chemistry Week during the week of October 18, 2009, by conducting hands-on science activities with millions of children in local schools, libraries, and museums; and

Whereas National Chemistry Week volunteers will help provide resources to science educators across the country, promote community events for recycling common elemental items such as aluminum cans, en-

courage students to explore creative representations of the elements in the Periodic Table, and generally act as "chemistry ambassadors" who emphasize the importance and contributions of chemistry to daily life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that the contributions of chemical scientists and engineers have created new jobs, boosted economic growth, and improved the Nation's health and standard of living;

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

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Chemistry Week with appropriate recognition, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of chemistry to everyday life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 793, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 793, a resolution recognizing the importance of chemistry and honoring National Chemistry Week.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for introducing this resolution.

The importance of chemistry and chemical engineering in our lives cannot be overstated. These disciplines contribute to public health by helping to keep our water clean and our food pure. They contribute to advances in medicine through new biomaterials, drug design and drug delivery techniques. They help make cleaner and more efficient energy technologies possible, and they help keep toxins out of our homes and out of our natural environment through the development of green chemicals and materials.

In short, chemistry and chemical engineering contribute in immeasurable ways to the economic strength, security, and well-being of our Nation and all its citizens. For this reason, it is important to get young people excited about chemistry and interested in pursuing careers in chemistry and in the sciences in general. National Chemistry Week plays a great role in this effort.

National Chemistry Week activities are carried out by local sections of the American Chemical Society located in all parts of our Nation. It is estimated that over 10,000 volunteers from industry, government, and academia will

participate in National Chemistry Week activities this year.

They will be working to design hands-on activities, to provide demonstrations and to develop exhibits. Through these activities, they will help stimulate the interest of young people in chemistry and in pursuing careers in science and technology.

So, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the American Chemical Society for its efforts to establish and to sustain National Chemistry Week.

Once again, I thank Mr. REYES and his cosponsors for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of chemistry in our daily lives and the positive impact of National Chemistry Week by supporting H. Res. 793.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 793, supporting the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

This year marks the 21st anniversary of National Chemistry Week. It is a concept that was first introduced in 1987 by the American Chemical Society, the world's largest scientific society and one of the premier scientific societies in our Nation. Over the past 20 years, this annual event has proven to be a great success, and it will continue this week with various events, celebrating the impact chemistry has made on our society from the very beginning.

Designed to reach out to the public, especially elementary and secondary schoolchildren, the National Chemistry Week program will emphasize the importance of chemistry in everyday life with this year's theme, "Chemistry—It's Elemental," which will celebrate the Periodic Table of Elements. Created 140 years ago this year by Dmitri Mendeleev, the Periodic Table of Elements articulates the very basis of the universe, and it consists of common elements used in our everyday lives as well as some fairly exotic elements which are rarely used in our everyday lives.

Activities for the week will highlight the history of elements, the roles elements play in everyday life, the common and not-so-common uses of elements, and the history of the periodic table. This week is a wonderful opportunity for the public to engage in various events designed to increase the knowledge and awareness of chemistry's everyday effects.

More than 10,000 volunteers from local areas, businesses and schools will unite this week to educate millions of children across the country. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring all those who are volunteering their time and who are promoting these various activities through National Chemistry Week.

I would just like to add a few personal observations of things that I've encountered during my lifetime as a

scientist. I'm a physicist, not a chemist; but I have learned some chemistry. I remember speaking to a group about environmental issues sometime back, and a lady came up to me afterwards, and was very concerned—actually, I would say distressed.

She said, I'm terribly concerned about all these chemicals today and what's happening to us and what it's doing to us and our bodies.

I said, Well, that's certainly something to be concerned about. Do you have any chemicals specifically that you're worried about?

She said, No, no. All of them.

So I asked her if she liked to eat oranges. She said, Oh, yes, I love oranges.

I said, In spite of the fact that they're filled with chemicals?

She said she didn't know they were filled with chemicals.

I said, Well, yes, things like vitamin C and lots of other foods and chemicals that are very useful to your body.

The point that I made to her is that the question is not so much the chemicals; it's which chemicals. We have to recognize which are bad chemicals for individuals to ingest or to breathe and which ones are very good for us and are, in fact, very healthy. That's the point of what the Chemical Society is trying to develop here, that chemistry is an integral part of life. It is not bad in and of itself. In fact, it can be good in and of itself, but we should be aware as legislators and as scientists of the many great things that we have developed using chemistry which have improved living for people in this Nation and in other nations throughout the world.

So let's all join in this particular effort. Let's recognize the tremendous strides we have taken forward thanks to chemistry and, for that matter, physics and other sciences. Let's recognize that these are, by and large, good for the people and good for the Nation. Let's all join in this great event which recognizes what the American Chemical Society and chemists in general have done for the past few years.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Chairman BART GORDON from Tennessee, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 793, a resolution recognizing the week of October 18 as National Chemistry Week.

I want to thank Congressman SILVESTRE REYES, co-Chair of the Diversity and Innovation Caucus, for sponsoring this resolution.

The American Chemical Society, the world's largest scientific society, established National Chemistry Week in 1987 to help educate the public, particularly school-aged children, about the important role of the chemical sciences and their significant contributions to our quality of life.

□ 1500

This year, more than 10,000 National Chemistry Week volunteers, from both the public and private sectors, will help educate millions of children about the practical applications of chemistry by engaging them through stimulating hands-on science activities in local schools, in libraries and museums around the whole country.

During this year's observance of National Chemistry Week, students and chemistry professionals will celebrate the theme "Chemistry—It's Elemental." This theme recognizes the 140th anniversary of Dmitri Mendeleev's creation of the periodic table of the elements. The elements are the basis of the universe and of life on Earth, composing the graphite in pencils, the tungsten in light bulbs and in neon lights, the copper for cooling applications and the sodium in table salt, almost everything we encounter in our day-to-day activities.

The promotion of STEM education and the advancement of minorities in the STEM areas have become increasingly important in my congressional district and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, just last month, the University of Texas-Pan American in Edinburg, Texas, held its eighth annual Hispanic Engineering Science and Technology Conference to promote the importance of science literacy to thousands of students, parents and teachers. It was a big success.

HESTEC was created to address the shortage of scientists and engineers in our country. This year, the event drew more than 400,000 participants in deep south Texas. Since its inception in 2002, the university has created an exceptional pipeline of Hispanic scientists and engineers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness, I am proud to say that in the past 2 years, Congress has expanded educational opportunities in STEM education, particularly for women and minority students, and authorized programs to recruit highly qualified teachers to high-need school districts in the STEM areas with the passage of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act in 2007, as well as the passage of the Higher Education Opportunity Act in 2008.

This legislation made historic investments in higher education to strengthen STEM education and create a new generation of minority workers in STEM fields. As you know, the House passed H.R. 3221, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, last month to increase affordability and accessibility in higher education.

If the House-passed bill is signed into law, this legislation will provide \$2.5 billion over a 10-year period to strengthen minority-serving institutions in STEM areas and ensure that the students they serve graduate and become the engineers and scientists our country desperately needs.

National Chemistry Week highlights the importance of chemistry and the

natural sciences to our students. It's critical that our schools continue to cultivate exceptional scientists, engineers and technicians from every background to help strengthen our Nation's competitiveness and to promote scientific discovery and innovation in the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFITH). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I want to thank Chairman REYES from El Paso for introducing this resolution, H. Res. 793, and I thank Chairman GORDON for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, National Chemistry Week is critically important in promoting STEM issues in our schools and in preparing our students to pursue careers in STEM. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

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

First of all I want to commend the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA). We work together on the Education Committee, and I have always admired his deep interest in science and his desire to make science available to and comprehensible to everyone in this Nation, including those who have not had the opportunity to study it in elementary or high school.

I commend him for his deep interest. Whenever I have needed help on this issue of science and science education, Mr. HINOJOSA has jumped into the fray with me, so I want to take a minute to commend him on that.

I also want to commend the Chair of the Science Committee, who has also been very helpful in these efforts. As most Members know, I was a professor for many years, a professor of physics. I taught every course at the college level, from the simplest to the most complicated. I have never lost my love for teaching, and particularly my effort to improve science education in the elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HINOJOSA pointed out that if we do not produce a generation of scientists out of those students who are currently in elementary and secondary school, our Nation in the future will suffer because of that. On the next topic which will be coming to the floor, I will say more about that.

It's absolutely essential that we recognize how important it is for our students to learn these subjects. Parents must realize that. I always tell the students, if you really want to make certain you have a job after you get out of college, study science. You may end up in medicine, as the Speaker pro tempore has, or you may end up in other fields. But it's quite likely you are not going to get as good a job if you don't bother to learn science. This is just the nature of the world today.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 793, a resolution I introduced to recognize the week of October 18th as National Chemistry Week.

The American Chemical Society, the world's largest scientific society, established National Chemistry Week in 1987 to educate the public, particularly school age children, about the important role of the chemical sciences and their significant contributions to our quality of life.

This year, more than 10,000 National Chemistry Week volunteers from both the public and private sectors will help educate millions of children about the practical applications of chemistry by engaging them through stimulating hands-on science activities in local schools, libraries, and museums around the country.

During this year's observance of National Chemistry Week, students and chemistry professionals will celebrate the theme "Chemistry—It's Elemental!" This theme was chosen to emphasize the 140th anniversary of Dmitri Mendeleev's creation of the Periodic Table of the Elements. The elements are the basis of the universe and of life on Earth, composing graphite in pencils; tungsten in light bulbs and neon lights; copper for cooling applications; and sodium in table salt—almost everything we encounter in our day-to-day activities.

Local El Paso college students are doing their part to promote chemistry in our community by coordinating the Chemistry Circus. Sponsored by the Department of Chemistry at the University of Texas at El Paso and performed by the American Chemical Society Student Affiliates, the Chemistry Circus incorporates short vignettes that explore many fundamental concepts of chemical science. The performances are presented throughout the school year to K–12 audiences—and adults—emphasizing Texas science academic standards.

The promotion of student advancement and success in the STEM fields is one of my highest priorities. In 2008, I founded the Diversity and Innovation Caucus with five of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in order to generate policy ideas for increasing the participation of underrepresented groups in the fields of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, articulate the importance of pro-STEM and pro-innovation policies for underrepresented groups in STEM fields, and communicate the importance of promoting diversity in STEM for the achievement of America's innovation and competitiveness goals.

Over the past year, I am proud to say that the caucus has produced key legislative initiatives that promote the recruitment of highly-qualified teachers to high-need school districts, the development of laboratory facilities at less privileged schools, and the recruitment of minority students to the STEM fields through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Emphasizing the importance of chemistry and the natural sciences to our students is essential to ensure that our schools continue to cultivate the finest scientists, engineers, and technicians from every background. Educating our children about the importance of chemistry and the natural sciences will help strengthen our nation's economic competitiveness and foster American ingenuity and innovation in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, National Chemistry Week is a vital component in the effort to promote STEM issues in our schools. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this effort through the passage of this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 793 to support the goals and ideals of National Chemistry Week.

This year, National Chemistry Week takes place on October 18–24 and is a community-based annual event that unites local sections of the American Chemical Society, schools, businesses, and individuals to communicate the importance of chemistry in our daily life. This year marks the 22nd Anniversary of National Chemistry Week, and events and demonstrations will take place across the country to engage students of all ages. This year's theme, "Chemistry—It's Elemental," emphasizes the important role of elements in everyday life and celebrates the 140th anniversary of Dmitri Mendeleev's creation of the Periodic Table of Elements.

I have been a strong supporter of the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields and have long encouraged students and teachers to hold STEM education in higher regard. It is well documented that science and math skills are becoming increasingly important to the U.S. workforce, and with the creation of a new, competitive, and complex global economy, we must ensure that we are educating the next generation of STEM professionals. Innovation is a product of a sound knowledge in math, science, and engineering, and without this understanding, our ability to be innovative will decrease along with our ability to be competitive.

For this reason, I believe it is incredibly important to recognize the goals of National Chemistry Week to increase our understanding, and our students' understanding, of the chemical sciences. I applaud the American Chemical Society's efforts in this regard and encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 793 for our students and the future of our economy.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me thank Dr. EHLERS for bringing both his real-world experience to the Science Committee, as well as his passion for the work that we do there. He makes us a better committee.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 793.

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.

SUPPORTING COMPUTER SCIENCE AND COMPUTING CAREERS AMONG THE PUBLIC AND IN SCHOOLS

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 558) supporting the increased under-

standing of, and interest in, computer science and computing careers among the public and in schools, and to ensure an ample and diverse future technology workforce through the designation of National Computer Science Education Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 558

Whereas computing technology has become an integral part of culture and is transforming how people interact with each other and the world around them;

Whereas computer science is transforming industry, creating new fields of commerce, driving innovation in all fields of science, and bolstering productivity in established economic sectors;

Whereas the field of computer science underpins the information technology sector of our economy, which is a significant contributor to United States economic output;

Whereas the information technology sector is uniquely positioned to help with economic recovery through the research and development of new innovations;

Whereas National Computer Science Education Week can inform students, teachers, parents, and the general public about the crucial role that computer science plays in transforming our society and how computer science enables innovation in all science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines and creates economic opportunities;

Whereas providing students the chance to participate in high-quality computer science activities, including through science scholarships, exposes them to the rich opportunities the field offers and provides critical thinking skills that will serve them throughout their lives;

Whereas all students deserve a thorough preparation in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, including access to the qualified teachers, technology, and age-appropriate curriculum needed to learn computer science at the elementary and secondary levels of education;

Whereas these subjects provide the critical foundation to master the skills demanded by our 21st century workforce;

Whereas computer science education has challenges to address, including distinguishing computer science from technology literacy and providing adequate professional development for computer science teachers;

Whereas the field of computer science has significant equity barriers to address, including attracting more participation by females and underrepresented minorities to all levels and branches;

Whereas Grace Murray Hopper, one of the first females in the field of computer science, engineered new programming languages and pioneered standards for computer systems which laid the foundation for many advancements in computer science; and

Whereas the week of December 7, in honor of Grace Hopper's birthday, is designated as "National Computer Science Education Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Computer Science Education Week;

(2) encourages schools, teachers, researchers, universities, and policymakers to identify mechanisms for teachers to receive cutting edge professional development to provide sustainable learning experiences in computer science at all educational levels

and encourage students to be exposed to computer science concepts;

(3) encourages opportunities, including through existing programs, for females and underrepresented minorities in computer science; and

(4) supports research in computer science to address what would motivate increased participation in this field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 558, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering H. Res. 558. I would like to thank my good friend from Michigan, Dr. VERN EHLERS, for his leadership on STEM education generally and for his resolution highlighting computer science education. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for his work on the resolution.

Today's world is run by computers. From communications, to finance, to transportation and national defense, almost every facet of the modern world is tied to computers.

As we move forward in the 21st century, the country that leads in innovation in the computing and IT fields will very likely lead in productivity and economic growth. If we want America to be the leader, it is vitally important that we train the next generation of IT and computing professionals to provide this spark to our economy.

This resolution recognizes the importance of computer science education to our country, and encourages increased efforts and participation in this field. I want to highlight the attention this resolution pays to the important issue of increasing the involvement of women and underrepresented minorities in the computer science field.

If we want to be truly successful in our efforts to maintain an innovative economy, we need everyone in our country involved in the effort. This is true across the STEM fields, where the problem of underrepresentation of certain groups persists.

I want to once again thank Dr. EHLERS and Mr. POLIS for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 558, supporting computer science and the designation of

National Computer Science Education Week, and I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

The purpose of this particular resolution is multifold. One, it's to recognize the importance of computer science and computer science education. Secondly, it is to recognize that we are falling behind as a nation in the number of computer scientists that we graduate. I had no idea of this until last year when I was visited by one of my constituents. The purpose of this resolution is also to honor that constituent, as well as Dr. Grace Hopper.

The constituent who took the time to visit me was Professor Joel Adams. He is the Chair of the Computer Science Department at Calvin College, a stellar liberal arts college located in my district in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He pointed out to me something that I was totally unaware of, even though I thought I kept up with all the problems in science. He told me he was very concerned about the small number of computer scientists that we are graduating, and was particularly concerned about the lack of students entering into computer science, either taking computer science courses in high school or majoring in computer sciences in their college or university careers.

Without the students enrolling in this field we are, of course, going to have a shortage of individuals in the future to develop computer science theory and practice in the United States of America. Therefore, I commend Professor Adams for bringing this to my attention. I also will commend in a few moments Dr. Hopper, who has been very effective in bringing computer science down to the level of elementary students.

I am very pleased today that we are considering this resolution, which turns our attention to the issue of computer science education. As you know, I have spent much time in Congress fighting for research in education, particularly education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, mathematics, all of which are collectively called STEM.

I believe these STEM subjects hold special promise for the future of our Nation, and that it is very critical that all of our Nation's students receive a foundation in STEM. This helps develop well-rounded citizens and also may prepare some students to become the innovators of tomorrow.

As a former teacher, I always enjoy speaking to students in high schools, and I always have a little bit of fun with them, too, because high school students, out of custom, I think, tend not to want to study too hard and tend not to want to study too much science. Some people would say those go hand in hand.

But I always remind them of one thing. I ask them a question, first of all, who is the richest person in the world? Well, they all know that. Bill Gates.

How did he start out? Computer science.

Is he a nerd? No, he's not a nerd.

I said, Yes, he is. I know him personally, and he is a nerd of the first order. I say it's very important what courses you take in high school, because I can tell you one thing. When you get out and start looking for a job, you either are going to be a nerd or you are going to work for a nerd. Now which would you rather do?

Of course at that point they say, Well, I guess I'd rather be a nerd.

At any rate, somehow we have to reach the high school students and make them recognize that these issues are very important to their future.

□ 1515

It is very nice to have acronyms to catch these general areas, as we do in talking about STEM education, but the lines between these disciplines blur quickly when you step into the classroom and into the real world. One of the areas where we are facing a really unique challenge is in computer science.

It is very important that students in K-12 are exposed to computer science, and we have a shortage of teachers in high schools who are able to teach it in a meaningful way. Many students do not get a chance to learn about it in school, and even when they have a chance, they may not learn it as well as they should. The lack of understanding of computer science and how it fuels innovation in STEM disciplines contributes to a lack of interest in computing careers, especially among women and underrepresented minorities, whose participation rates in computer science are among the lowest of any scientific field.

By introducing students to computer science at an early age and providing them with learning experience in computer science at all educational levels, we can reverse this trend and expand and diversify our technology workforce.

Computing technology and the innovation it yields are transforming our world and are critical to our global competitiveness, particularly our economic competitiveness. However, we are not preparing an adequate and diverse workforce to meet the ever-growing demand for the information technology sector, which includes some of the country's most innovative and successful companies.

A 2009 Computer Science Teachers Association study shows that even in schools which employ computer science teachers, only a little more than half of the schools offer introductory courses in computer science, and the number of course offerings are declining. Given the enormous importance of these skills, we need to understand how to attract more students to these courses early in their education.

To raise awareness about the challenges facing computer science education, the resolution before us today

designates National Computer Science Education Week. The week of December 7 has been chosen to honor the birthday of Grace Murray Hopper, one of the first female computer scientists.

Dr. Hopper is best known for her 1953 invention of the compiler, the intermediate computer language that translates English language instructions into computer language. She came up with the compiler, she said, because she was “lazy” and hoped that “the programmer may return to being a mathematician.” Her work on compilers and getting machines to understand language instructions ultimately resulted in the COBOL business language.

I can say from personal experience I deeply appreciate the work she did, because when I first started using computers in 1957, I was writing programs in assembly language. It is just one step above the computer language itself. It was laborious, painstaking work to try to get the computer to understand what I was trying to do. Today, of course, we program in English or some other language and are able to accomplish much more as a result.

A mathematician by training, Dr. Hopper taught mathematics, served in the military, and held a vast variety of positions throughout her life in both the public and private sector. Her pioneering work, particularly in computer languages, underpins many of the tools used in today’s digital computing.

I would like to share a quick anecdote about Dr. Hopper, as recounted by Merry Maisel of the San Diego Supercomputer Center.

“Most of us remember seeing Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper on television. We recall a charming, tiny white-haired lady in a Navy uniform with a lot of braid, admonishing a class of young naval officers to remember their nanoseconds. The ‘nanoseconds’ she handed out were lengths of wire, cut to not quite 12 inches in length, equal to the distance traveled by electromagnetic waves along the wire in the space of a nanosecond—one billionth of a second. In teaching efficient programming methods, Rear Admiral Hopper wanted to make sure her students “would not waste nanoseconds,” and we are talking about the nanoseconds of computer operation.

“Occasionally, to make the demonstration even more powerful, she would bring to class an entire ‘microsecond,’ a coil of wire nearly 1,000 feet long that the rear admiral, herself tough and wiry, would brandish with a sweeping gesture and a steady wrist.”

Dr. Hopper passed away in 1992. I am glad to honor her legacy with the designation of National Computer Science Education Week, as I also honor Professor Adams for calling to my attention the current shortfall in computer scientists.

This resolution also promotes cutting-edge professional development for teachers in order to encourage students

to be exposed to computer science concepts and support researching ways to increase participation in this field. Without professional development, we will not train and retrain the necessary workforce to provide the education students need in computer science.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in recognizing the importance of computer science education and honoring the memory of Grace Murray Hopper. I would particularly like to thank my distinguished colleague from Colorado, Mr. POLIS, for his early and steadfast support for this resolution and his work on it.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. EHLERS for standing up for us nerds of America, as he does so well.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in today’s knowledge-based economy, technological breakthroughs and innovations are the keys to economic growth and prosperity. As a former Internet entrepreneur myself, I know firsthand how computer technology is transforming people’s lives throughout the world and represents a critical strategy for ensuring our Nation’s global competitiveness.

The applications of computing innovations are present in every aspect of our lives and are fueling major changes in our society, from communications, to education, to health care, to defense, to how we interact with each other every day and conduct our transactions.

To maintain America’s leadership and ensure that we remain at the forefront of cutting-edge technology advancements, we need to prepare and train a highly skilled and diverse workforce that can effectively meet the needs of the information technology sector, which includes some of the country’s most innovative and successful companies.

In my Second Congressional District alone, we have IBM, Google, Qualcomm, Sun and Avaya. A forthcoming report by the National Center for Women & Information Technology, NCWIT, based at the University of Colorado at Boulder, clearly demonstrates the ever-growing demand.

Computing professions rank among the top 10 fastest-growing professions. By 2016, there will be more than 1.5 million computer specialist jobs available. And yet the talent pool shrinks as the industry is failing to attract and retain an ample and diverse technology workforce. If current trends continue, the IT industry will only be able to fill half of its available jobs. By 2016, U.S. universities will produce only half of the computer science bachelor’s degrees that are needed.

Obviously, this shortage requires a bold vision for, and major investments in, education. And while such an effort should permeate the entire spectrum of

lifelong learning, the K–12 school system represents the most important area to provide students with a solid grounding in computer science and spark their interest in rewarding careers in information technology.

But, unfortunately, too many students don’t get a chance to learn about computer science in schools today, especially women and under-represented minorities, whose participation rates in computer science are among the lowest in any scientific field.

Consider these facts. High school girls represent only 17 percent of computer science advanced placement test takers. Only 18 percent of computer and information science degrees were awarded to women in 2008, down from 37 percent in 1985. While women comprise almost half of the workforce, they hold less than a quarter of our Nation’s IT-related professional jobs, down from 36 percent in 1991. Finally, only about 10 percent of the 2005 computer and information science graduates were African American and 6 percent Latino.

During my six year tenure on the Colorado State Board of Education and then as a charter school superintendent, I saw how a lack of understanding of computer science and its critical role in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM disciplines, contributes to lack of interest in computing careers. For example, in a recent survey among college freshman in the school district I live in, only 1 percent of them responded that they intend to major in computer science, double our State average, but still very discouraging.

There is some good news. The good news is we can reverse this trend and expand and diversify our technology workforce by introducing students to computer science at an early age and providing them with a learning experience in computer science at all educational levels.

Through cutting-edge professional development, we can assist teachers to encourage students to be exposed to computer science concepts. Through high quality computer science activities, including science scholarships, we can provide students with the critical thinking skills that will serve them throughout their lives. And by researching and implementing the best practices to increase participation in the field, we can begin to lay the groundwork for preparing and encouraging diverse students to join the workforce that will launch a new era of innovation and economic growth.

That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in approving this bipartisan resolution that raises awareness about these important issues by supporting the designation of the week of December 7th as the National Computer Science Education Week, which honors the birthday of Grace Murray Hopper, one of the first female computer scientists.

As my colleague Mr. EHLERS said, it is better that our students become nerds than work for them.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I will make some closing comments.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments. He knows whereof he speaks. He did a lot of good work in this area before he came to the Congress. He has been very helpful in the Education Committee in addressing these issues, and I appreciate that effort.

I think the key is to get children started in computer science at an early age. They love to deal with computers when they are doing video games and things of that sort. It is not too much of a leap to get them thinking about programming the computers, and that is the kind of knowledge that we need to develop in this Nation if we are going to remain competitive in the years ahead on the international scene.

So, I am delighted to recognize computer scientists in general, and I hope we do a better job of producing more and better computer scientists in this Nation so that we indeed will remain competitive and continue to lead the world in this particular area.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to once again thank Dr. EHLERS for his leadership in this area. It has been very evident by his conversation today of his passion that he brings to this important subject.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 558, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING AWARENESS AND ENHANCING THE STATE OF CYBER SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 797) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of cyber security in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of the sixth annual National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 797

Whereas more than 220,000,000 American adults use the Internet in the United States, 80 percent of whom connect through broadband connections, to conduct business, communicate with family and friends, manage finances and pay bills, access educational opportunities, shop at home, participate in online entertainment and games, and stay informed of news and current events;

Whereas nearly all United States small businesses, which represent more than 99 percent of all United States employers and employ more than 50 percent of the private workforce, increasingly rely on the Internet to manage their businesses, expand their customer reach, and enhance the management of their supply chain;

Whereas nearly 100 percent of public schools in the United States have Internet access, with a significant percentage of instructional rooms connected to the Internet to enhance children's education by providing access to educational online content and encouraging self-initiative to discover research resources;

Whereas approximately 93 percent of all teenagers use the Internet;

Whereas the number of children who connect to the Internet at school continues to rise, and teaching children of all ages to become good cyber-citizens through safe, secure, and ethical online behaviors and practices is essential to protect their computer systems and potentially their physical safety;

Whereas the growth and popularity of social networking websites has attracted millions of Americans, providing access to a range of valuable services, but exposing them to potential threats like cyber bullies, predators, and identity thieves;

Whereas cyber security is a critical part of the Nation's overall homeland security;

Whereas the Nation's critical infrastructures and economy rely on the secure and reliable operation of information networks to support the Nation's financial services, energy, telecommunications, transportation, health care, and emergency response systems;

Whereas cyber attacks have been attempted against the Nation and the United States economy, and the Department of Homeland Security's mission includes securing the homeland against cyber terrorism and other attacks;

Whereas Internet users and critical infrastructure owners and operators face an increasing threat of criminal activity and malicious attacks through viruses, worms, Trojans, and unwanted programs such as spyware, adware, hacking tools, and password stealers, that are frequent and fast in propagation, are costly to repair, can cause extensive economic harm, and can disable entire systems;

Whereas coordination among the Federal Government, State, local, and tribal governments, and the private sector is essential to securing America's critical cyber infrastructure;

Whereas millions of records containing personally identifiable information have been lost, stolen or breached, threatening the security and financial well-being of United States citizens;

Whereas now more than ever before, consumers face significant financial and personal privacy losses due to identity theft and fraud;

Whereas national organizations, policy-makers, government agencies, private sector companies, nonprofit institutions, schools,

academic organizations, consumers, and the media recognize the need to increase awareness of cyber security and the need for enhanced cyber security in the United States;

Whereas the Cyberspace Policy Review, published by the White House in May 2009, recommends that the Federal Government initiate a national public awareness and education campaign to promote cyber security;

Whereas the National Cyber Security Alliance's mission is to increase awareness of cyber security practices and technologies to home users, students, teachers, and small businesses through educational activities, online resources and checklists, and Public Service Announcements; and

Whereas the National Cyber Security Alliance, the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and the Department of Homeland Security have designated October as National Cyber Security Awareness Month to provide an opportunity to educate United States citizens about cyber security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month; and

(2) intends to work with Federal agencies, national organizations, businesses, and educational institutions to encourage the development and implementation of existing and future cyber security consensus standards, practices, and technologies in order to enhance the state of cyber security in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 797, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 797, a resolution to applaud the goals and activities of the National Cyber Security Awareness Month. The Science and Technology Committee has been a leader in Congress supporting the efforts to promote better security and cybersecurity, and I am pleased to support this resolution and to help raise awareness of this critical issue.

Each year, Americans become more and more dependent on technology for their daily lives. More than 200 million people in this country use the Internet for shopping, education, socializing, information gathering, banking and entertainment, and an increasing number of Internet users are children and seniors.

Unfortunately, with this growth in use, we have also seen a startling increase in cybersecurity. Bank accounts are now being hacked; children are

being bullied or harassed on social networking sites; and personal information is being stolen from relatives, retailers, universities, and even government agencies.

For example, earlier this year, computer systems at the FAA were hacked, increasing the risk of large-scale commercial air traffic systems disruption.

Improving cybersecurity will take the effort of all of the key stakeholders: Federal, State and local governments, academia, business and individuals.

□ 1530

We are all part of the user community and we each must do our part, from updating the Web browsers of our personal computers to improving the coordination of cybersecurity research investments across the public and private sectors. We need to change the way we think about cybersecurity and ensure it is built in from the beginning.

Cybersecurity is a challenge that transcends borders. There are 1.7 trillion Internet users worldwide, which means that we can only advance cybersecurity through increased international collaboration. That's why I join my colleagues in applauding the efforts of the National Cyber Security Alliance, a public-private partnership focused on improving cybersecurity for home users, small businesses, and education institutions.

I want to thank my friend from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 797 and yield myself so much time as I may consume.

It seems that nearly every facet of our lives, professional and personal, relies on computers and the Internet in some fashion—communication, transportation, shopping, medicine, entertainment, and the list goes on. It is not an understatement to say that information technology has become one of the main components of our everyday American lives, and as such, we are left more and more vulnerable to cyberattacks, viruses, worms, and identity theft. As our Nation depends more heavily on this technology, both proactive and reactive cybersecurity are essential.

In order to raise awareness of the importance of cybersecurity, the National Cyber Security Alliance has declared the month of October as Cyber Security Awareness Month. All month long, the NCSA is sponsoring events and programs to raise awareness of the importance of cybersecurity.

The National Cyber Security Alliance is the preeminent public-private partnership, working with the Department of Homeland Security, corporate sponsors, and nonprofit collaborators to promote cybersecurity awareness for home users, small and medium size businesses, and primary and secondary education. We all have a role in sus-

taining our cyberinfrastructure, which is essentially this year's theme, "Our Shared Responsibility."

The NCSA offers many tips for individuals and businesses alike to help protect themselves from cyberattacks. StaySafeOnline.org is a Web site created by the NCSA to provide education on all of the different aspects and issues related to cybersecurity. All of the organizations and agencies involved in National Cyber Security Awareness Month have put forth a great effort in raising awareness and helping us as Americans become better, more responsible computer users.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 797, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of this resolution, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), and congratulate her on an outstanding hearing last Friday on this issue.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer H. Res. 797, my resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month, for a vote today. I would like to thank Chairman BART GORDON for giving me the opportunity to share with him and this committee the virtues of National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

The goal of National Cyber Security Awareness Month is to heighten awareness of everyday Internet users and to explain that by taking some simple steps, we can all safeguard ourselves from the latest online threats and respond to potential cybercrimes against ourselves and our Nation.

Each year, the National Cybersecurity Division (NCSA) of the Department of Homeland Security joins with the National Cyber Security Alliance (NCSA), the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and other partners to support National Cyber Security Awareness Month. I thank DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano and Assistant Secretary Greg Schaffer as well as Will Pelgrin with MS-ISAC and Michael Kaiser with StaySafeOnline.org for their leadership in promoting National Cyber Security Awareness Month.

This year, the theme of National Cyber Security Awareness Month is "Our Shared Responsibility." Ultimately, our cyberinfrastructure is only as strong as its weakest link. In this digital age, we are all connected. No individual, business, or government entity is solely responsible for cybersecurity. We all must understand how our individual online computing practices have a collective impact on our Nation's cybersecurity. It would be naive to believe, however, that simple steps by end users alone will sufficiently combat the larger threats associated with a growing networked society.

As chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science

and Technology, I have held three hearings this year on our Nation's cybersecurity posture. Cybersecurity vulnerabilities can and have significantly impacted our national and economic security. Through the leadership of the Obama administration, cybersecurity is finally gaining the much-needed attention it deserves, both in the Federal Government and the private sector. The oversight that the Homeland Security Committee is undertaking will help to focus our attention; however, much more work remains to be done.

Last week, I held a roundtable discussion with key cybersecurity stakeholders in Congress, the administration, and the private sector on this extremely complex issue. Everyone agreed that end user awareness and education is an extremely critical component to fortifying our national cybersecurity posture. More and more and with each passing moment, we are awakening to the vulnerabilities and threats that come from our interactions on the World Wide Web. Simply put, we must protect ourselves. That is why this resolution received overwhelming bipartisan support.

I thank my colleagues, especially Chairman GORDON, for cosponsoring H. Res. 797, and I look forward to working with him as well as other committees of cross jurisdiction on this critical issue going forward.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if the majority has no additional speakers, then I will proceed to close.

We have had a lot of good discussion here about cybersecurity, but a word that hasn't popped up as much is cyberwarfare, and that is by far the most dangerous situation facing our Nation today.

Cybersecurity is indeed a major issue and we need protection from thieves trying to steal our bank accounts, et cetera. But the real difficulty we face as a Nation occurs because we are so vulnerable. We are so advanced technologically, that we are vulnerable to attacks of all types from many enemies of different backgrounds and different abilities.

It is a sad commentary today that a powerful, strong nation such as the United States of America can be the victim of a very small nation or even a small group of individuals seeking to do us harm using cyberwarfare. I myself did not realize the extent of this until some years ago. I was selected as a rapporteur of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly Science Committee to write a report on cyberwarfare; and it was simply astounding to learn the risks that we face as a wealthy, well-established, highly developed nation simply because we make such great use of cyberknowledge and cybertechniques that we are automatically very vulnerable in the area of cyberwarfare.

I appreciate the gentle lady from New York bringing this to our attention. We have a lot of work to do here, not just in the military, but in many civilian sectors as well. The warning is

here. The alarm has been rung. Let's make sure that, as a nation, we go ahead and defend ourselves as we should against this very, very highly technological but very dangerous new activity.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I want to once again thank the gentlewoman from New York for bringing this important resolution to us. I think that this will help give our country a better awareness of the concerns we have about cybersecurity.

Also, as Dr. EHLERS notes, our Science and Technology Committee has spent quite a bit of time on this issue, being the first to have a review of the 60-day review. Hopefully, we are going to be seeing in the next very few days a significant bill coming out of our committee concerning the necessary research and technology aspect of moving forward with our research in the cybersecurity area.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 797.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3585, SOLAR TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP ACT

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 111-304) on the resolution (H. Res. 846) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3585) to guide and provide for United States research, development, and demonstration of solar energy technologies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3763, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3319, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 558, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on House Resolution 797 will resume later in the week.

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

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3763, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3763.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 790]

YEAS—400

Ackerman	Boustany	Cleaver	Duncan	Larson (CT)	Quigley
Aderholt	Boyd	Clyburn	Edwards (MD)	Latham	Radanovich
Adler (NJ)	Brady (PA)	Coble	Edwards (TX)	LaTourette	Rahall
Akin	Brady (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Ehlers	Latta	Rangel
Alexander	Braley (IA)	Cohen	Ellison	Lee (CA)	Rehberg
Altmire	Bright	Cole	Ellsworth	Lee (NY)	Reichert
Arcuri	Broun (GA)	Conaway	Emerson	Levin	Reyes
Austria	Brown (SC)	Cannolly (VA)	Engel	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Conyers	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Cooper	Fallin	Linder	Roe (TN)
Bachus	Ginny	Costa	Farr	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
Baird	Buchanan	Costello	Fattah	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Baldwin	Burgess	Courtney	Filner	Loeb sack	Rogers (MI)
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Cuellar	Flake	Lucas	Rooney
Bartlett	Butterfield	Culberson	Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Cummings	Forbes	Lujan	Roskam
Becerra	Calvert	Dahlkemper	Fortenberry	Lummis	Ross
Berkley	Camp	Davis (AL)	Foster	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman (NJ)
Berman	Campbell	Davis (CA)	Fox	E.	Royal-Allard
Berry	Cantor	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)	Lynch	Royce
Biggart	Cao	Davis (KY)	Franks (AZ)	Mack	Ruppersberger
Bilbray	Capito	Davis (TN)	Frelinghuysen	Maffei	Rush
Bilirakis	Capps	DeFazio	Fudge	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Cardoza	DeGette	Gallegly	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Bishop (NY)	Carnahan	Delahunt	Garrett (NJ)	Markey (CO)	Salazar
Bishop (UT)	Carney	DeLauro	Giffords	Markey (MA)	Sanchez, Linda
Blackburn	Carson (IN)	Dent	Gingrey (GA)	Marshall	T.
Blumenauer	Cassidy	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gohmert	Massa	Sanchez, Loretta
Blunt	Castle	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gonzalez	Matheson	Sarbanes
Bocchieri	Castor (FL)	Dicks	Goodlatte	Matsui	Scalise
Bonner	Chaffetz	Dingell	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Bono Mack	Chandler	Doggett	Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Schauer
Boozman	Childers	Donnelly (IN)	Graves	McCaul	Schiff
Boren	Chu	Doyle	Grayson	McClintock	Schmidt
Boswell	Clarke	Dreier	Green, Al	McCollum	Schock
Boucher	Clay	Driehaus	Green, Gene	McCotter	Schrader
			Griffith	McDermott	Scott (GA)
			Guthrie	McGovern	Scott (VA)
			Hall (NY)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
			Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Serrano
			Halvorson	McKeon	Sessions
			Hare	McMahon	Sestak
			Harman	McMorris	Shea-Porter
			Harper	Rodgers	Sherman
			Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Shimkus
			Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)	Shuster
			Heinrich	Meeks (NY)	Simpson
			Heller	Melancon	Skelton
			Hensarling	Mica	Slaughter
			Herger	Michaud	Smith (NE)
			Herseth Sandlin	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
			Higgins	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
			Hill	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
			Himes	Miller, Gary	Snyder
			Hinchey	Miller, George	Souder
			Hinojosa	Minnick	Space
			Hirono	Mitchell	Speier
			Hodes	Mollohan	Stark
			Hoekstra	Moore (KS)	Stearns
			Holden	Moore (WI)	Stupak
			Holt	Moran (KS)	Sullivan
			Honda	Moran (VA)	Sutton
			Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Tanner
			Hunter	Murphy (NY)	Taylor
			Inglis	Murphy, Patrick	Teague
			Inslie	Murphy, Tim	Terry
			Issa	Myrick	Thompson (CA)
			Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (MS)
			Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)
			(TX)	Neal (MA)	Thornberry
			Jenkins	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
			Johnson (GA)	Nunes	Tiberi
			Johnson (IL)	Nye	Tierney
			Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Titus
			Johnson, Sam	Obey	Tonko
			Jones	Olson	Towns
			Jordan (OH)	Olver	Tsongas
			Kagen	Ortiz	Turner
			Kanjorski	Pallone	Upton
			Kaptur	Pascrell	Van Hollen
			Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
			Kildee	Paul	Visclosky
			Kilpatrick (MI)	Paulsen	Walz
			Kilroy	Payne	Wamp
			Kind	Pence	Waters
			King (IA)	Perlmutter	Watson
			King (NY)	Perriello	Watt
			Kingston	Peters	Waxman
			Kirk	Peterson	Welch
			Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Petri	Westmoreland
			Kissell	Pingree (ME)	Whitfield
			Klein (FL)	Pitts	Wilson (OH)
			Kline (MN)	Platts	Wilson (SC)
			Kosmas	Poe (TX)	Wittman
			Kratovil	Polis (CO)	Wolf
			Kucinich	Pomeroy	Woolsey
			Lamborn	Posey	Wu
			Lance	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
			Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—32

Abercrombie	Gerlach	Schwartz
Andrews	Grijalva	Shadegg
Barrett (SC)	Gutierrez	Shuler
Bean	Israel	Sires
Boehner	Langevin	Spratt
Capuano	Lofgren, Zoe	Walden
Carter	Lowey	Wasserman
Crenshaw	Maloney	Schultz
Crowley	Murtha	Weiner
Deal (GA)	Price (GA)	Wexler
Etheridge	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)

□ 1855

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHWARTZ, Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 790, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. LANGEVIN, Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 790, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have vote “yea.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BOB DAVIS OF MICHIGAN

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

Mr. STUPAK, Madam Speaker, I rise to regretfully inform my colleagues of the passing of former Congressman Bob Davis, who represented most of northern Michigan in Congress from 1979–1993. Bob died last Friday.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in his honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will all Members rise for a moment of silence.

Mr. DINGELL, Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and achievements of Former Representative Bob Davis. I was deeply saddened to hear the loss of my friend Bob, a true Michigander. Through attending public schools in Mackinac County, miming a small Michigan business, and serving as a city council member, state representative and senator, Bob came to understand the state on every level. By the time he came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1979, he truly understood the needs of Michigan’s people. From his work with then-Governor George Romney to reduce the tolls on the Mackinac Bridge, to his work in the House Armed Services Committee to procure major defense weapons systems, he always worked toward tangible results for those he was serving.

Bob and I not only shared a love for Michigan and its people, but also a deep appreciation for the outdoors. Some of his greatest achievements while serving in the U.S. House were through his role as the Ranking Member on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He was able to help establish the Upper Peninsula’s Keweenaw National Historical Park, the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and to protect the Great Lakes from invasive species. Even after his passing, Bob Davis’ legacy and achievements will live on, in no small part through the natural and

historic lands of Michigan that he fought to protect and preserve.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

ARMY SPECIALIST JEREMIAH PAUL McCLEERY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3319, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3319.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 791]
YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Cantor	Emerson
Ackerman	Cao	Engel
Aderholt	Capito	Eshoo
Adler (NJ)	Capps	Fallin
Akin	Cardoza	Farr
Alexander	Carnahan	Fattah
Altmire	Carney	Filmer
Arcuri	Carson (IN)	Flake
Austria	Cassidy	Fleming
Baca	Castle	Forbes
Bachmann	Castor (FL)	Fortenberry
Bachus	Chaffetz	Foster
Baird	Chandler	Foxx
Baldwin	Childers	Frank (MA)
Barrow	Chu	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett	Clarke	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Clay	Fudge
Becerra	Cleaver	Gallely
Berkley	Clyburn	Garrett (NJ)
Berman	Coble	Giffords
Berry	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Biggart	Cohen	Gohmert
Bilbray	Cole	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Connolly (VA)	Gordon (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Graves
Blackburn	Costa	Grayson
Blumenauer	Costello	Green, Al
Blunt	Courtney	Green, Gene
Boccieri	Cuellar	Griffith
Boehner	Culberson	Grijalva
Bonner	Cummings	Guthrie
Bono Mack	Dahlkemper	Hall (NY)
Boozman	Davis (AL)	Hall (TX)
Boren	Davis (CA)	Halvorson
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Hare
Boucher	Davis (KY)	Harman
Boustany	Davis (TN)	Harper
Boyd	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Heller
Bright	Dent	Hensarling
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Brown (SC)	Dicks	Herseth Sandlin
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Higgins
Brown-Waite,	Doggett	Hill
Ginny	Donnelly (IN)	Himes
Buchanan	Doyle	Hinchey
Burgess	Dreier	Hinojosa
Burton (IN)	Driehaus	Hirono
Butterfield	Duncan	Hodes
Buyer	Edwards (MD)	Hoekstra
Calvert	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Camp	Ehlers	Holt
Campbell	Ellsworth	Honda

Hoyer	McMorris	Ryan (OH)
Hunter	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Inglis	McNerney	Salazar
Inslee	Meek (FL)	Salazar, Linda
Issa	Meeks (NY)	T.
Jackson (IL)	Melancon	Sanchez, Loretta
Jackson-Lee	Mica	Sarbanes
(TX)	Michaud	Scalise
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Schakowsky
Johnson (GA)	Miller (MI)	Schauer
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Schrader
Jones	Minnick	Schwartz
Jordan (OH)	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Kagen	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kennedy	Moore (WI)	Serrano
Kildee	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Kilpatrick (MI)	Moran (VA)	Sestak
Kilroy	Murphy (CT)	Shea-Porter
Kind	Murphy (NY)	Sherman
King (IA)	Murphy, Patrick	Shimkus
King (NY)	Murphy, Tim	Shuster
Kingston	Myrick	Simpson
Kirk	Nadler (NY)	Skelton
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Napolitano	Slaughter
Kissell	Neal (MA)	Smith (NE)
Klein (FL)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Kosmas	Nye	Smith (WA)
Kratovil	Oberstar	Snyder
Kucinich	Obey	Souder
Lamborn	Olson	Space
Lance	Olver	Speier
Langevin	Ortiz	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Stark
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Stearns
Latham	Pastor (AZ)	Stupak
LaTourette	Paul	Sullivan
Latta	Paulsen	Sutton
Lee (CA)	Payne	Tanner
Lee (NY)	Pence	Perlmutter
Levin	Perlmutter	Taylor
Lewis (CA)	Perriello	Teague
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Terry
Linder	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Petri	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (PA)
Loeback	Pitts	Thornberry
Lucas	Platts	Tiahrt
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Lujan	Polis (CO)	Tierney
Lummis	Pomeroy	Titus
Lungren, Daniel	Posey	Tonko
E.	Price (NC)	Towns
Lynch	Putnam	Tsongas
Mack	Quigley	Turner
Maffei	Radanovich	Upton
Manzullo	Rahall	Van Hollen
Marchant	Rangel	Velázquez
Markey (CO)	Rehberg	Visclosky
Markey (MA)	Reichert	Walz
Marshall	Reyes	Wamp
Massa	Richardson	Waters
Matheson	Rodriguez	Watson
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Watt
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Waxman
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Welch
McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
McClintock	Rooney	Whitfield
McCullum	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
McCotter	Roskam	Wittman
McDermott	Ross	Wolf
McGovern	Rothman (NJ)	Woolsey
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Wu
McIntyre	Royce	Yarmuth
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
McMahon	Rush	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Gerlach	Shadegg
Barrett (SC)	Gutierrez	Shuler
Bean	Israel	Sires
Capuano	Kanjorski	Walden
Carter	Lofgren, Zoe	Wasserman
Crenshaw	Lowey	Schultz
Crowley	Maloney	Weiner
Deal (GA)	Murtha	Wexler
Diaz-Balart, M.	Price (GA)	Wilson (OH)
Ellison	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Etheridge	Schock	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JAY JOHNSON OF WISCONSIN

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to regretfully inform my colleagues of the passing of our former colleague, Jay Johnson, who represented the Eighth District of Wisconsin with distinction from January of 1997 through January of 1999, and I would ask that the House observe a moment of silence in his honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will all Members rise to observe a moment of silence.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the moment of silence in memory of former Representative Bob Davis of Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING COMPUTER SCIENCE AND COMPUTING CAREERS AMONG THE PUBLIC AND IN SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 558, 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 Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 558, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 792]

YEAS—405

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Aderholt
- Adler (NJ)
- Akin
- Alexander
- Altmire
- Andrews
- Arcuri
- Austria
- Baca
- Bachmann
- Bachus
- Baird
- Baldwin
- Barrow
- Bartlett
- Barton (TX)
- Becerra
- Berkley
- Berman
- Berry
- Biggert
- Bilbray
- Bilirakis
- Bishop (GA)
- Bishop (NY)
- Bishop (UT)
- Blackburn
- Blumenauer
- Blunt
- Boccieri
- Boehner
- Bonner
- Bono Mack
- Boozman
- Boren
- Boswell
- Boucher
- Boustany
- Boyd
- Brady (PA)
- Brady (TX)
- Braleley (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
- Carney
- 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
- Costello
- Courtney
- Cuellar
- Culberson
- Cummings
- Dahlkemper
- Davis (AL)
- Davis (CA)
- Davis (IL)
- Davis (KY)
- Davis (TN)
- 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
- Fallin
- Farr
- Fattah
- Filner
- Flake
- Fleming
- Forbes
- Fortenberry
- Foster
- Foxx
- Frank (MA)
- Franks (AZ)
- Frelinghuysen
- Fudge
- Gallegly
- Garrett (NJ)
- Giffords
- Gingrey (GA)
- Gohmert
- Gonzalez
- Goodlatte
- Gordon (TN)
- Granger
- Graves
- Grayson
- Green, Al
- Green, Gene
- Griffith
- Grijalva
- Guthrie
- Hall (NY)
- Hall (TX)
- Halvorson
- Hare
- Harman
- Harper
- Hastings (FL)
- Hastings (WA)
- Heinrich
- Heller
- Hensarling
- Herger
- Herseth Sandlin
- Higgins
- Hill
- Himes
- Hinchey
- Hinojosa
- Hirono
- Hodes
- Hoekstra
- Holden
- Holt
- Honda
- Hoyer
- Hunter
- Inglis
- Inslee
- 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
- 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
- Loeb
- Lucas
- Luetkemeyer
- Lujan
- Lummis
- Lungren, Daniel E.
- Lynch
- Mack
- Maffei
- Manzullo
- Marchant
- Markey (CO)
- Markey (MA)
- Marshall
- Massa
- Matheson
- Matsui
- McCarthy (CA)
- McCarthy (NY)
- McCaul
- McClintock
- McCollum
- McCotter
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McHenry
- McIntyre
- McKeon
- McMahon
- McMorris
- Rodgers
- McNerney
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Melancon
- Mica
- Michaud
- Miller (FL)
- Miller (MI)
- Miller (NC)
- Miller, Gary
- Miller, George
- Minnick
- Mitchell
- Mollohan
- Moore (KS)
- Moore (WI)
- Moran (KS)
- Moran (VA)
- Murphy (CT)
- Murphy (NY)
- Murphy, Patrick
- Murphy, Tim
- Myrick
- Nadler (NY)
- Napolitano
- Neal (MA)
- Neugebauer
- Nunes
- Nye
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olson
- Olver

- Ortiz
- Pallone
- Pascarella
- Pastor (AZ)
- Paul
- Paulsen
- Payne
- Pence
- Perlmutter
- Perriello
- Peters
- Peterson
- Petri
- Pingree (ME)
- Pitts
- Platts
- Poe (TX)
- Polis (CO)
- Pomeroy
- Posey
- Price (NC)
- Putnam
- Quigley
- Radanovich
- Rahall
- Rangel
- Rehberg
- Reichert
- Reyes
- Richardson
- Rodriguez
- Roe (TN)
- Rogers (AL)
- Rogers (KY)
- Rogers (MI)
- Rooney
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Roskam
- Ross
- Rothman (NJ)
- Roybal-Allard
- Royce
- Ruppersberger
- Rush
- Ryan (OH)
- Ryan (WI)
- Salazar
- Sanchez, Linda T.
- Sanchez, Loretta
- Sarbanes
- Scalise
- Schakowsky
- Schauer
- Schiff
- Schmidt
- Schock
- Schrader
- Schwartz
- Scott (GA)
- Scott (VA)
- Sensenbrenner
- Serrano
- Sessions
- Sestak
- Shea-Porter
- Sherman
- Shimkus
- Shuster
- Simpson
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (NE)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Souder
- Space
- Speler
- Spratt
- Stark
- Stearns
- Stupak
- Sullivan
- Sutton
- Tanner
- Taylor
- Teague
- Terry
- Thompson (CA)
- Thompson (MS)
- Thompson (PA)
- Thornberry
- Tiahrt
- Tiberi
- Tierney
- Titus
- Tonko
- Towns
- Tsongas
- Turner
- Upton
- Van Hollen
- Visclosky
- Walz
- Wamp
- Waters
- Watson
- Watt
- Waxman
- Welch
- Westmoreland
- Whitfield
- Wilson (OH)
- Wilson (SC)
- Wittman
- Wolf
- Woolsey
- Wu
- Yarmuth
- Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

- Barrett (SC)
- Bean
- Capuano
- Carter
- Crenshaw
- Crowley
- Deal (GA)
- Etheridge
- Gerlach
- Gutierrez
- Israel
- Kirk
- Lofgren, Zoe
- Lowey
- Maloney
- Murtha
- Price (GA)
- Rohrabacher
- Shadegg
- Shuler
- Sires
- Velázquez
- Walden
- Wasserman
- Schultz
- Weiner
- Wexler
- Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1912

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 790, 791 and 792.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II

of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 20, 2009, at 5:23 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to the Conference Report accompanying the bill H.R. 2892.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 621.

That the Senate passed S. 1793.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 874

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H. Res. 874.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2009.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, October 20, 2009 at 4:28 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, first declared by Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-71)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this pro-

vision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in that country, are to continue in effect beyond October 27, 2009.

The situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has been marked by widespread violence and atrocities that continue to threaten regional stability, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency to deal with that threat and the related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in that country.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 20, 2009.

□ 1915

HONORING FORMER CONGRESS- MEN BOB DAVIS AND JAY JOHN- SON

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, earlier today the House observed moments of silence for two former Members of this Chamber.

Last Friday, former Congressman Bob Davis, a Republican from St. Ignace, Michigan, and my predecessor in Congress, passed away in Arlington, Virginia. Bob Davis dedicated his life to public service. He served members of his community as owner and operator of a funeral home in St. Ignace before serving in the Michigan State House and State Senate, where he was the Republican leader.

In 1978, Bob was elected to Congress where he served for 14 years. Over the course of those 14 years, Bob Davis was known to the people of what was then Michigan's 11th Congressional District for his constituent services. Bob's last, and perhaps greatest, legislative achievement was the establishment of the Keweenaw National Historic Park in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, which showcases the region's rich mining heritage.

Just like they did 17 years ago with the establishment of the Keweenaw National Historic Park, the people of the Keweenaw Peninsula rang the local church bells in tribute to Congressman Davis last Friday as citizens paid tribute and silently prayed for Bob and his family.

I join my constituents and Members of this Chamber in paying tribute to Bob and offering our sympathy and prayers to his wife, Brook, and their children Rob, Lisa, George, Alexandra, and Hannah.

Just days after Bob's passing, we lost another public servant with roots in northern Michigan.

On Saturday, former Congressman Jay Johnson, a Democrat from Green Bay, Wisconsin, passed away. Jay was a native of Bessemer in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and a graduate of Gogebic Community College and Northern Michigan University. He was a man of the people, and he was always proud to be known by his Upper Peninsula roots.

Jay worked as a journalist for 32 years in Wisconsin, Florida, and Michigan before making a run for Congress. He represented Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District from 1996 to 1998 and was appointed director of the U.S. Mint by President Clinton in 2000 where he served for 2 years.

I am pleased to have served with Jay in Congress, and my heartfelt condolences go out to his wife, JoLee, and his entire family.

HONORING DAVE AND JULIE ZISKA'S SERVICE TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF SOUTH FLORIDA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate Dave and Julie Ziska for 28 years of service to the Boy Scouts of south Florida. This year, the many individuals and families who have been enriched by the Ziskas gather together in Miami as Dave and Julie receive the 2009 Distinguished Citizen Award from the South Florida Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

The Boy Scouts of America is an outstanding organization that fosters strong ideals in young men and helps build leaders for the future. With the Ziskas' amazing service and support, the Boy Scouts of south Florida has been able to successfully accomplish this mission. Dave and Julie Ziska have not only had a profound impact on the Boy Scouts but also on the families of the Scouts and the entire south Florida community.

The Ziska's guidance and goodwill over the past 28 years has encouraged many young men to become active in Scouting. In fact, 207 young men attained the distinct and high honor of being Eagle Scouts with their help.

I congratulate and recognize Dave and Julie Ziska for their commendable service to the Boy Scouts of America and to the Boy Scouts of south Florida. Congratulations.

GUN CONTROL IN CHICAGO

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, in the past weeks and months, Chicago has made national news, unfortunately not just because of the Olympic decision. It is because school-age children

have been attacked and killed by other school-age children. The last thing our city needs is more guns on our streets and more children fearing for their safety.

Recently, the United States Supreme Court agreed to review *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, a case that challenges whether Chicago's local handgun ban is legal. In a time of national concern over senseless and deadly attacks, it is a concern.

Since 1983, it has been illegal to purchase or own a handgun within Chicago city limits. Over the course of that 26 years, Chicago has seen the number of registered handguns drop. Guns have become scarcer, saving lives and creating safer neighborhoods in the process.

As we work to make our cities and communities safer, there are many additional things we could and should fight for. I stand ready to work with the administration to reinstate the assault weapons ban and ready to work with this body to close the gun show loophole.

But in the absence of Federal action, it is critical that we preserve the rights of the people to protect their children and their families at the local level.

RECOGNIZING OCTOBER AS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, a time to remember the victims of this terrible and often hidden crime and also a time to renew our commitment to eliminating it.

I recently had the privilege of participating in the dedication ceremony for a new Peace Garden at Cornerstone Shelter in my district. The garden honors both the victim of the crime as well as those people committed to restoring hope for those who have experienced domestic violence. The Minnesota Department of Public Safety has reported that 70,000 primary victims have received services from battered women's shelters and domestic abuse agencies in 2008 alone.

Thankfully, we have organizations like Cornerstone who provide needed assistance and resources to victims while working to end domestic violence as a whole. When we bring the light of truth to an issue like domestic abuse, its power to destroy decreases.

It's important that we remember the victims of domestic violence and let them know they are not alone as we fight to make the world a better place.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF CONGRESSMAN JAY JOHNSON

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, like everyone else in northeast Wisconsin, I am shocked and saddened by the passing of my friend, former Congressman Jay Johnson. Jay represented the Eighth District of Wisconsin in this body from January of 1997 to January 1999.

Jay was a friend of mine. He was a gentle person, and everyone in northeast Wisconsin was considered his friend as well. He served the best interests of all of our families and will be greatly missed.

For many years, Jay's trusted voice and kind countenance came into all of our homes as a news anchor on WFRV-TV and WLUK-TV in Green Bay. His colleagues in this room here all recall how kind he was. His colleagues in the newsroom in Green Bay recalled his kind heart, his unending patience, and his grand sense of humor. They will remember him as a gentleman in every sense of the world.

It's clear from his life spent in front of the camera and here in public service that he truly loved people.

In 2000, President Clinton appointed Jay to be director of the United States Mint; and more recently, he ran Jay Johnson Coins and Consulting.

During my service here, Jay had been a mentor, an adviser, and a close friend. On behalf of the people of the Eighth District of Wisconsin, I want to thank Jay for his service and extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, JoLee, their family and friends.

PROTECT SMALL BUSINESS FROM BIG GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, small businesses are doing all they can to create jobs and bring our economy back to life. Unfortunately in Washington, Democrats have decided to scheme new taxes and mandates as a part of their Big Government takeover of the health care system. With 263,000 more jobs lost last month, it is shocking that Democrats believe now is the time to punish small business that creates the majority of jobs in America.

The National Federation of Independent Business has revealed the Big Government Democrat health takeover would cost 1.6 million jobs in the United States. Destroying jobs will make it harder, not easier, for individuals to afford health care.

We need H.R. 3400 to target reforms to our health insurance system, like shopping for plans across State lines, association health plans for small businesses, and tax credits for individuals to purchase insurance.

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

HEALTH CARE AND TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, it's now been over 5 months since the White House announced numerous deals with major stakeholders in the health care debate. Little or no details regarding these negotiations have been released. And last week during the Finance Committee hearings in the other body, a plan for a commission to slow the growth of Medicare spending was revealed. But it was then revealed that the hospitals would be exempt from this commission because, according to Congress Daily, they had already negotiated a cost-cutting agreement with the White House.

You know, despite the rhetoric of last fall, then-candidate Obama's promise to make all health care reform negotiation public, we still have very few details on what exactly was agreed to during these highly publicized but very secret meetings last May. How can Congress do its due diligence in creating policy before us without the crucial details? More importantly, how can the American public know what we are doing is indeed in their best interest?

In January of this year, we were promised an administration that would bring all parties together; we were promised an administration that would not negotiate behind closed doors and in fact would be broadcasting these negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people could see for themselves what the choices were.

When will these cease to become promises and become reality?

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

CONGRESS NEEDS TO STEP UP TO THE PLATE FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, yesterday I had the privilege to be in the heart of my district in Waterbury, Connecticut, to meet with a group of seniors, very concerned and active seniors. They call themselves the Silver Waves. And

through letters and phone calls and emails and thousands of one-on-one conversations throughout the greater Waterbury area, they have been able to gather over 300 signatures on the petition that I am holding right here expressing why they believe that this Congress has to start paying attention to the very real economic pressures that seniors in this economy and in this country are facing and why, in particular, we need to step up to the plate and do the right thing for seniors who are about to face a zero percent increase on Social Security in this country.

□ 1930

Madam Speaker, I'm here to bring these petitions to my colleagues because I couldn't agree with them more.

This economic downturn has hit all of us, but it has hit seniors in particular. Just like many Americans, they have mortgages to pay, they've got car payments to make, and they've got grocery bills to pay. But unlike many Americans, they also face disproportionately high health care costs, unusually high prescription-drug costs, and multiple bills that seem only to be rising. Put that together with decreased retirement funds, and seniors are facing a particularly tough forecast.

Now over the past year, this Congress has tried to take some steps to pull this economy up from the depths of the recession. We've acted to make sure that our financial system didn't collapse. We've moved quickly to make critical investments in our economy to help it recover. We're working now to try to make this health care system work for both our customers, our patients and also for our economy. But in all of this, we have to remember that seniors throughout this country face economic challenges that are unique only to them, and as we continue to work on getting our entire economy to recover, we have to remember that we have to specifically target seniors, most of which are living on fixed incomes today.

Now the impetus behind these petitions is a very real sense from the senior citizens in my district, which I think is reflective of a feeling across this country, that over the past decade or so, they've watched Washington dole out special favors to the insurance companies, to the drug companies, to the oil companies and to the banks. And they're wondering where the help is for them. And in the middle of this tough economic recession, just when they're waiting for the help to come to them, they get some of the worst news of all, that they will be receiving a zero percent increase in their Social Security check.

Now that's why we need to listen to the people who have signed these petitions, because this number is 3,000 in Waterbury, Connecticut, but it would be millions across the country of seniors who want to know why a formula

designed to reflect the true cost of living increases for them gives them a zero percent increase when they know that their costs are increasing on a regular basis, and why they can't get Congress to step up to the plate and help them when it seems like over the past decade, a lot of other people with a lot more influence and a lot more power than them have been helped.

So I'm here to deliver these petitions and to say "thank you" to people like Lucille Keating, Jeannine Laliberte, Lorraine Johnston and Lida Keroski, who put these together, and assure them not only do I agree with the sentiment they and so many Americans have brought to this House, but that I believe we are going to take seriously the notion that in this very difficult economy we need to step up to the plate and do the right thing for seniors in this country.

HALLOWEEN HEALTH CARE

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Senate's Halloween health care bill seeped out of the dark dungeons of the Capitol Building today. News reports say it's 1,500 pages long. Why is legislation drafted in the secret, dark caverns of the Capitol, where the trolls roam at night, void of public view? Is it so scary the healthcrats don't want us to know what's in it?

We need to know exactly what's in these bills and how much they really cost before we vote on anything. And why is there such a rush to pass a bill anyway? Maybe they have frightening parts that no one will see if quickly passed. One scary part is the government wanting American money now. You see, new taxes take effect immediately, but the legislation won't be in operation until 2013. That's right. American taxpayers pay 3 years of new taxes on a deal that doesn't take effect for 3 years. Now isn't that scary?

And what is the goal of this government bill? If the goal is to provide universal health care for everyone, the bill is a failure. The President told us there are 30 million uninsured. The Congressional Budget Office said the latest and greatest bill still will leave 25 million uninsured. So we're letting the government take over health care just to add 5 million people to the government system. It would be cheaper just to buy them all health insurance and then require proof of citizenship to get insurance rather than spend trillions and let Uncle Sam take care of us all.

If the goal of the Halloween health care bill is to provide better quality care, the bill is a failure. Just look at the way the government runs the Indian universal health care system. The government has been committing medical malpractice against the Indians for decades. If the goal is to make health care cheaper, the bill fails again. The bill will cost over \$1 trillion just to set it up. And the idea that government can run an entire health care system cheaper than the private sector

is a myth. The only way that government can do it cheaper is to drastically cut services to patients, ration care or both.

Madam Speaker, has there ever been a government program that costs less than projected? I don't think that has happened in the history of the Republic.

If the goal is to make government-run Halloween health care more efficient, the bill fails once more. The government is almost always more inefficient because it has no competition, has no accountability, and when it runs out of money, it just spends more money and taxes the taxpayer.

However, if the real goal of this legislation is to have government take control of our health care, the bill is a total success.

The Halloween health care nightmare on Capitol Hill is this specific provision—government takeover of health care. So rather than let the government take care of us all, Congress should reform specific problems under our current system. Allow insurance to be purchased across State lines, provide for a safety net for catastrophic injury or illness, have a method to allow people with preexisting conditions to obtain insurance, allow for health savings accounts so people can take care of themselves and get a tax break, provide tax incentives and tax breaks for businesses who take care of their employees rather than more taxes on small businesses, which taxes them to death, and eliminate the fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicaid system.

And, Madam Speaker, there are many other specific things Congress should do. But turning over America's health to the Federal Government is unhealthy for the American people. Such an idea is truly a Halloween nightmare and a trick on the American people.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

U.S. DEFICIT BIGGEST SINCE 1945

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. Madam Speaker, I would like to share with the House tonight some writings from the October 16, 2009, CNNMoney.com. The title is, "U.S. Deficit Biggest Since 1945."

"The Obama administration on Friday said the government ran a \$1.42 trillion deficit in fiscal year 2009. That made it the worst year on record since World War II, according to data from the Treasury and the White House Office of Management and Budget. Tax

receipts for the year fell 16.6 percent overall, while spending soared 18.2 percent. Consequently, the annual deficit rose 212 percent to the record dollar amount of \$1.42 trillion, from \$455 billion a year earlier."

I continue to read from this article:

"As a result, the country is very near to breaching its so-called "debt ceiling," currently set at \$12.1 trillion. Lawmakers, however, are expected to vote to raise that ceiling this fall."

I further share with the House:

"In August, the OMB projected a 10-year deficit of \$9 trillion, assuming President Obama's 2010 budget proposals are put in place. A deficit of that magnitude means the debt held by the public would approach 82 percent of gross domestic product. That's double the 41 percent recorded in 2008.

"The 10-year forecast as well as the longer-term outlook are considered unsustainable. The GAO further cautioned that the yawning deficit problems should be addressed sooner rather than later. The longer action to deal with the Nation's long-term fiscal outlook is delayed, the larger the change will need to be, increasing the likelihood that they will be disruptive and destabilizing."

Madam Speaker, I wanted to share that tonight with the House because whether you be a Republican, which I am, or a Democrat, this country needs to understand that no longer can it take care of the world, because we can't even take care of our own Nation.

I want to make reference just briefly to a book that I read a couple of years ago that I would recommend to each Member of Congress. And if I could buy it for each Member of Congress, I would, but I cannot. It is called "Day of Reckoning" by Pat Buchanan. The book "Day of Reckoning" reminds America what has happened to other great nations, whether it be England, Spain or France. These nations went down the road where they believed in building empires around the world and making everybody be like they are. They all collapsed in a matter of years. Rome is probably the best example of a nation that felt that it could go and create other entities around the world, and they failed, as well.

So, Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to ask unanimous consent to put the entire article from CNNMoney.com into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank you very much. And I hope that we in Congress, as we debate not only the health bill, but other bills, determine how we're going to pay for it. Is it fair for our grandchildren to pick up the debt of those of us today who are irresponsible to our responsibility of maintaining a frugal government?

And with that, Madam Speaker, as I always do, I want to ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I

want to ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And Madam Speaker, I want to ask God to please give wisdom, strength and courage to the President of the United States. And I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

[From CNNMoney.com, Oct. 16, 2009]

U.S. DEFICIT BIGGEST SINCE 1945

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION CLOSES THE BOOKS ON FISCAL 2009: FALLING REVENUE PLUS SOARING SPENDING LEADS TO A \$1.42 TRILLION DEFICIT

(BY JEANNE SAHADI)

The Obama administration on Friday said the government ran a \$1.42 trillion deficit in fiscal year 2009.

That made it the worst year on record since World War II, according to data from the Treasury and the White House Office of Management and Budget.

Tax receipts for the year fell 16.6% overall, while spending soared 18.2%. The rising unemployment, the economic slowdown and the extraordinary measures taken by lawmakers to stem the economic meltdown that hit in fall 2008.

Consequently, the annual deficit rose 212% to the record dollar amount of \$1.42 trillion, from \$455 billion a year earlier.

As a share of the economy, the deficit accounted for 10% of gross domestic product, up from 3.2% in 2008. As breathtaking as that may be, it's still not in the same stratosphere as the 1945 deficit, which hit 21% of GDP.

PERFECT DEFICIT COCKTAIL MIX

Fiscal year 2009, which ended Sept. 30, had all the right ingredients for a recordbreaking deficit.

While tax revenue overall took a big hit, corporate receipts led the way, falling 55%. Individual income tax revenue fell 20%.

At the same time spending jumped in large part because of the various economic and financial rescue measures undertaken. The Treasury and the OMB noted that the \$700 billion Troubled Asset Relief Program and the \$787 billion American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, not all of which has been used, accounted for 24% of the deficit total.

As a result, the country is very near to breaching its so-called debt ceiling, currently set at \$12.1 trillion. Lawmakers, however, are expected to vote to raise that ceiling this fall.

At the end of September, the country's total debt—which is an accumulation of all annual deficits to date plus other obligations—stood at \$11.9 trillion.

THE LONG-TERM VIEW

In August, the OMB projected a 10-year deficit of \$9 trillion, assuming President Obama's 2010 budget proposals are put in place.

A deficit of that magnitude means the debt held by the public would approach 82% of gross domestic product. That's double the 41% recorded in 2008.

Most budget experts blanch at the thought, especially given that the country's fiscal future was already a source of concern before the economic crisis because of expected shortfalls over time in funding for Medicare and Social Security.

The financial and economic meltdowns of the past year have accelerated the strain on federal coffers. So much so that now the 10-year forecast as well as the longer-term outlook are considered unsustainable, according to deficit experts William Gale and Alan Auerbach.

In a report this week, the Government Accountability Office noted that the deficits

born from the financial crisis are not the biggest crux of the problem.

"While a lot of attention has been given to the recent fiscal deterioration, the federal government faces even larger fiscal challenges that will persist long after the return of financial stability and economic growth," the GAO said.

The GAO further cautioned that the yawning deficit problems should be addressed sooner rather than later.

"The longer action to deal with the nation's long-term fiscal outlook is delayed, the larger the changes will need to be, increasing the likelihood that they will be disruptive and destabilizing."

The Obama administration is promising to put a plan in place to lessen the deficit when the economy recovers.

"It was critical that we acted to bring the economy back from the brink earlier this year. As we move from rescue to recovery, the president recognizes that we need to put the nation back on a fiscally sustainable path," said OMB director Peter Orszag in a statement. "As part of the FY2011 budget policy process, we are considering proposals to put our country back on firm fiscal footing."

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

(Mr. STUPAK 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 New York (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONDURAS

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

Ms. ROSLEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to once again express my strong support for the elections scheduled to take place in Honduras on November 29. Though much of the recent news coming out of Honduras has been focused on the current round of talks between the representatives of Manuel Zelaya and the current Honduran Government, one thing has remained constant through it all: The Honduran elections that are scheduled to take place on November 29.

The most recent talks began with both sides agreeing that the elections should proceed ahead as planned. Predictably, however, now that Zelaya is realizing that he won't be able to jump back into his throne of power as easily as he expected, he and his supporters have started to call for boycotts and nonrecognition of the elections. Not surprisingly, Zelaya's ALBA fan club, headed by Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, got together this weekend in Bolivia. The ALBA league of oppressors and dictators-in-waiting issued a statement stating that neither the Honduran electoral process nor its outcomes should

be recognized by the international community unless Zelaya has been restored to power.

The United States must have no part in these efforts. They are undermining and delegitimizing the Honduran election. We have got to make sure that we recognize the validity of this process, and we should say to the world that we must recognize the free will of the Honduran people to express their desires in the ballot box.

The United States cannot play wingman to tyrants who dismiss fundamental civil liberties and forsake constitutional commitment. We should be proud of our democratic standards and not fear standing alone, if necessary, against those who work against the freedom agenda.

Despite tremendous world pressure and punishment, the people of Honduras have remained true to their democracy and their constitution. And the November 29 elections are just one more testament to their unwavering commitment.

Tomorrow I will be hosting a Members briefing, open to all Members, Republicans and Democrats, with the members of the Honduran Supreme Electoral Tribunal. This will afford an opportunity for Members from both sides of the aisle to discuss the measures being undertaken in Honduras to ensure that the November elections proceed as scheduled. I invite all of my colleagues again to please join us for this important discussion. Although we may have differing views regarding the approach that the United States has taken to the situation in Honduras, I'm hopeful that free, fair, clean and transparent elections is the way that we can all unite.

□ 1945

This is a concept that all Americans should agree. U.S. policy has historically recognized and even encouraged the implementation of elections as a necessary step to moving forward from an untenable political situation. Just this past August, as a matter of fact, Secretary of State Clinton visited Angola, where she emphasized repeatedly the importance of holding timely, free, and fair presidential elections in Angola.

Each year, the United States spends millions and millions of our tax dollars to support elections through our democratic form of government and to make sure that we promote governance programs around the world. So why, then, does the U.S. commitment to and support of elections fade away when it comes to Honduras? It should not. It must not.

A stable, secure, democratic Honduras is what is in the best interest of the United States. This election that will take place on November 29 offers us the perfect opportunity for this to happen—free, fair, democratic elections. I urge the State Department to encourage international observers to participate in these upcoming elec-

tions, and I encourage my fellow colleagues to go to Honduras for themselves. Go now and go for the elections. See for yourselves what we are dealing with and the impact that the U.S. policy is having on a democratic ally, a friend of the United States.

Again, I welcome all of my colleagues to join me tomorrow for a briefing with members of the Honduran Supreme Electoral Tribunal. Let democracy take root once again in Honduras.

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

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

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, throughout my tenure in Congress, I have worked to raise awareness about the devastating impact of domestic violence. I rise again this evening to recognize the month of October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Each year I visit the House floor to speak about this topic. I hope that there will be some signs of progress in the fight against domestic violence, but sadly, Americans still suffer from its effects.

As I have reminded my colleagues, often we assume that acts of domestic violence don't occur in our own communities or to people we know or families that live down the street. Last year, I shared the story of a young woman from my hometown in Kansas named Jana Mackey, and today I would like to provide you with an update of her story.

Jana was born July 20, 1982, in Harper, Kansas. She was an active member of 4-H, an athlete, and a talented musician. Upon graduation from high school, she completed a bachelor's degree, where she discovered her passion—advocating for others. Jana went on to pursue a law degree from the University of Kansas and fought for equality and social justice through her work with countless organizations, including volunteer work at Lawrence, Kansas' GaDuGi SafeCenter, a shelter that aids victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. But on July 3, 2008, Jana's own life was ended by an act of domestic violence.

Since her death, Jana's parents, Curt and Christie Brungardt, started the Eleven Hundred Torches campaign to inspire others to continue Jana's admirable work. The goal was to encourage 1,100 people to carry on Jana's torch through civic engagement and volunteerism. As of this month, I am

happy to report the campaign logged its 1,100th volunteer, but Jana's work still remains unfinished.

Jana's story proves that no State, community or family is immune from domestic violence. Domestic violence does not discriminate based upon gender, race, age, education or social status, and its plague wreaks havoc on our day-to-day lives within our communities and our overflowing criminal justice system.

Every year, there are more than 4 million new incidents of domestic violence reported in the United States, with many more unaccounted for due to fear and intimidation. Of those 4 million reported cases, nearly 100,000 Kansans fall victim to domestic violence each year.

While we make gains in raising awareness about domestic violence and providing assistance to affected victims, there is still much work to be done. Whether we are part of a business providing a service, such as refurbishing cell phones for women in domestic emergencies, or volunteers donating time to local domestic violence centers, we all can do more to end domestic violence. I encourage my House colleagues to seek out a center, a shelter, or an organization in their district or State and to further engage on this issue.

This October, let us remember the victims of domestic violence and learn from their courage as we do our best to ensure that our communities are a safe place to live, work, and raise families. I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Madam Speaker, I ask for continued support and assistance for domestic violence prevention programs.

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

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

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 North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX 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 Florida (Mr. POSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HALLOWEEN BUDGET SCARE

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, tonight I want to talk about where we are with the budget deficit.

Just in time for Halloween, we are looking at scary numbers: an annual deficit of \$1.42 trillion, accumulated debt of \$13 trillion. It's a real fright. So, what does it compare to in our history?

Well, here we have a chart that shows the historical debt levels of the United States. This is debt owed to the public, not intergovernmental debt. But what it shows is that after World War II there was a substantial amount of debt owed to the public; in fact, it was over 100 percent of our gross domestic product. Since then, it has gone down nicely, and that's a good thing. But here, lately, you can see the trajectory over there of where we're headed to, another dangerously high level of debt; again, an accumulated debt right now of \$13 trillion, and this year will throw on 1.42 trillion from this year's annual deficit.

But the historical debt level gives us a little bit of comfort because it shows that after World War II we had a higher percentage of debt than we do now. But there is a big difference between the debt after World War II and the debt today. As you can see here, the comparison of our creditors on this debt is what's really telling and what, again, just in time for Halloween, is rather frightening.

In 1945, 95 percent of the debt was owed to the U.S. public; only 5 percent of it we were looking at back then was foreign investment. Now, then, in 2009, that \$13 trillion debt that I was just talking about, the U.S. public owns only 54 percent of that debt. China owns 11 percent, other foreign countries, 35 percent.

So the very scary thing is that, unlike World War II where we had a higher percentage of debt compared to GDP but we owed it to ourselves, now with this \$13 trillion debt, we owe it to foreign countries, not to ourselves.

The very sad thing for me as a member of the Republican Study Committee is that if we had enacted the conservative budgets that we proposed since 2005, we would be, right now, \$613 billion to the better, because over those years, we proposed here on this House floor the most conservative budget alternatives offered. Had they been enacted, we would have been looking at \$613 billion less than what we are looking at now by way of debt.

Now, from here, it gets even scarier, because this chart shows the effect of President Obama's proposed budget in 2010. As you can see, government

spending as a percentage of GDP—that's what this chart is showing is government spending as a percentage of GDP—you can see it taking off at a trajectory that truly is frightening. The Republican alternative budgets, as you can see there, show a trend line down so that we would be moving away from government spending as a percentage of GDP. It would actually be declining over the years to come.

So, the question for us as Americans is: How are we going to cope with the fact that we've got a \$13 trillion accumulated debt? First thing we could do is cancel the unspent part of the stimulus package; that's \$787 billion. Only 13 percent of it has been spent. Surely we can cut that out. The next thing we can do is make sure we do no harm in health care, and that means avoiding yet another government program like Medicare and Medicaid that involve cost shift. That means that private sector employers and people covered by their own insurance will have to make up for the shortfall created by the cost shift that comes from these underpaying government programs. But even in their underpayment, they create an enormous government deficit problem.

So, Madam Speaker, the message I think to all of us, Republicans and Democrats, the President and the Congress, is to come together to figure out a way to get this trajectory down, to not be looking at this kind of government spending that takes off, but rather to bring that down.

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

(Mr. BURGESS 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 North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ENERGY

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, today, we are going to highlight this hour on energy and the needs of the United States in terms of enacting a robust energy policy that is going to create jobs here in America, move away from our dependence on foreign sources of oil, and make our country stronger in the long term.

Now, I want to speak to you from a military perspective, having served nearly 15 years in the United States Air Force. I think that this issue has to

be elevated from just a national debate to a matter of national security. And it's not just Congressman BOCCIERI from the 16th District of Ohio saying this.

In fact, in 2003, the United States Department of Defense issued a study and suggested that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and other intelligence experts to place increased pressure on weaker nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and maintain order for their citizens.

So, from my own perspective, having graduated with a degree in baseball and minoring in economics, I didn't get into the whole scientific debate on whether climate change was real or perceived, but when the military experts and our intelligence experts speak, I'm going to listen, and I have to tell you that America should be listening as well.

I hope that over this next 60 minutes we will have a robust discussion about how this energy policy is going to move our country down the field so that we can end our dependence on foreign oil and we can make sure that our country becomes energy independent. After all, we did send a man to the Moon in 10 years, and I think and believe in my heart of hearts that we can become energy independent in the next 15 to 20 years. I believe in the innovation of America, and I believe that we can do this if we put our efforts on it.

Now, with the national energy debate comes a sense of trying to correct the status quo. And I know those changes are difficult, but for those who are against a national robust energy policy for the United States, you hear them speak the rhetoric from those who delivered \$4-a-gallon gasoline to the United States of America. We listened to the same talking points that delivered oil prices over \$150 a barrel. We listened to the same talking points who don't want us to end our dependency on foreign oil.

□ 2000

We import 66.4 percent of our oil from overseas; 66.4 percent of our oil comes from overseas. Nearly 40 percent comes from the Middle East. Forty percent comes from the Middle East.

History reminds us that, in 1944, when the United States and our allies bombed the Ploiesti Romanian oil fields, we effectively cut off the German supply of oil; but they quickly transitioned to a synthetic fuel, which is a derivative of coal, and they fought on a lot longer.

So the single largest user of energy in the United States is the Department of Defense. My friends, this is a matter of national security, and that's why an energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil is going to move us down the field to becoming

energy independent. I believe that the amount of alternative energy our Nation is able to produce is only limited by the amount of energy we are willing to invest in it, and that is why the United States is moving down this track.

We find that our intelligence experts, over serious matters of national security, have talked about this. In fact, General Anthony Zinni, a retired military staffer, has weighed in on this. We find that many of our military experts have weighed in on this as well as the CIA, which last month just set up a national policy and an agency in launching the center on climate change, with national security as a focal point for its work on this subject. So this is not just a matter of climate change but a matter of national security, and the impacting phenomena of such certification is just giving emphasis to the fact that we have got to address this as a matter of national security.

So we are going to talk tonight about energy. We are going to talk tonight about health care. I am joined by some of my colleagues on the floor, and we are going to be able to pivot in between these two subjects tonight as members of the 30-somethings because there are two topics.

There are two issues that confront us as a Nation that offer some serious challenges for our long-term competitiveness. They are health care and energy, health care in the fact that we spend more than any industrialized country on health care. Yet we find that our outcomes, our life expectancy, is on par with Cuba. With infant mortality and with chronic diseases like diabetes, heart conditions and asthma, we rank out somewhere around 38th in the world. So it's very clear that we are spending more than any industrialized country on health care. Yet our returns and outcomes, our return on investment, is not as good as it needs to be. So tonight we are going to talk about those two subjects as 30-somethings, energy and health care.

I am happy to be joined by my colleague from just a State away, JASON ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. I would like to recognize him for this time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

I did want to start by joining the gentleman in a discussion of energy. I come from a region of the country where we have an incredible amount of coal reserves and where we have natural gas reserves that exceed anything available literally anywhere else in the world. We have the international headquarters of nuclear, with Westinghouse headquartered in my district, which employs 4,200 people currently; and it's growing literally every day. I have a lot of energy in the district that I represent, and a lot of it is the fossil fuels that you hear about.

When you hear about coal and natural gas, you say, well, that's the old way of doing things. I would certainly take issue with that. I think we can

have clean coal and liquefied coal. I think we can use natural gas to our advantage both from a homeland security aspect and from an energy independence aspect as well. Coming from western Pennsylvania, when you think about that, that does not mean we don't think about new types of energies. I want to talk about solar and about one way western Pennsylvania has taken a leadership role in solar technology.

This week, for example, this House is going to consider Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS' Solar Technology Roadmap Act. That establishes a committee to draft a solar energy roadmap for the Nation. Now, this roadmap sets short-, medium- and long-term solar technology goals for the United States of America, identifying research, development and demonstration needs for this technology and identifying opportunities to coordinate that effort all across the country. The bill creates a solar technology research, development and demonstration program that awards merit-reviewed grants for up to 50 percent of project costs to organizations such as academic institutions, national laboratories, industry, State research agencies, and nonprofit organizations.

Now, the reason I wanted to talk is I'm working with my colleagues to incorporate into the bill for one of the fiscal year 2011 demonstration projects a technology called "organic solar technology." Many of us think solar power is a rigid cell of large glass plates, but organic solar technology turns solar cells into high-tech ink that can be printed or sprayed onto surfaces using the same general idea as an ink-jet printer. If you think about the way that works, that's the way organic solar would work as well.

This technology leap allows us to turn lightweight, flexible films into solar receptors, which open the door to using solar power for items like cell phones, laptops and, perhaps, one day, as the gentleman was talking about, for military equipment that can recharge in the field or smart labels to track retail inventory. This technology will potentially cost less than traditional silicon solar technology because it's easier to process. Some manufacturers are confident that they can bring the cost of organic solar technology to one-fifth the cost of traditional silicon technology, making solar technology more attainable for all Americans, certainly western Pennsylvania included.

Furthermore, organic solar cells would potentially be better for the environment than traditional silicon solar technology. Not only does organic solar technology use less energy in production because it requires less processing, but the cells can be easily recycled.

Today, some estimates show that our Nation is falling behind in bringing this technology to the market. Half of the world's organic solar technology

patent filings since 2004 came from the United States. Yet the United States lags behind Europe and Asia in the actual development of this technology in the field according to a Navigant report on photovoltaic markets in 2007.

So two of the biggest barriers to organic solar technology today are how long the cells last in the field and how efficiently they convert sunlight into electrical energy. In closing, my provision would ensure the opportunity for a demonstration project to pursue these and other advancements.

The points of this, as the gentleman was talking about, are military applications and the ways that we can achieve energy independence. This is one example of how western Pennsylvania, which you think of as coal country and as natural gas country—and I told you we have the nuclear headquarters—this is one way that we're taking a leadership role in solar technology as well.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I couldn't agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania more in that we will find the courage to find what is clean coal technology and what we can use clean coal technology for.

Let me just say this: the United States Air Force right now is testing synthetic fuel in our airplanes, and it is using it for other applications broadly across the military because they know that we have more coal reserves in America than we have oil.

For those who may be out there who believe that we should drill in America and should take every last drop of oil out of America, we are going to expand drilling at some point. It's in the Senate version of the bill right now; but we will always have less oil than the Middle East, and right now 40 percent of our demand is supplied by the Middle East. Many have said that we're funding both sides of this war on terror, that we're sending money over to the Middle East and that they, in turn, are sending money to rogue terrorist nations that are actually looking to harm America.

So let's become energy independent. Let's use our resources. Let's use nuclear. Let's use clean coal. Let's use solar. Let's use the type of biofuels that are being researched right in our part of Ohio.

Now I want to speak to you because, if we end our dependence on foreign oil from the Middle East, what will it take? many Americans ask. What will it take to end our dependence on foreign oil?

There was a study issued that said if we put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road in the United States which are gas electric hybrids, like the Ford Escape or the Toyota Prius, we could end our dependency on foreign oil from the Middle East. Isn't that an achievable goal? Eighty percent of the world's oil reserves are in the hands of governments and of their respective national oil companies. Sixteen of the twenty largest oil companies are state-owned—

nations that want to seek harm to the United States.

In fact, we hear from our military leaders, from General Anthony Zinni, a retired marine and former head of the Central Command, who said that we will pay for this one way or another. We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today, and we will have to take an economic hit of some kind, or we will pay the price later in military terms, and that will involve human lives. It is very clear that this is a matter of national security.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOCCIERI. I will.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for bringing this up, and I would like to really put this in real terms for people.

When I went over to Afghanistan and Pakistan with a group of Members of Congress earlier this year, I, frankly, was surprised to find out that the two major funders, the two major governments putting money on the ground in Pakistan, were the United States of America and Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has the second largest presence on the ground in Pakistan with regard to the direct government funding of social service infrastructure, of educational infrastructure, and of health infrastructure. If you want a real example of how the money that we are paying in gas prices and in home heating oil prices are directly ending up contravening our national security interests, there is a perfect example.

Saudi Arabia is taking the money that it makes off of American consumers of oil, and they are putting that money on the ground in Pakistan to fund the madrasas, the religious schools and many of the efforts that are feeding this growing generation and generations of people who have adverse interests to the United States. They are the recruiting tools of the Taliban and of the al Qaeda funded on the ground in Pakistan by countries that get revenues from the use of their oil.

So, as we try to chart a path forward as to how we are going to make sense of the very direct threat presented to this country by al Qaeda's presence and by the Taliban's presence, giving them cover in Pakistan and in Afghanistan, we can't lose sight of the fact that this isn't just about how many troops we have there and what our role is vis-à-vis direct military action or the training of Afghan troops. This is also about the fact that, while we are funding all of those troops, as you have said, Mr. BOCCIERI, we are also funding at the very same time the efforts that are ongoing in both of those countries to undermine our efforts.

There are, frankly, a dozen great reasons that we need to progress towards energy independence, but with direct respect to the security of this country and to the threats presented to it in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region, we have immediate, immediate impera-

tives to get ourselves off of the oil which is funneling the efforts against us.

Mr. BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. MURPHY, you are exactly right. This is not a debate that is new just to this year or to this Congress. In fact, every Presidential candidate running for the highest office in this country last year stated that it is a matter of national security.

So I remind some of our friends on the other side who need to be reminded of the fact that some of their leaders who were running for this office suggested that we need a national energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil, that creates jobs in America and that makes America stronger, not weaker. One of those was Rudolph Giuliani.

To the gentleman from Pennsylvania's remarks about clean coal, he said we need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles, clean coal/carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than we have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of national security. Every Presidential candidate has suggested that. We'll revisit some of their remarks in a few moments, but I want to go back to what some of our national intelligence experts are saying here.

Peter Ogden, chief of staff to the State Department's top climate negotiator, said the sense that climate change poses security and geographical challenges is central to the thinking of the State Department and the climate office. They're citing studies that were done under the Department of Defense which suggested that our National Intelligence experts are suggesting that this will be a breeding ground for terrorists if we do not look at this very seriously.

We are finding that areas which are wiped out by tsunamis and which have these cataclysmic events happening in their regions become breeding grounds for terrorists. They can't fund the national or the basic interests of their communities, of their countries. As a result, the CIA has said that the economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected to place increased pressure on weak nations which may be unable to provide basic needs or to maintain order for their citizens.

That is critical, my friends. I didn't get into the whole scientific debate of climate change, but I'm paying attention when our military experts and when our Nation's intelligence experts are suggesting that we have to elevate this to a matter of national security.

I know Representative TONKO, from New York, has a few words, and he joins us in our 30-something hour.

□ 2015

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BOCCIERI, for bringing us together this evening. I can't agree more with you and the Representatives that have

joined us here this evening, both Representatives ALTMIRE and MURPHY, who have indicated that there is an importance to looking at the big picture frame that should guide this debate and discussion. It is certainly about energy transformation. It's about energy security that's enhanced. It's about growing our energy independence. But it goes well beyond that. It is a factor; it is a huge argument that speaks favorably to our national security, to our economic security. I think when we look at that bigger framework, we're able to understand the ripple effect of benefits, of good, that comes from the negotiated efforts here in this House to produce a strong bill. For energy transformation, for climate change, for global warming to be addressed in positive, progressive terms.

To have listened to some of the discussion and debate on this floor that denounces some of the studies that were authored out there, where the authors of those studies have suggested to us that you're overstating, exaggerating, if not outright denouncing studies that have been put together that speak favorably to these sorts of investments have not stopped people from using misinformation and growing the arguments out there that are unfounded, unfounded and unsubstantiated by evidence and by truth and by documentation that has been established.

I think it's important for us to look at the facts. If we're willing to continue to invest hundreds of billions of dollars into foreign treasuries, to continue to rely in a gluttonous measure on fossil-based fuels for our energy agenda, shame on us as a nation. We have an opportunity here to go forward with a green energy economy that can create jobs of various disciplines, from Ph.D.s over to those with bachelor's degrees, over to those who have associate degrees and skill sets that have been developed with apprenticeship programs, with vocational programs. Across the board, we have an opportunity to invest in all sorts of disciplines out there that strengthen our economy and strengthen our comeback for job creation and job retention in this nation.

Just the other day we were talking to people in my district from the nanoscience arena. And in a generalization of that arena, what they see from start-up businesses is that we have about 20 percent of Ph.D.s and master's degree holders occupying jobs at those centers, at the various start-up businesses that are being established; we have perhaps 20 percent with bachelor's degrees; and then some 60 percent occupied jobs that are bringing to that table associate degrees and technical training. So I think it's very evident, very obvious, by these calculable sorts of outcomes that speak to what's happening in my district that we're growing jobs in every sphere, in every dimension, with all sorts of skill sets that are required.

It is important for us to go forward with this green energy race. And we don't have a choice whether or not to enter in. We have a choice to be as prepared in that race as possible. I liken this to the space race of four decades ago, where this country vigorously pursued with a degree of passion, a high degree of passion, the efforts to land a person on the Moon. That was more than just a race to land a person on the Moon. It was a growth of technology in all sorts of areas in our life that define our quality of life: in communications, in health care, in all sorts of technical advancements in our society. And it allowed for us to think in bold and very noble terms about the importance of science and technology.

Here today, many more nations are joining in a race, a global race, on green energy, clean energy. And we don't have the luxury to stand along the sidelines and watch other nations prosper and pass us by. That's what will happen if we don't go forward with a plan, an energy plan, that will calculate jobs, that will allow for us to invest and reach to our intellect in this nation. Our intellectual capacity is great. We can't just stop with the ideas. Many of those ideas are being commercialized and deployed into the manufacturing sector in other nations. They're using American patents, they're using American ingenuity, American ideas to make things happen in their nations. We need to invest vigorously in that sort of economy. We can do it by putting together a progressive policy like that of ACES that was voted upon in this House, where we put together the framework, the blueprint—the green print, perhaps—as to how we're going to pursue job creation and responsiveness to our energy needs and a responsible approach to the environmental stewardship that is assigned each and every one of us as American citizens to this globe.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I couldn't agree with the gentleman from New York more, that this is not only about creating jobs, it's a matter of our national security and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, in September, the Central Intelligence Agency, the CIA, is launching the Center on Climate Change and National Security as the focal point for its work on the subject. The Center is a small unit led by senior specialists from the Directorate of Intelligence and the Directorate of Science and Technology. And further, the National Intelligence Council reports that the demands of potential humanitarian responses may significantly tax U.S. military transportation and support force structures, resulting in a strained readiness posture and decreased strategic depth for our combat operations.

This is a telling remark of where this issue needs to be highlighted. I'm a C-130 pilot. We provide humanitarian relief. We support our troops. We will be flying humanitarian relief all over the world if this issue is not addressed. And

they are talking about our readiness as a country. The CIA and others are talking about our readiness as a country. And I think this is very, very important. We can use all the resources that we have at our disposal. Can you imagine one day, my colleagues, rolling into a fuel station and having a choice, between using traditional gasoline, biofuels, biodiesel, ethanol; maybe we plug in our electric hybrid or drive by the gas station or fuel station altogether because we have a fuel cell that allows us to get a hundred miles to the gallon. That is an achievable goal that we should strive towards, having choices, not just using traditional gasoline but having a variety of sources. And, in fact, we can end our dependence from Arab nations and OPEC-producing nations if we put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road that were gas-electric hybrids. That's an achievable goal, to end our dependence from the Persian Gulf.

Would we bring our troops home? Would our national interests now be so closely aligned and attached to what happens in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and Iraq and all those areas—Iran—that have all the oil, 40 percent of the oil that comes to this nation? We can use the resources at our disposal, and I think that we ought to think about doing that. This is about jobs. This is about national security.

Let me just relate to you something that some of our leaders who are running for the highest office in this land have said. Mike Huckabee himself said this:

A nation that can't feed itself, fuel itself or produce the weapons to fight for itself is a nation forever enslaved. It's critical for our own country and our own interest economically, and from a point on national security, we commit to becoming energy independent and we commit to doing it within a decade. We have to take responsibility for our own house before we can expect others to do the same in theirs.

It goes back to his basic concept of leadership. Leaders don't ask others what they are unwilling to do themselves. That right there, my friends, is something that is very, very important.

We have been joined by one of our friends from Virginia, Congressman PERRIELLO, who has much passion about this topic.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Mr. BOCCIERI, thank you very much for continuing this. Since the last time we had one of these discussions, China has made yet another massive investment of tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars in their energy future, in their energy independence. I am sick and tired of us falling behind China. I'm sick and tired of importing everything from there instead of building things and growing things right here in the United States. We can do this better.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy came down to my

part of southern Virginia and the Secretary of Energy had just recently gotten back from China. He was looking at the bio refineries in my district and the potential for us to be growing our own energy and keeping that wealth in our communities.

I asked him, How does this compare to what's going on in China?

He said, This is better than anything they have there right now.

But we are not investing and committing to this in the same way that they are. We cannot afford to fall behind. That's why those quotes come from leaders who are trying to show that they're leaders. But what happens once it gets to governing? Leadership cannot stop on election day. That has to be the beginning of a commitment, not the end, to showing your patriotism, to showing that you will put this country's interests ahead of the interests of the next election cycle.

For 30 years, both parties have talked about and understood the importance of energy independence, importance to our national security, importance to our competitive advantage. And yet nothing, year in and year out. This Congress is different. We are not going to allow the problems that have hackled us for a generation to continue to do so.

I was in a group with some regional planners the other day talking about infrastructure investments. They said, Mr. PERRIELLO, do you think that we have an economic development strategy in this country?

I said, Unfortunately for too long we have not, because the economists guiding the way have too often come only from the financial sector, not from the economic development sector. We need to make the commitments on infrastructure, on energy consumption, on efficiency, on smart grid technology that will create the new competitive advantage for the new American century. That is our obligation. And now is the moment where we ask, Are we ready to lead or will we cower? I want to acknowledge your leadership, not only in making difficult votes but more importantly for being a tireless advocate for what we can do in this country; advanced manufacturing of these new means of energy production, producing the energy-efficiency technology. I just cut the ribbon last week on a small business, four or five employees in my district, in a town with over 20 percent unemployment, that is figuring out how to sell the wind and solar and efficiency technologies to small businesses to help make them more competitive and to middle-class families to help them make that family budget that is so tight these days.

Mr. BOCCIERI, I appreciate your leadership. Thank you for including me in this; and we will not rest until we do what is necessary to protect this country and make it competitive again.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you. I agree that this is not only about national security but creating jobs, too. We had a

recent announcement last month that Rolls Royce was moving the center for their research into my district, for fuel cells. We are going to become a leader in fuel cell research provided that we have the courage to invest in it.

You may have missed my earlier remarks because you just joined us, but I said that the only thing that is holding us back in terms of the amount of alternative energy our nation is able to produce is the amount of energy we are willing to invest in it. We have got to find the energy and the courage to make this happen.

I know Congressman MURPHY has been trying to champion this in Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. BOCCIERI, we have the best-educated, most highly trained, most productive, most innovative workforce in the world. You go back over the history of major invention over the last hundred years, almost every single one of them has come out of American ingenuity. Yet today with respect to the global industry that produces advanced battery technology, solar cells, solar technology and wind turbines, in all three of those areas, the United States today has either one or two of the top 10 producers in the world. We have lost ground to Asia, to Europe, because we have been unwilling to be a partner with those industries in getting them off the ground.

This place is obsessed with short-term thinking. Maybe it's because everybody in this Chamber is up for reelection every 2 years. But this is a problem. This is an opportunity that requires that vision that Mr. PERRIELLO is talking about, to extend beyond 2 years, to be able to see pay-offs that may not happen for 4 years, 5 years, 10 years. But the fact is that this place, Washington, D.C., the United States Congress, has been so focused on the short term, has been so focused on how we get from this year to next year that we have caught ourselves in a cycle, a downward spiral, with regard to energy and economic development policy that we are now so far beyond and behind the rest of the world.

This is absolutely about national security, but this is about putting ourselves back on the mantle of leadership with regard to the development of these technologies where we should be today. This is growing jobs in everyone's district, but it does involve some government help at the outset. To simply ask venture capitalists and private investors to put up all of the seed money required to develop these new technologies whose payoff may not come for another 5 or 10 years is unrealistic. And the reason why Japan and Germany and so many other countries are so far out ahead of us with respect to the development of wind turbines and solar panels and advanced battery technology is because they have at the outset partners in government who set market conditions that are hospitable to a public-private partnership in the development of these technologies.

This is going to be part of the story of the regrowth and resurgence of the American economy. But it only happens if we follow the example that unfortunately has had to have been set by these other countries, China included, as Mr. PERRIELLO points out. We can get back to a leadership place on this issue, but it is going to take a Congress and a President and a House and a Senate that's willing to look out beyond the 2-year time horizon, that's willing to make some sacrifices and some tough votes right now in order to get us to that point of energy sustainability and independence in the long run.

□ 2030

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I couldn't agree with you more. The gentleman from Connecticut is absolutely correct. This is about creating jobs. So many jobs have been created already in our congressional districts, and let me just highlight a few of those.

In Ohio, he is right about the private venture funds and the public investment that is going to be required to get this started. Ohio is going to see a \$5.6 billion investment in new public and private sources due to programs and incentives under the American Recovery and Reinvestment and American Clean Energy and Security Act. These investments will lead to nearly 70,000 clean-energy jobs in Ohio, even assuming some potential setbacks with respect to how we transition to those new technologies. Presently there are about 35,000 clean-energy jobs in Ohio, and that was as of 2007.

So we can do this. We can create the jobs of tomorrow. We can stand with the innovators and the entrepreneurs, and we can disregard the gibberish and the talk that we hear, the talking points from the status quo folks, who believe and are taking their talking points, quite frankly, from the same people, the very people who gave us \$4 a gallon gasoline, \$150 a barrel oil prices. We can do better than that, and I think it is about our country.

Let me revisit, before we recognize Representative ALTMIRE, what Mitt Romney said. He said there are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less energy dependent on foreign energy and develop our own sources. That is the real key, of course, additional sources of energy here, as well as more efficient uses of energy. That will allow us and the world to have less oil being drawn down from various sources where it comes without dropping the prices too high to a level. It will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy.

Now, even Mitt Romney, who was running for the highest office in the country, had suggested the fact that we get and we fund both sides of this war on terror, because we buy so much oil from overseas. And I believe that every presidential candidate running last year said that this is a matter of na-

tional security, and it is time that we do this.

One last thing. I visited an industry this week in my district that is leading the charge in trying to make our buildings more efficient. We spend \$400 billion a year on inefficient buildings across this country, and I know Representative PERRIELLO said this before, the cheapest energy in our country is the energy that we never use.

To save energy, to reduce our consumption, is very important, especially when you have 3 percent of the world's population and we are consuming nearly 30 percent of the world's resources of energy. That has got to change, and we have got to find our way away from this, and that is what this means tonight.

Representative TONKO had a few words on that.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BOCCIERI.

I have heard all of our colleagues talking about leadership, exercising leadership and putting a plan into action. I think what is most regrettable is that we are still having this debate as to whether or not to enter into a new energy economy, to address the climate change issues that are so much an imperative these days.

All of this discussion is coming while other nations are now investing and investing heavily in their country's economy, driven by these new technologies, these emerging technologies, an innovation economy. So our pace here needs to be sped up. But it has also got to be preceded by a sound plan that is put together. So I would implore this House and the Senate to work in a bipartisan, bicameral way with the White House to make certain that that plan is in place in very short order.

Let me just talk about some of the evidence that I have seen in my district, again with advanced battery manufacturing. I am looking at investments from GE that would allow us to address a number of dynamics that are speaking to the empowerment of the energy transformation where the battery is the linchpin.

We are talking about development at GE that will allow for multiple purposes, for heavy vehicles for their fuel needs, for those heavy vehicles to be empowered by this alternative, but a new format of battery, advanced battery manufacturing. We are talking about creating a power supply with this sort of battery.

We are also talking about their battery development, essential to the storage of intermittent renewables, supplies from the sun, from the wind, that may be intermittent in nature. The linchpin here is to develop the battery manufacturing that will transition us. All of this investment needs to be sped up.

We also need to look at what we can do with efficiency within renewables. I have recently passed in this House a wind energy-efficiency bill that allows us to take a closer look at the manufacturing and the assemblage of those

given sorts of power supply. Those renewables can be done in a more efficient way. Citing the materials that are used, we can reach to nanoscience to develop lighter materials or durable materials. How we assemble the gearbox assemblage is an important bit of R&D that needs to get done, how we develop through manufacturing a better tower system for our renewable supply from wind.

All of this needs to be a huge American investment. Again, we have the energy intellect. We can emerge from this race as a winner, but the time is passing us by. And whichever nation emerges the winner in this race will be that go-to nation that will be the exporter of energy intellect, energy ideas, energy innovation for generations to come.

So, we are going to fail the next generation of job holders, we are going to fail this Nation's economy, we are going to fail the environment agenda, we are going to fail the energy transitioning if we don't move forward intelligently, thoughtfully, progressively, in a way that allows us to capture the brain power of this country that has driven invention and innovation in so many measures, in so many dynamics.

We have it within our grasp. We need to go from research that is done at our universities and the private sector and further deploy into the commercialization zone, into the manufacturing efforts, those ideas. We have failed after that research investment. We need to have that "valley of death," as it is termed, where we don't get the seed money that is necessary for a lot of this innovative spark to take its presence in our American economy. We need that sort of commitment and we need that sort of policy development.

We can do it. This House has offered a great bill. We challenge those in this process to work with us to have an outcome that has a bill on the President's desk that can sign us into a new era of energy policy.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I want to pick up on what Mr. TONKO and Mr. MURPHY said. Right now there are two types of countries around the world. There are those that are looking back 20 years ago and crying over what we have lost, and there are those who are looking 20 years ahead and saying, what could we be?

Right now, this body has too often been a problem in focusing because of the way our campaigns work and other things on how to try to protect what has been, instead of how to promote what could be. We are falling behind in competitive advantage. We still have the best workforce, we have the best capital and innovation, we have the best entrepreneurs, we have the best science. Yet we get out-competed. It is time for this body to be part of promoting what could be.

I found a lot of folks talking during August and other times I have been home about threats to capitalism and

how great capitalism has been for our system. It is truly the economic driver of innovation and growth. But the threat to capitalism right now is not, in my mind, what some people have seen as a secret agenda. It is that we reward failure and we reward the status quo, instead of rewarding innovation. That is what has worked in the past. That is what can work again.

This bill, fundamentally about energy independence, is about finally getting us incentivizing and rewarding the next generation of innovation. That is how we build jobs here. That is how we grow jobs and middle class incomes in this country.

One thing we don't often do in this body is to give credit to our friends across the building in the Senate, but I do want to commend the work and the leadership of Senator GRAHAM and Senator KERRY on a call to action on that side, in the Senate; a call for whether there are 60 patriots ready to go in the Senate and pass this. In particular, I appreciate that they are willing to put the issue of a more robust nuclear agenda on the table.

I think we need to look at everything as part of this. This problem is too serious for any side to dig in its heels to some ideological purity. We must look at how energy efficiency and smart-grid technology will be part of this. We must look at nuclear, wind, solar, biomass, we must look at all elements, because this is that important to our national security and our job creation.

So I hope that there will be a robust debate on that side; that they will find ways to maybe even strengthen what we have done on this side by blazing that trail. That is how we revive innovation, entrepreneurship and job creation in the next generation.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman is correct that we spend an awful lot of time often looking back at what was instead of looking ahead at what could be. And I remember the words so clearly, reading and hearing about what President Kennedy said: We do these things not because they are easy, but because they are hard.

It is hard to break from the status quo. It is hard to let the folks who have been delivering us \$4 a gallon gasoline, let them go and break our dependence on our consumption of oil that comes from overseas. The opponents of a robust energy policy in this country have been attempting to define this bill and define our movement towards efficiency, towards creating jobs, towards protecting our national security, about cap-and-trade. Cap-and-trade is one section of the bill, one section of the bill that looks at addressing the climate change issue that the CIA, that the Department of Defense and our intelligence experts are looking at.

So, are we going to put our weight with the folks who have been giving us \$4 a gasoline and those big energy industries that have been making a lot of money over the status quo years, or are we going to stand with our intelligence

experts and suggest that this is real? Our intelligence experts are suggesting we need to do this.

Now, when this body was faced with the decision, the section of the bill that deals with cap-and-trade, we had a decision to make. There was a court case at the end of last year that said the EPA was going to regulate emissions in this country. Well, do you want the EPA and bureaucrats in Washington doing it, or do you want the free market to do it? Because I believe, like so many of my colleagues, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to set the out-of-bounds markets, to set the goalposts, let the free market operate in between, and then throw the flag like a good referee does when someone goes out of bounds. That is what we should do. Let the free market drive innovation; let entrepreneurial spirit, let the innovators in this great country do that.

Let's do that. But attempting to define this as a national energy policy, as cap-and-trade, is not only disingenuous, I think it threatens our national security. And those aren't just my words. Those are the words of a fellow who I have a great deal of respect for, JOHN MCCAIN, Senator MCCAIN.

I flew this gentleman, this honorable American, out of Baghdad when I was flying missions over in Iraq and Afghanistan. He said it is about cap-and-trade. There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is a free market approach. JOHN MCCAIN is saying it is a free market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain.

He said if we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. This will be a profit-making business. It won't cost the American taxpayer. Let me repeat that. It won't cost the American taxpayer, he said, because of the free market approach. JOE LIEBERMAN and I, Senator McCain introduced the cap-and-trade proposal several years ago that would reduce greenhouse gases within a gradual reduction. He said we did this with acid rain. This works. It can work—if we have the courage to do it.

We do these things not because they are easy, but because they are hard. That is what leadership does. But if we are worried about the next election and not worried about where our future is going, the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct that we are going to continue to be enslaved, like the gentleman from Arkansas said. Like he said, if we can't produce the weapons to fight our own Nation's wars, if we can't find the energy here in our own country, if we can't feed ourselves, it is exactly right that we will be forever enslaved. That is why we have to make the decision now. That is what leaders do.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I have learned a lot from the hardworking folks in my district, particularly in southern Virginia, where we have been seeing job

losses and negative economic growth for years. While the country has been facing this for the past year in particular, we have seen it for a decade-and-a-half while jobs have gone overseas.

One of the things that folks say to me over and over again is, stop offering us quick fixes. We know they are not true. Stop focusing your politics on who to blame for the problem instead of how to fix it. That is what I hear from the hardworking folks of my district. It is time to stop the politics of blame and the politics of lollipops falling from the sky and everybody will be happy on a sugar high. What it is time for is the tough work of tough solutions.

There is no quick fix for regrowing our economy. We have to recreate America's competitive advantage. We are getting out-competed, and there is no excuse for that. And too often Washington has been part of the problem instead of part of the solution.

What we are looking at is things that can not only have some short-term benefits through energy efficiency, but will be part of a long term strategy, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, 50 years, that keep America on top. Every previous generation of Americans has been willing to step up to the challenge of their times.

□ 2045

They haven't said, What do I do to get to the next election cycle? They say, What do we do to leave America stronger and better than we inherited it? That is the sacred covenant that Americans pass from one generation to the next.

Our generation must deal with these sorts of threats, energy independence and how we compete in a global economy. It's a new thing that we haven't had to face at the same degree in the past. And for me, this is also a question of moral responsibility. We are paying the price for a period of tremendous greed and irresponsibility, from Wall Street and corporate CEOs to the people of this body to individuals buying a home that they can't afford or consuming energy they know they could preserve.

There's an irresponsibility there that we must translate into a new period of accountability and innovation, and that's what this is about. This is about living up to that sacred covenant that the Greatest Generation passes on and on through American tradition to say we have it in our DNA as Americans to not back down from a fight or a challenge, to not do what's easy, but to do what's right. And that's what I'm proud to say we have begun to do here in this body, and it is a seismic shift towards responsibility, and I'm proud to have been a part of it with you.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I can agree with the gentleman more that this is about tomorrow. This is about where we are as a Nation 10 to 15 years down the road, 20 years down the road, where my

children and their children's children will be.

Let me just drive home this point on national security. There was a report that came out in 2009 by the Center for Naval Analysis, coauthored by 12 retired generals and admirals of the United States military, and they found that our dependence on fossil fuels undermines United States foreign policy. It involves us with the volatile and unfriendly powers, endangers our troops in combat, undercuts our economic stability, and drives climate change, which weakens and threatens to destabilize countries and add to an already heavy American military burden. Our military experts are saying this. Our intelligence experts are saying this.

Now, we have to be leaders and say that enough is enough. We can invest in the tomorrow because we have the energy, we have the alternative energy at our fingertips, and we can make this happen. But we have got to find the courage to do this.

I know Representative TONKO wants to speak one last word on some of our colleagues and what they have said. A gentleman that we serve with here in this body, who I have a great deal of respect for, RON PAUL, Congressman RON PAUL, he said, "True conservatives and libertarians have no right to pollute their neighbors' property. You have no right to pollute your neighbors' air, water or anything. And this would all contribute to the protection of all air and water."

Now, what he's saying in the broader context is that this issue of climate change is our responsibility, too. We're great partners and leaders in the world, and we have to lead by example, like Mitt Romney said, like Mike Huckabee said, like the President is saying, like Secretary of State Clinton is saying. We have to lead by example, and that's what America has always done. We've led by example. So this is about where we are reaching down within our own internal national character and finding the courage to lead in this economic challenge that we face as our country.

Representative TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative BOCCIERI, I couldn't agree more. And we do embrace, we can embrace that challenge, the challenge that has been put forth by all of these individuals that you named here this evening and quoted.

I heard you express the free market system and what it can do to enable us to have a better energy and environment outcome. I heard Representative PERRIELLO talk about not accepting the status quo. I heard there, Representative, a kind of a pioneer spirit, a challenge to be those pioneers that we have been throughout our history.

You know, gentlemen, I have the great fortune of representing the Erie Canal communities. Where that Hudson and Mohawk River meet gave birth to an industrial revolution. This whole channel of the waterway, which was seen as a folly approach, became the

empowerment tool, not only in developing this Nation and prospering in the process, but changing the entire world in terms of their quality of life. For in that Erie Canal channel developed a number of mill towns, a necklace of mill towns, each mill town becoming that epicenter of invention and innovation, and they sparked their genius in a way that really transitioned not only America but the world.

We are at that same juncture. We are now at that opportunity moment that can allow us to seize this moment and make a difference. There are those in our country who are those intellectuals that are proposing these wonderful product lines, these wonderful inventions, but they need to transition from that hybrid, that prototype, into the commercialization and manufacturing of that idea.

And today, that new birth of an industrial revolution, a new economy, isn't about mass production, where they might have invented some wonderful object, produced a few numbers within their garage and then, as business grew, created a factory and mass produced. That is a different spot today for us. It's about precision. It's about the prototyping. It's about the testing, and it's about the evaluating. And that, my friends, is a very pricey situation.

There are not a lot of the start-ups and emerging technologies that have available cash at hand, and there is a huge risk factor, and there are ways to reduce that risk or work through it to see if it is, in fact, going to endure the process. But there are also opportunities for the government to invest in high-risk, great opportunities, situations that can take us into new opportunities with battery manufacturing, with new product lines, emerging technologies, that will be shelf-ready for energy efficiency, alternative technologies for producing power supplies, American power needs that are addressed by the American workforce. Think of that as a great, novel idea, growing our economy.

People have said time and time again, we hear it in our districts, Why are the jobs leaving this country? We have an opportunity to create jobs in this country that respond to our social and economic needs, that respond to our environmental curiosity and our environmental responsibility, but we need to seize the moment. We need to express, in very bold measure, that we care about the energy transformation, the innovation economy.

Let's be those epicenters of invention and innovation as those mill towns I represent were in the heyday of the industrial revolution. It is within our grasp, it is within our intellect, and it needs to be within our political will. And being here this evening and expressing with you gentlemen where we can go and where we believe we are growing our way toward is an important statement to make here this evening, and it's a pleasure to have joined with you in this special hour.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman TONKO.

We're going to wrap up here with the last 4 minutes just underscoring what we're talking about here today, the fact that we're focusing on our Nation's energy needs and the fact that we have got to move away from our dependence on foreign oil, protect our national security, and create jobs right here in America with our investments in these technologies.

And how disingenuous to some who would use the arguments by the status quo who suggest that we need to continue on the way that we have, where we'll be dependent on foreign sources of energy, on the Middle East, and on OPEC-producing nations when we want to put our faith and our trust and our energy in the innovators and the great thinkers here in America.

And how disingenuous that we attempt to define a national energy policy on an issue of cap-and-trade that has been working in this country since the 1990s, on an issue that really is just one small segment of a national energy policy that will mean the difference of us breaking our dependence and creating jobs.

This is a turning point, a tipping point for America. Are we going to lead or are we going to block? Are we going to believe or are we going to fear? And are we going to look forward or are we going to look back? Those are the questions that we have to ask with the national energy policy. That's what we can do.

Representative PERRIELLO, why don't you finish this up tonight.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, I appreciate, again, your leadership on calling us together on this.

It's a very simple question. Do we want to continue funneling our dollars through our gas tanks to the petro-dictators around the world that hate us or do we want to invest those dollars back in the kind of innovation and job creation that has always made this country great? Do we want to continue to support those who undermine our Nation's security or do we want to create the kind of energy independence that is necessary to secure this country and secure our competitive advantage?

And I'll tell you what. It's kind of exciting. It's an exciting moment to be at the forefront of a new industrial revolution and think about just how much American businesses will be able to outcompete and outcreate other countries if we unleash this, if we unleash the innovation and the profit motive that is available through this system, a system developed by Republicans. And more credit to them.

Cap-and-trade is a Republican idea whose time has come, which is how do we use the free market to solve some of the greatest problems of our generation. That's what this new kind of politics should be about, taking the best ideas, whether they come from Republicans, Democrats, or Independents, and using them to solve the problems

for our generation. This is that time. This is that moment with energy independence, to recreate the competitive advantage of this country and to reinforce our national security.

We can do it. We've led the way. We believe we can see this through this year, and we are going to see an incredible amount of potential in this country for job growth and security because of it.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Mr. PERRIELLO.

National security, creating jobs right here in America, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil, that's what this bill is about. Making America again the producers of wealth instead of just the movers of wealth, that's what this bill is about.

I'm proud to stand with my colleagues today to talk about our Nation's energy policy and how we move this country down the field. We do these things not because they're easy but because they're hard, as President Kennedy said.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about and take this opportunity to address my colleagues about the issue of health care, and let me just kind of frame this and put it in a context that I think will make a difference.

This is, again, one of those opportunities where Washington says, We are here to help, but what we may see is something very, very different. Washington helps the State of Michigan today to about 41 percent of its budget, but what it's really doing is it's controlling the State of Michigan. And along with some of the ill-advised decisions that have been made in our State, Washington policy, antigrowth policies in the State of Michigan, have resulted in Michigan lagging the country. We're number 50 in employment, which means we are number 1 in unemployment, and we've been there for a long time.

Let me explain how this happens. Like I said, 41 percent of Michigan's budget this year, the State of Michigan's budget, will come from the Federal Government directly. It will come with strings attached to it, Washington telling us and our State about how we need to spend our money, what we can and cannot spend it on. And remember, it's our money. It came from the State of Michigan in the first place. It came from our taxpayers. It came from our citizens. Of course, when you have a \$1.4 trillion deficit, we also know that it came from our kids and from our grandkids. But with that 41 percent of direct infusion into our State budget, I think, at a minimum, what we see is

this affects another 20 to 25 percent of our budget.

So, roughly, out of Michigan's budget, more than 60 percent of our spending in the State of Michigan is directed by the Washington establishment, directed by Washington bureaucrats telling us how to spend our money. And some of you may ask, Well, how does that happen? Well, think about it. When you go to the pump and fill up your tank, there's a Federal gas tax. That money comes to Washington. It goes into over 110 different funds, and then it's distributed back to the States. And many of those funds, to get our own money back, we have to put up matching funds.

□ 2100

Think about it, the State that has kind of the economic problems that Michigan has right now.

To get back our own money, we have to put up our own money and we have to put it up in such a way that we have to spend it the way that Washington wants us to spend it, not the way that we need it and the way that we might be focused on it to address the issues and the problems that we are facing in Michigan.

It's disappointing, but Michigan is known as having some of the worst roads in the country. Plain English: we've got lots of potholes.

So it was kind of surprising a few years ago when I found out that the Michigan Department of Transportation was going to build a turtle fence. Think about it. We were going to build a turtle fence. And if you think what do you build a turtle fence for, it's pretty obvious. You build a turtle fence to prevent the turtle from crossing the highway. Over \$400,000 to build a turtle fence, and of course to do the expensive study beforehand to determine that we needed a turtle fence.

Remember, this is a State that has the highest unemployment in the country; it has some of the worst, if not the worst, roads in the country. We send our highway dollars to Washington and we put up our matching funds, and then the Governor says, Well, Pete, the Federal Government has told us that we need to build a turtle fence.

We got it stopped the first time, and I hope the money was used to fill potholes, to build an interchange, or to help build an extra lane in a busy place or perhaps to use it on a project that would improve the safety of our highways. But, no, 2½ years later it came back.

So I am driving north through my district, and I am going through some of the wetlands where they've constructed this highway, and I see people working. I don't need to guess what they're doing. They are constructing a turtle fence. It is a very nice fence. It's about, you know, 2½, 3 feet high, got the plastic tube on it so that the turtle can't climb the fence and then crawl over the top of it. I think it works.

I think that for \$400,000, MDOT, the Michigan Department of Transportation, can build a very, very good and

a very effective turtle fence, and we can prevent the turtles from crossing the highway. I applaud the efforts of the Michigan Department of Transportation to construct that fence and to build it in such a way that it will be a long-lasting fence and will not allow turtles to cross the highway.

I am frustrated with the leadership in Michigan that allows the State to prioritize the building of turtle fences when we have so many other high-priority needs.

We've also built rest areas that cost us in the millions of dollars, rest areas that replace other rest areas that might be a little bit old, they may not be the best or the nicest rest areas in the country, but it's hard to get into the rest area because you have got to dodge the potholes to get to them.

This is what happens when we send our money to Washington and put this in the context of health care. We're going to get to health care, but put it in the context of what happens. Michigan sends its money to Washington, it goes into 110 different funds, it comes back to the States with strings attached, and then they tell us how to spend the money.

You know, back in 1998, 1999, even though I was a member of the Transportation Committee where we have responsibility for doling that money out, I said, This is the wrong way to do it. What we need to do is we need to leave the money in the State, never send it to Washington in the first place, so the people of Michigan can use their money to spend it on the priorities that they have identified. It is their money, and the money should stay in Michigan. And if there are some national priorities for a national highway system, send a couple of pennies out of every dollar to Washington, DC, but don't send all of it and then go to Washington and beg to get some of it back.

For perhaps more than 50 years, Michigan and all of the other States have been beggars to Washington to get their money back for the life of the highway trust fund. Michigan has averaged about 83 cents. Think of that. For the life of the highway trust fund, almost 50 years, we've sent a dollar to Washington, and we've gotten 83 cents back. It's time to embrace an approach that says that money stays in the States.

I was talking to a constituent the other day and they went on vacation. They said, Where does all of that money go? They'd just gone on vacation. They went to West Virginia. They now know where our highway money went. They said, Pete, the highways and the roads in West Virginia are absolutely gorgeous; they are in great shape. I would hazard a guess that they've gotten a lot more money back than what Michigan has.

So for 50 years, Michigan has been subsidizing other States because perhaps our Members of Congress weren't the chairmen of the Transportation

Committee, weren't part of the elected leadership. So they didn't get their fair share. Well, it's time to go back to where we need to be, which is we need to make sure that States get their fair share and we only give part of what we need for national priorities, the Highway Interstate System. We leave the rest of the money here.

Like I said, I've been advocating for that since the late 1990s. That argument back then was Washington is here to help build a highway system, and it has now grown to Washington telling us we need to build turtle fences in Michigan.

It was 2001 we had a new President. The President's priority was K-12 education. Washington once again was here to help. So we went through the process. I was excited. I was on the Education Committee. I thought that there was a small role for the Federal Government in K-12 education. My perspective is K-12 education, the education of our most precious assets, our kids, is the responsibility of parents, local schools, communities, the State. And then perhaps to address some inequities and some very hardship cases and maybe to do some research that would be used by all of the States and by all of our school districts, you would have the Federal Government.

So I was excited because I saw us diminishing the role of the Federal Government, rolling back Federal mandates. We'd done a study in the 1990s that showed that every Federal education dollar we spent in Washington or that was allocated in Washington, only about 65 cents made it to where it needed to be. It made it to a point where it was helping educate a child in a classroom.

I came out of the business world. I worked for a company called Herman Miller. If we were looking at it and said, Wow, we're eating up 35 percent of every dollar in bureaucracy and it's not enabling us to serve our customer, we would have said we've got to go back and take a look at the system. We've got to use every penny we can to serve our customer, or our competition is going to beat us. But for Federal education dollars—again, money that would come from Michigan, go to Washington and then we'd have to beg to get it back—but only 65 percent of it would end up in a classroom, the place where the leverage point was the most important place; 35 percent would go to bureaucracy. And we'd have to fill out all kinds of reports and paperwork back to the Federal Government telling them about what was going on in our local schools.

A friend of mine and I, we would go over to the education department consistently, and we would kind of walk through it and say, Who here in the Department of Education might be from the Second Congressional District of Michigan? Who might be from Holland, who might be here from Ludington, who might be here from Manistee so they can understand the unique per-

spectives of the Second Congressional District of Michigan? Really couldn't find anybody. But I've got a passion for the State of Michigan and believe that every child in the State of Michigan needs a great education.

So we go around and say if we can't find somebody from the Second Congressional District, who's here from Grand Rapids? Is there anybody who works in the Department of Education from Flint? From Detroit? From Ann Arbor? From Traverse City? From Manistee? From Marquette? Who is here that understands the unique challenges or the financing of education in Michigan and how education in Michigan runs that makes education more challenging or provides more opportunities than other States in the Midwest or other States in the country?

Who understands the challenges that we face in the winter for getting our kids to school? Who understands the challenges that we have since tourism is one of our biggest industries? Is there anybody from Michigan here who can really understand all of this paperwork that comes in? And we couldn't find those folks.

So I thought, Wow, this is a great opportunity to move and diminish the Federal role, get that money back in a classroom where we could leverage it and have an impact. And from a disappointing standpoint, we went the other way. We passed a bill called No Child Left Behind. And it was a lot of folks that were enticed and seduced by the promise of Washington money and the simple solution that said, Don't worry about your education; we'll take care of it.

There were only 41 of us that said "no" to No Child Left Behind. Everybody else said, Washington is here to help. Don't worry about it. Things will be fine.

We're now 8 years into No Child Left Behind, and as we go around, I am finding a lot of my colleagues are now embracing a plan that we called A-PLUS that says let's roll back No Child Left Behind, let's leave the money in the States, and let's leave educating our kids to be the primary responsibility of the States, local school districts, and parents.

People say that is a novel idea. No, that's not a novel idea. Many of us came into Washington in the 1990s, and that was the idea that we promoted. Just like we did with highway funds, leave the money in the States.

Why would we want to transfer money from the States for education and for highways to a place like Washington, D.C. where they want to control our lives, tell us how to spend our money, tell us how to educate our kids? Under No Child Left Behind, what did they do? They're telling us who are good teachers.

Excuse me, I don't need Washington, DC to tell me who are the good teachers in the schools that my kids go to and who are the bad teachers. Somehow Diane and I figured that out long before our kids got to that grade.

How did we do it? Very simple. We talked to other parents who had kids in the same school that we did. It's amazing. People at the community level actually know what the strengths and weaknesses of their schools are. It's amazing. People at the local level actually can find their schools. They know where the various schools are in our communities in Lansing and Hillsdale and Oakland County. We know where the schools are. Bureaucrats in Washington can't. They can't tell the difference between one community and the next.

So think about it. In the late 1950s, the interstate highway system. Washington said, We are here to help. Fifty years later, they're telling us to build turtle fences we don't need. 2001—actually the creation of the Department of Education in 1979. It's Washington is here to help. We're now in 2009, and they're telling us who are good teachers and who are bad teachers. It kind of sets the context for health care.

Think about it. This is now where we are with health care. "Reid offers docs a deal." At least this is what's reported in one of the newspapers that we receive here in Capitol Hill. It's not about quality and quantity, just like highways is no longer about building the roads that are needed and are necessary. It's about who's got the power and the authority in Washington to allocate those dollars that we send from Michigan.

Think about it. It's the powerful in Washington that have taken that power from the State, from a State legislature, and they've usurped it and they've taken it to Washington and they're using it to demonstrate their own power.

□ 2115

It's not about what roads we need in Michigan. We don't need turtle fences in Michigan right now. We have fundamental transportation problems and issues that need to be addressed, but people in Washington think they know better about how Michigan should spend its transportation dollars.

We are reducing funding for K through 12 education. We don't need No Child Left Behind, which is money from Michigan going to Washington and then being allocated by the powerful in Washington so that some States win and some States lose. In highways, Michigan has lost to the tune of 17 cents of every dollar that has ever been sent to Washington, D.C., in the highway transportation program. Think about how much better our roads would be if we would have been able to spend that money on our priorities. We might have the infrastructure that would be able to support and attract a better business climate.

Think about education, where we are cutting funding for K through 12 education, yet the money is coming here to Washington and it's going back to our local school districts under No Child Left Behind, and we've got ad-

ministrators hiring extra people to figure out how we need the mandates. And a lot of this, as I look at it, ends up being what some have called "legalized Washington corruption" because those dollars come to Washington, and they are allocated not by priority or need, but by who has the clout and who doesn't. So some States are winners and others are losers. Some communities are winners and others are losers. And when you get to education, it means that some kids are winners and some are losers.

Then you get to health care. That's the kind of system we are moving to in health care. You're going to have winners and losers in health care because this health care debate is not about the quantity and the quality of health care. It's about who is going to make the decisions. We were promised all kinds of transparency as we were moving forward on health care and health care reform. Where is the transparency? My colleagues on the other side of this building voted on a health care reform bill—think about it—they voted on a health care reform bill based on an outline of what the author intended it to stand for and intended it to be.

And finally, after they voted on it, they passed an outline. Is that transparency? Yeah, it might have been more transparent than what we got. It ended up being a 1,500-page bill after they voted on it. And now people are starting to go through the bill and to find out what's different between what was in the outline and now what is actually in the legislative language. Surprise. We are going to have Senators who found out that they thought they were voting for this and they actually ended up voting for that. That is what we've got for transparency.

And now the next thing, "Reid Offers Docs a Deal." Think about it, America. Think about it. This is what health care has now amounted to. "Reid Offers Docs a Deal." Here's the deal as reported in *The Hill*: "The White House and Democratic leaders are offering doctors a deal." This is how we are going to reform health care? "They'll freeze cuts in Medicare payments to doctors in exchange for doctors' support of health care reform."

Some might call that bribery.

It goes on to say, "At a meeting on Capitol Hill last week with nearly a dozen doctors groups, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID said the Senate would take up separate legislation to halt scheduled Medicare cuts in doctor payments over the next 10 years. In return, REID made it clear that he expected their support for the broader health care bill, according to four sources in the meeting."

I thought this was about improving the quality, the quantity and the access to health care. But it's really not much different than what you see in the highway bill and in education. And you're already starting to see it in health care. The quality of your roads,

West Virginia versus Michigan, depends on the people and the positions that they have moved into. Is that what health care is going to be, that you're going to go to certain States because they get more money? We'll talk about that a little bit more.

But this is what the process is for passing legislation. "REID Offers Docs a Deal." It's a massive shift. REID can offer that—according to this paper—can offer that because if this legislation becomes law, it will not be the individual American person, family, the employer or the State who sets the framework for education. It will be leadership in Washington determining who the winners and losers will be. That's what H.R. 3200 is about. That's what the Bachus bill is all about. It's not about quantity and quality of health care. It's about who is going to have control of the decision. Who's going to be able to say, you're the folks that are going to be paying the 18 percent of the GDP, the gross domestic product, into Washington.

And then they're going to distribute it. They're going to distribute it to those people within this Chamber and within the other Chamber that are sitting in the right spot in the right chair to get more for their State and more for their community than what others may. Some of you may say, that won't happen; this is about everybody in America getting quality, quantity and improved health care. Do you really believe that that's what's happening in the highway bill? All those States that are out there, you know who are the winners in the highway formula bill, the donor States. You know who they are. We all know who they are.

We are the ones that get less back than what we pay in, not because we have fewer needs, but because someone else has made that determination.

Just like for the highway bill and No Child Left Behind, we have proposals to do it differently. For the highway bill, it's very simple. Leave the money in the States. No Child Left Behind, it's very, very simple—empower parents, don't empower Washington bureaucrats. Highways, let States and communities make the decisions as to where we're going to spend our money. As for education, let parents, teachers, community leaders, and States decide where we're going to spend the money. Heaven knows we've got enough other issues in Washington that we could and should be spending our time on, national economic issues and Afghanistan. Those deserve national priority. We want roads and transportation decisions to be made in the States. We want Michigan people to determine where Michigan dollars are going to be spent. We don't like sending our money to other States. We will make the decisions about how to educate our kids.

There's another vision that's out there for health care. It's written by a colleague of mine and myself, "How to Insure Every American." Just like the highway bill has caused many of the

transportation problems in Michigan, so government has caused many of the problems that we face today in health care. Our tax code incentivizes employer-provided health care, rewards health insurance companies by insulating them from accountability and competition, and punishes those who lack employer-provided care. It's an op-ed that JOHN SHADEGG and I wrote in *The Wall Street Journal* published September 4 of this year.

We believe that there's a better way than going to what we have got here, H.R. 3200, over 1,000 pages, one massive bill that takes power from you, the American people, and moves it to Washington, D.C. Think about it. Do you really want to know how this bill is going to get passed, how it's going to change, and how it's going to be modified over the coming weeks? "Reid Offers Docs a Deal." How many other deals are being cooked up to move this bill through the process and move the power away from you, as individual consumers, to people in Washington, D.C.?

Think about it. JOHN and I, JOHN SHADEGG and I, we've outlined an alternative vision, how to insure every American. We believe the solution to this problem is what? Just like we believe that parents ought to drive the education decision of their kids, we believe that patients and consumers should have increased power in a new insurance market because what we have today, what appears to be a free market health care system, is not. We want to improve and increase competition.

We want to empower people to have access to be able to afford health care. And later on, I will talk about the specific solutions that we have. But we have a vision that says we want consumers in charge, and yeah, we don't really have a lot of faith in this process here being in charge of health care, because they have done such a great job for some of our States and for some of us when it comes to education and when it comes to transportation.

Let me just read on. We believe that all Americans deserve the ability to select health care coverage that meets their needs, not the preferences of politicians. People versus politicians. Republicans in Congress want to empower Americans to make their own choices by providing a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for you to purchase the plan of your choice. Those who cannot presently afford coverage would be able to select and purchase their own plan using a health care voucher provided by the Federal Government, empowering individuals in a market, not the Federal Government, through mandates.

If we give citizens the ability to control their own care, cover preexisting conditions, and provide resources to the uninsured, we will have fixed health care in America. No bureaucrats. Guess what? No new czars, no mandates, just choice and coverage for every American.

It's a very, very different approach, empowering individuals, empowering States, and embracing the concept of the 10th Amendment to our Constitution, which says we are going to reserve the rights to the States, except for those things that are expressly given to the Federal Government.

Where in the world have we gone so far wrong that we believe it's the Federal Government's responsibility to get down to the point where it will decide whether our teachers develop the framework, where it will decide whether our teachers in our local schools are good teachers or bad teachers, where it believes we need a clover leaf in our transportation system, an on- and off-ramp. They don't know. These are decisions best left for parents. And since when are they going to be—if they can tell us who are the good teachers and the bad teachers, do you really believe they aren't going to try to move on and try to tell us who are good docs and who are bad docs, where our hospitals should be and what they should be able to do? We've seen what happens when they do that in education. Let's not let them do that in health care.

What does H.R. 3200 do besides moving all of this responsibility from you, the American people, to Washington, D.C.? Think about what it does to small business. Small business, the lifeblood of Michigan, the lifeblood of the U.S. economy. Do you wonder why there's uncertainty in the economy? If you're a small business and you're thinking about investing today, it's kind of like, wow, let's see. Those folks in Washington, they want to do cap-and-trade, which may put huge taxes on me. Do you know what? I'm going to have to just kind of step back and maybe reserve a little cash because I don't know what they're going to do with cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, massive new taxes on small business, small and medium-sized business, I'd better wait.

□ 2130

That doesn't help the economy, this uncertainty.

Massive new tax increases because we don't know what is going to happen with the tax cuts that were passed and have been in law for the last number of years. All indications are that the current administration is going to let them expire, meaning more money for Washington—at least in the short term—less money for businesses for investment and for jobs because the money is going to be coming here because, guess what, we're moving health care decisions here.

And now they've got this new tax through H.R. 3200. What will it do? It mandates what businesses will have to ensure for their employees. And if they don't, it has a sliding scale. It says you will pay zero percent if you have payrolls of under \$250,000; you will pay 2 percent, 4 percent, 6 percent, 8 percent, depending on what your payroll is. New taxes for small business. Wow, when

we're at record high unemployment rates.

Now, I know that this is the strategy in the State of Michigan, that when we are down, our Governor has decided that she will raise taxes because the State will be taken care of first. We found out how good that worked. They raised taxes. People looked at us from around the country and said, That's kind of strange. They've got the highest unemployment rate in the country, they've got budget problems, and they believe that the way to grow the economy in Michigan is to raise taxes. They laughed, and they were right. Michigan raised taxes, our unemployment went up. Not really brain surgery; when you tax more of it, you're going to get less of it.

So when we taxed jobs and businesses more, guess what? We got less business activity and fewer jobs. Think about it. We are at 15.3 percent unemployment in our State. The scary thing is now we've embraced that kind of mentality here in Washington, D.C. The President, the leadership in the House and the Senate, they have said we're not going to continue the tax cuts that were in place for job creation over the last number of years.

They have also said that we are going to and we want to tax business more for cap-and-trade, the carbon controlling mechanism. And now they're saying the same thing with health care, an 8 percent payroll tax. Even if an employer in good faith is offering health care to their employees and an employee decides not to take it, the company will be taxed 8 percent of that employee's salary. Penalties in here up to \$500,000 for unintentional failures on the part of the employer, unintentional failures on the employer.

So, what do we see? That this health care bill is predicted to drive the same kind of results that we have seen in Michigan, that by raising taxes, we're going to get a vibrant economy; right? No, wrong. That by raising taxes, we will smother our economy.

The National Federation of Independent Businesses says that they expect that if this bill goes into law, we will lose perhaps an estimated 1.6 million jobs. The Council of Economic Advisors, the Chair, Christine Romer, found that an employer mandate could result in the loss of somewhere between 4.7 and 5.5 million jobs.

This bill also has in it taxes, surtaxes on high-income individuals. So in a State like Michigan, think about the top wage earners would be paying taxes at the rate of about 52 percent, 52 percent. And remember that about 42 percent of small business income would be subject to this surtax. That's going to be really good for small business. In Michigan, it's projected our tax rate, when you combine Federal and State taxes, the tax rate would be 51.59 percent. Wow. That is going to be something that is going to stimulate our economy. But that's the direction where this bill is headed. There are lots

of questions about this bill, but let me go on.

I laid out for you that Congressman SHADEGG and I and many of our colleagues have a vision for where we want to go that says we want to empower individuals to have a greater ability to have more choice in selecting the kind of health insurance that they want.

Just recently, on October 14, JOHN and I wrote another op-ed because we were hearing all of these things about the Senator BAUCUS plan that was working its way through the Finance Committee in the Senate. And in this op-ed, people characterized it—the title was, “Lies, Earmarks and Corruption All in One Bill.” Now, we didn’t put the title on it, but people read our content and the editors at the Investors Business Daily said—they are kind of implying that they made that decision to put those words at the heading of this bill. So it kind of tells you how we feel about the Baucus bill.

Let me just read some of what is in the Investor Business Daily editorial. “We are nominating Senator BAUCUS’ health care reform bill for the Pulitzer Prize—for fiction.

“Like works of great fiction, writers such as Ernest Hemingway, Joseph Conrad and F. Scott Fitzgerald, the story line of the Baucus bill is not what it seems and is in fact a clever subterfuge of what health care will mean for the American people.

“Hiding behind this facade is another story about a massive power grab by the Washington political establishment.

“The bill is loaded with fiction. To begin with, it purports to reduce the deficit. This is really an Enron-style scam with the bill’s massive new taxes starting on day one and dramatic new health care expenditures, which will far exceed the tax revenues, beginning in year four.”

You know, in the private sector, if Herman Miller did that type of accounting when I was there, or if any company did that in the private sector today, Enron-style accounting, people would go to jail. But in the Baucus bill, what we see is tax revenue starting on day one, massive new health expenditures starting on day one of year four, and they come back and say, well, the 10-year window is going to help the deficit. And it’s like, yeah, I think you’re right. You’ve got 10 years of revenue and only 7 years of expenditures. What’s going to happen when you’ve got 10 years of revenue and 10 years of expenditures? Excuse me. You are going to have a massive deficit. Some would call that a lie.

The Baucus bill claims to treat all Americans equitably, but we find that in the Baucus bill, “Let’s Make a Deal” has been around and alive and well in the crafting of this bill already. And how is that? Well, just like Senator REID, apparently, according to The Hill, was willing to make deals with docs, someone in the writing of the

Baucus bill was willing to make deals with perhaps other Senators to maybe get their support. Well, how would that happen? “The Baucus bill claims to treat all Americans equitably, yet four States receive Medicaid exemptions—the Federal Government will pick up the State’s share of Medicaid costs,” the increased Medicaid costs—“for 5 years.”

Interesting, one of those States is Nevada. Where is the majority leader from? Oh, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID is a Democrat from Nevada. Oh, okay. I think he may also be up for election. But it’s interesting, Nevada will get a 5-year exemption of expanded Medicaid. Well, maybe they need it. This is the beginning of dealmaking that says your health care will be determined by leadership and not by your State.

Think about it. Sure, four States are going to get a Medicaid break. That means the other 46 States are going to be paying for it. Remember what we called that in the highway bill? You’re going to have 46 States that are donor States that are subsidizing the other four States. It’s already starting. And this is when people are watching. Four States are going to get a better deal on health care than what 46 other States are going to get. So now we’ve got, at least according to press reports, docs maybe getting a deal, four States are getting a deal on Medicaid. Does it stop there? No. It doesn’t.

Again, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, according to the Investors Business Daily, “put in a little-noticed provision that exempts New Yorkers and taxpayers from some other States from the bill’s tax on gold-plated insurance plans.” The result? I guess there are going to be 17 States exempted there. So 17 States, at least for a period of time, are going to be exempted from paying the tax on gold-plated insurance plans. Seventeen States are exempted. That means that 33 other States must be subsidizing the health care of these 17. It means that these 33 States will pay more in taxes and it will go to these folks in these 17 States to improve the quality of their health care.

So now we know that there may be a deal for docs. In the bill, there is a deal for four Medicaid States. There is a deal for 17 States on gold-plated. It’s starting to look an awful lot like how we do transportation.

Then it goes on. Massive earmarks in the bill. Earmarks. That’s right, it’s in the title there. Up to—I think in the House bill it was \$10 billion. Maybe in the Senate bill it’s \$5 billion for VEBA. What is VEBA? Well, we found this about 3 or 4 weeks after the bills came out of the committees in the House, a little-noticed provision said \$10 billion. I think in the Baucus bill it may be \$5 billion, an earmark for VEBA. And people are saying what’s VEBA?

VEBA is the retirement account underfunded for retired UAW workers. This may be a very worthwhile invest-

ment and expenditure, but it shouldn’t be in a health care bill. Why is it in a health care bill? I’m not sure. Is it another deal? I don’t know. It may help get some votes for this bill.

The bill will cover illegal aliens. It will cover adoption. No American is going to be able to keep their health care plan. Maybe for a period of time that they will, but when you take a look at the bill, you know, what you find is that in the bill you can’t have a Health Savings Account.

If you’re young, healthy, you’re thinking about investing in a business, a start-up business, and you say, You know what? I want to have health care coverage, but I’m going to take a high deductible plan so my premiums are low. I don’t engage in high-risk activities, but I want to put that money into my dream business. I want to go back to Michigan. I want to open up a business and I need some of that money myself, so I’m going to take the risk. I want a high deductible plan. I’m going to cover myself so if something really bad happens, I know I’m going to have the insurance coverage that I need, but I’m willing to take a little bit of a risk because I have this dream of starting this business and I want to put my money and I want to put my cash into that. I want to create a job for me and a business for me, and I want to take my job and I want that little business to grow to be two employees, to be five employees, and in 5 years I hope it’s 100. And you know what? I have a dream that maybe I can be the next Apple.

□ 2145

Remember, Apple and Hewlett-Packard started in back rooms. They started in garages.

I’ve got an idea, and I’ve got a vision, and I’ve got a passion for this new product. It may be in energy. It may be in technology. It may be in ag, but I’m going to be the next Microsoft. I’m going to be the next Apple. I’m going to be the next Hewlett-Packard, and I’m going to do it right here in the State of Michigan, or I’m going to do it right here in the United States, but to do that, I need some start-up capital. Guess what?

The government is going to mandate that you buy a Cadillac insurance plan. You’re no longer going to have that choice. Guess what?

If you started a business in the last year, saying, you know, I’m going to be able to take that money and I’m going to have that high-risk plan and I’m going to have that catastrophic and I’m going to have that high-deductible plan and I’m going to keep pouring that money into my business, when this plan goes into effect, you’d better change your business plan because the health care czar, the person whom we’ve told 181 times, will say you must, you shall, you will in terms of establishing the rules and regulations have to follow the law. She will say, Sorry, you cannot do that. You’ve got to buy

a full plan. You don't have that choice anymore.

When you take a look at it, this is why, I think, the folks in Investors Business Daily said—and when we look at the content of this editorial written by myself and Congressman SHADEGG and when we see the deal that was cut for 33 States on gold-plated insurance plans and the deal that was cut for Medicaid for four States and the deal that Reid is now looking at again, according to press reports, at cutting on docs—they call it “corruption,” but in Washington, some would say it's legalized Washington corruption. This is what leads many to believe that this is not about the quality or the quantity of health care; it's all about who has the power and the decision-making in health care.

You know, our last line in this editorial—and I think this is why, when I go home, I am somewhat energized by the response. I think that the TEA party movement has been phenomenal because, if we're going to leave the power with the American people on health care, if we're going to restore the power to the American people and to parents on education, if we're going to restore the authority back to States and follow the Constitution and the Tenth Amendment, the American people and the TEA party folks and the Tenth Amendment folks and others are going to have to stand up and say, Absolutely no more because, as we close: the American people need to stand up and say no, no to this callous grab of power by Washington elites.

This is the first real test, the TEA party movement, to influence public policy. Americans are counting on their elected Representatives to protect them from a tragically flawed health care bill. Grass-roots America needs to speak. They need to speak out before it's too late. If you're not willing to fight on this issue, if not now, when? Time is running out.

People say, well, we need health care reform. You know what? The American people are absolutely right; but this bill, going through this process in the dark of night and with no transparency—the President promised us transparency and that the negotiations would be on C-SPAN. We have yet to see that materialize.

So where do we go? It's a very simple alternative. It's a seven-solutions plan.

At one of my town meetings early on, the process engineer said, you know, PETE—and you probably did this when you were at Herman Miller—you know, when you were in the business world, what you did is you identified the problems, and you fixed the problems.

I said, Yeah, that's what we did at Herman Miller whether it was in the engineering area, whether it was in customer service, whether it was in marketing. You identified the problem. You brought together a group of people to develop the solution to fix that problem, and you left the other 85 percent of the company alone that was

working pretty well and maybe working really, really well.

You know, 83 percent of the American people today recognize there need to be some fixes to health care. They have compassion for those who cannot get it. They have compassion for those who cannot afford it. They have compassion for those people who have pre-existing conditions. America is a compassionate country.

So they're saying, Pete—and I think they're telling a lot of my colleagues this—they're saying, Address the problems that are out there, but you know, I'm relatively satisfied with my health care. Don't mess with mine, because you know what? We really didn't like what you did with No Child Left Behind. The promises were all really good, but the implementation has been terrible in No Child Left Behind.

It's just like after 50 years there are some things we really like about the interstate highway system, but we really don't like where it has evolved to today where you tell us to build turtle fences or where the Washington government says take it and identify the pieces that are broken and fix those.

So we came up with seven very simple bills—you can look these up—which address the issues that are most frequently identified as being the problem in health care. So, just like when I was at Herman Miller in the private sector, we would go out, and we'd identify the problem. We'd talk to our customers and say, What are the difficulties? What are the issues that you have dealing with Herman Miller? They'd identify them. We'd come back, and we'd fix them.

So, as we've done that and as we've talked about health care, people have said, you know, well, cost is a problem. All right. So we've got H.R. 2607, the Small Business Health Fairness Act, which are association health plans. Create more competition.

Health savings and affordability. Expand health savings accounts. Our elders may not want to use a health savings account. They've always gotten health care in a different way. So our elders may not want to use health savings accounts. Our family uses a health savings account.

Expand the access to health savings account. My kids love it. It empowers them to make health care decisions. If they access health care effectively, guess what? At the end of the year, they have money that they have saved, and they now put that as a part of their retirement plans. My daughter is planning this already, and she's 27. She has gone through this for 3, 4 years. It works. It has made her a better consumer of health care. Under H.R. 3200, that option is gone.

The Health Care Choice Act. Allow insurance companies to compete across State lines. We can address the cost aspect.

Access. Community building access. This is a plan that we've used in Michi-

gan, in Muskegon. It's now being used. We've got a three-party cost share of the business, the individual, and the community. Creating access. Assuring coverage. Let's take care and help people with preexisting conditions. Improving health care for all Americans. So we can address the access issue.

Then let's make sure that we don't forget about tort reform. So we can address cost, access, and tort reform.

We have seven different bills which, if passed, we could implement all of them immediately rather than what this bill does. This bill goes through and implements the taxes on day one and doesn't do the program until year four. Simple bills singularly identifying a specific problem. You could identify the bill. You could read the bill. You could probably understand it. Not many people can go through this and understand it. You won't have to go through this process of let's make a deal to make it become law. Seven solutions.

It's just like we've got a vision and a plan for transportation that says empower the States to make more of our transportation decisions, leave the money in the State, and don't send it to Washington. A vision, a strategy and a plan to make that happen. It's just like we've got a vision for education that says we're going to empower parents and local communities and school districts rather than a Washington establishment, and we've got a plan to do that called A-plus, a solution.

We've got the same thing in health care. Empower consumers and not Washington bureaucrats to make decisions about their health care. We've got the strategies, and we've got the specific bills that can make that happen.

The bottom line is it's time for the American people to stand up and to say, We've had enough of Washington taking our freedom and usurping our authority and taking our decisions and having the decisions and the quality, whether it's transportation or education or now health care, be made by the Washington elites in a way that says some will win and some will lose.

That is what we have found in transportation. It is what we are finding in education. If we move the authority for health care to Washington, D.C., we will be violating the Constitution. It is the responsibility of individuals and States to deal with that. Nowhere in the Constitution does it say that this is the authority of the Federal Government, and we will be putting in place a system where the quality of your health care is going to be dependent on “let's make a deal” potentially with the leadership in Congress.

I want control of my health care. I think that you want control of your health care when you consider the alternative.

Take a look at the solutions that we have proposed: empowering individuals to have access and to have the means

to buy health care and to make the choices and to be held accountable and responsible for the choices that they make. When they make great choices, they will benefit. Yes, they will have the freedom to make, perhaps, some wrong choices, but that is what makes America great. When we make wrong choices, we will learn and we will improve, but let's make sure that we fight for freedom.

The time to fight for freedom is today, and it is on this issue, and we need to move forward. There is nothing more important for us to do than to move forward and to reform health care, but to do it in such a way that empowers individuals and not Washington.

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

ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS

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

Mr. MASSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to rise today to discuss something that has become exceptionally important to me and to many in my district. In fact, it has become exceptionally important to individuals all over this country.

I ask the Speaker's indulgence tonight to engage both on a short and technical historical discussion of a technology that not only holds great promise for the United States but, in fact, for the world; and I appreciate the Speaker's indulgence as I do so.

It was a pivotal time in history, just about 100 years ago, when motorized transportation was, in fact, in its infancy, and our country and its transportation industry faced a very important choice: Should the energy for powering the newly developed horseless carriage come from electricity and batteries, or should it come from the internal combustion engine and petroleum fuels?

Remember, please, that both of these technologies—and it's hard for us to imagine—were at that time brand new. Both technologies had been established in the fledgling motorized transport industry from the beginning. There were down sides to both choices.

Batteries were heavy; took up a lot of space and took a long time to re-energize or, as we come to call it today, recharge. Whereas, internal combustion engines were noisy. They scared a lot of horses; required fuel that was both difficult to come by; they were scarce, smelly and volatile. Our other choice, the electric drive, or the internal combustion engine, would require a huge investment in the development of a nationwide infrastructure.

Obviously, the choices taken then heavily favored the internal combustion engine. By a large margin, the internal combustion engine out-

performed electric drive; carried more passengers; could carry more cargo; could go farther while taking far less time to refill its on-board energy supply. This was for the fundamental reason that, by both weight and volume, more energy was contained in petroleum fuels, and they could then be packaged in batteries.

Thus, for the last 100 years and continuing today, petroleum-dependent internal combustion engines dominate every common mode of motorized transportation, but some things have not changed in 100 years. Batteries, no matter how improved, are still heavy. They take up a lot of space, and they require an awful long time to recharge.

□ 2200

Internal combustion engines, however improved, still scare a lot of horses, at least back where I am from, are still noisy, and require a fuel that is both smelly, hard to come by and volatile.

Among the things that have changed is our realization of the long-term consequences of our earlier choices. Increasingly in recent decades we have come to realize that there are many compelling flaws in our choices for internal combustion engines: The noise, the smell, the volatility, the scarcity of the fuel. The overriding concern now and the overriding environmental impact and national security considerations dominate today's discussions.

But that is not all. In the complex and dangerous world in which we live, international industrial competitiveness and domestic access to advanced technologies are now paramount. So, as with 100 years ago, much is at stake for our country and for the world in the decisions we make now. And as we are consumed in internal domestic debates over things like health care and other critical issues that we face, Mr. Speaker, I pause tonight to talk about advanced technologies.

Fortunately, the automotive industry and governments around the world have foreseen the present, what we face today, and they have been making preparations. Clearly, solutions to the environmental impact and energy security issues that we are facing have been embraced by the automotive industry, and technologies to move us to a future of clean environment and energy independence are now at hand and at the ready.

The automotive industry has proven its commitment by inventing and investing in these technologies and products, and governments have professed their support through statements such as the following from our President, Barack Obama, just recently on March 19th of this year. Mr. Speaker, please allow me to quote:

"So, we have a choice to make. We can remain one of the world's leading importers of foreign oil, or we can make the investments that would allow us to become the world's leading exporter of renewable energy. We can

let climate change continue to go unchecked, or we can help to stop it. We can let the jobs of tomorrow be created abroad, or we can create those jobs right here in America and lay the foundation for lasting prosperity."

National energy and environmental goals have already been set. We must address America's incredibly and increasingly dangerous dependence on petroleum and reduce the approximately 140 billion gallons of gasoline that U.S. drivers use every year—140 billion gallons of gasoline—and every year more and more of it imported from the very countries who would both do us economic and national security harm.

To meet these challenges, we must embrace the ingenuity of our national research community, an ingenuity and national research community that took us to the moon and beyond, and we must take these technologies from their cradle of infancy through commercial deployment and development.

Understand that we are again at a pivotal point in history. We are standing at the threshold of the greatest single paradigm shift in the entire history of motorized transportation. It has only been since the day we decided to shift from the horse and carriage to the horseless carriage that we have the options in front of us today. And only one phenomenon stands in the way of our accomplishing our national goals through the automobile industry, the phenomenon known as, and may I quote the automobile industry, "the valley of death."

The valley of death is an automotive industry reference to the treacherous territory between proven feasibility in the research laboratory and the commercially successful products in the marketplace. Every single new technology that we have come to enjoy in automobiles, from power brakes and power steering to factory air, has languished in the valley of death until it became a commercially available product in the mass market.

There are now four or five major technologies for us to choose from, and they are, from the most straightforward to the most technologically challenging, first, improved internal combustion engine technologies; next, internal combustion engine technologies that use alternative fuels, and we have already seen the increased deployment of things like corn and mixed cellulosic ethanol and hopefully future biodiesel. After that comes something we are somewhat familiar with, gasoline engine hybrids that we see deployed in commercial vehicles like the Prius. Next we will see electric hybrids, and, lastly, hydrogen fuel-cell technologies.

The least difficult of these technologies is the refinements to existing conventional engine technology, already discussed, and the most difficult are the advanced technologies that are brand new to the marketplace.

Automakers everywhere recognize that the technologies at the difficult

end are the ones that cannot cross this automotive valley of death alone. Successful movement from research and development successes to market successes require the cooperation and support of national governments.

One of the most promising but highly threatened technologies is the hydrogen fuel cell. This technology has an impressive history and important implications for our Nation's energy portfolio. But we are at a point where we must decide, is it worth saving this technology and promoting a vast domestic hydrogen-fuel capability? I happen to believe it is.

Let me be very clear, speaking as an individual who spent most of my life in military uniform and the final years of my military career as a senior advisor to the commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, where I witnessed firsthand the cooperation between the governments of NATO and their industries, this is a national security imperative.

In order for us to maintain our place in the world, we must maintain our industrial competitiveness, and that means we must have robust supply bases and parts manufacturing. We have let our ingenuity and investments in industry fail before, only to be picked up by foreign competitors, and then we pay the price for reimportation. It is dangerous to rely on their industries and not on ours. We must focus on maintaining a strong advanced-technology domestic industry, and we are in a good position. In fact, we are in the lead with respect to hydrogen fuel cells.

This is an energy issue involving national energy security. It involves sustainability that couples the capabilities of fuel cells with biofuels, hybrids, photovoltaic, wind. This is an entire portfolio. It is not one over the other, but the synergy of all of those technologies, and we cannot rely on foreign countries to power America. We must embrace domestic energy technologies for both their reliability and sustainability in the future.

If we are going to be a world leader with a strong domestic economy and not rely on foreign countries both for technology loans and for foreign loans, as we are today, we have to move forward in partnerships with industry. We risk maintaining and repeating the mistakes of the past.

In the late 1990s and the early 2000s, the United States Advanced Battery Consortium worked on battery research and development. Today, that battery technology has been commercialized and it is a market dominated by both Japanese and Korean manufacturing giants, not American.

From the early 1990s, the Department of Energy and General Motors have developed a U.S. fuel-cell program into what is today a global leadership position. Today, catching up quickly, there are announced programs from Germany and Japan, China and Korea, with huge investments to commercialize hydro-

gen fuel vehicles by 2015, and this will push the United States to a number three or worse position. I think this sounds all too familiar.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a series of charts to help us visually understand some of the challenges, the risks, and the benefits that we face today.

Back in 1968, we had the Electrován. It was completely filled with fuel cells and hydrogen tanks and it was done in a van of that size because this technology at that time could not be miniaturized. It was so large, it required the entire interior volume of a van.

In 1997, the first Department of Energy and General Motors fuel stack, not yet packageable for a vehicle, became an industrial reality.

In 2007, a complete hydrogen fuel-stack system was packaged into a Chevrolet Equinox, and over 100 of these vehicles matched in their capabilities were built and deployed all over the United States. They are now on the road being driven by your neighbors and friends in test and pilot programs and have accumulated over 1 million road miles of research and development.

In the very near future and in the research and development centers today—I have seen them with my own eyes—is a Generation 2 system being readied for 2015, half the size of its predecessor, with increased performance, and it will be both not only lighter and smaller, but it will be progressively even smaller to fit into more styles of vehicles.

□ 2210

This, frankly, in this short of a period of time, is incredible technology progress. From the humble roots of this technology and a van full of equipment to today's Equinox fuel cells and beyond, the U.S. is the country that has advanced automotive hydrogen fuel cell technology, us, Americans, right here in the United States.

The Department of Energy Research and Development program, developed in partnership with domestic automobile manufacturers, was one of the best thought-out, most fully vested, periodically reviewed programs the Department of Energy has ever deployed. And the DOE invested to help advance this technology quickly towards production, and it set difficult technical goals to measure the progress of that program. The auto companies met or exceeded every single technology milestone placed before them. These included the size and weight of hydrogen fuel cell technology as both of those shrank significantly.

The technology was cold weather tested, and I cannot tell you, coming from upstate New York, how critical that is. It proved to be extremely versatile under multiple different environments. It was also done while improving durability, and current hydrogen fuel cell vehicles increased a mileage capability that before was unheard

of, right now achieving some 800,000 miles—let me rephrase that, some 80,000 miles of lifetime between hydrogen fuel cell change-out, and the first commercial vehicles available in 2015 will have 125,000-mile durability capability between changing. That was unheard of just 10 years ago.

In the United States, billions and billions of dollars have been invested in government and private partnership to make hydrogen fuel cell vehicle technology a reality. The Department of Energy alone invested \$2.3 billion in vehicle-related research and development. And General Motors, from their own coffers, invested \$1.5 billion to place this company and this country at the forefront of hydrogen fuel cell research and development. Remember the goal, the billions and billions of gallons of gasoline we burn every year that will some day no longer be needed.

Hundreds of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles are currently on the road. Many major automotive companies have fleets. Preeminent among them, General Motors, but catching up quickly, Toyota, Honda, Hyundai, and Daimler. These are not some laboratory curiosity. Several automobile companies now loan or lease these vehicles to people just like you and me that take them home, park them in their garage, get up and take them to work the next morning. I know, because on my very first day as Member of the United States Congress just some 10 months ago, on a very cold January morning, I fired up a hydrogen fuel cell Equinox and drove it and its companion vehicle to the steps of the United States Capitol to demonstrate that this technology is no longer a laboratory miracle but is on the cusp of commercial development and deployment. So we've come a long way. And the question now is: Should we continue with this technology? Is this technology essential?

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the next slide if I might. I'd like to talk for a moment about energy and technology options.

Energy security and the ability to reach emission gas reductions is critical. On this slide, we see in green, blue, and yellow, a library of our energy source portfolios: oil in its conventional, oil its nonconventional formats, biomass, natural gas and coal, renewables of many kinds, and nuclear. That's about what we have where we can go shopping for today's energy sources.

In the center is the type of fuel that those energies provide from a liquid fuel, and we know that to be diesel, gasoline, to gaseous fuels, which have special uses in niche markets like agriculture, propane, natural gas compressed, electric vehicles and hydrogen. And then we can talk about propulsion systems. Today, we have conventional internal combustion engines. We have internal combustion hybrids. That would be what we call and have come to be known as the Prius, plug-in hybrids, next generation, range-extended

electric vehicles. We'll see those soon in a product called the Volt. Battery electric vehicles that have been around for quite a while are in use in many different ranges, and fuel cell hydrogen electric vehicles.

This is the menu that we can choose from, and it's absolutely critical that we maintain the broadest menu possible. So how do we avoid potential conflicts, unexpected shortages, foreign countries that will hold us hostage to a particular kind of energy, whether it be oil or nuclear fuel? How do we strive to move forward? We maintain a full menu of choices.

Now, some of these fuels have some limitations. We are very excited about biofuels, and certainly, based on my agricultural-dominated congressional district, I join in that. But they have a limitation. We can't fully meet demand based solely on biofuels, if for no other reason, because of land use requirements. We know and I've discussed briefly and will discuss in more detail that batteries have cost and weight problems. Let me illustrate this in the next slide, if I could.

There are different amounts of energy contained in different kinds of fuel, and, Mr. Speaker, if you will indulge me just a brief discussion of a technical nature. Today, if I want to drive 300 miles, it will take me approximately 72 pounds of diesel fuel. Now, if you take that amount of diesel fuel and you wrap it into the fuel delivery system, the piping, the pump, and the fuel tank, the total weight of that onboard device is about 94 pounds. If I want to do that with compressed hydrogen, the amount of hydrogen that I want to use contains 13.2 pounds. Now, why is that? That's because hydrogen, pound for pound, contains much more energy than does diesel fuel. It's an incredibly more efficient energy delivering fuel. But because it's a gas, it must be compressed and so its tank will weigh more. And the entire energy delivery system for a vehicle will weigh about 275 pounds. Well, that sounds like a lot more than the 94.8 pounds, but it's really only about 180 pounds heavier. That's about one passenger's worth. That's a very manageable technical challenge to engineers in the automotive industry.

But when we talk about batteries, it will take 1,829 pounds of Lithium ion batteries to allow me to drive 300 miles without recharging, and the delivery system, the encasement, the battery, cables, and the harnesses, will weigh about a total of 1,829, with 1,190 of that actually being the battery itself. Now, that has market value. There are urban uses for battery-powered vehicles, but long-range, high torque, high horsepower extended driving is not one of them. It is only through a high density, high energy fuel, in this case today, diesel or gasoline, and in the cars of tomorrow through hydrogen, that you can achieve that. Lithium ion batteries technically, because of the laws of physics, will never get us to where we

have to go across a broad spectrum of driving requirements. It is simply not physically possible. In order to do this, I believe, and many experts join me, we have to harness the power of hydrogen through advanced fuel cell technology.

Now, petroleum and hydrogen have two other advantages. These vehicles can be refueled every 300 or so miles, and it takes about 3 to 10 minutes to do it. A battery electric vehicle requires overnight charging and it requires it to be done with a high-capacitance recharging system. That's fine if you have 8 or 9 hours to recharge your car. And there are many uses in urban America where that's possible, but not in long-range, high horsepower transportation requirements.

Let's talk, if I could, on the next slide, about the range, about the requirements of driving as we see them today in the United States. This brings the technology back to the consumer. On this chart, on a four-way arrow, here we talk about high loads. Now, those of us who come from farm country know that there's a lot of driving to be done agriculturally that requires heavy duty pickup trucks.

□ 2220

On the other hand, light-load driving for those in a much more urban environment, like a Los Angeles or Miami or New York City, recognize light-load small vehicles.

Then we go as far as range: continuous highway driving down Interstate 90 and Interstate 5, or short-burst driving as we go on errands from store to store. Battery electric vehicles perform very well in local light-weight driving, and they can do a great deal to lessen our burden on imported petroleum in that market. Extended-range electric vehicles can make that just a little bit better, but it's still about a four-passenger car.

Fuel cell vehicles are the only vehicles that will be able to meet a consumer demand for range; that's long-range highway driving—load requirements—that's heavy pickup truck-type requirements—and quick refilling time.

Diesel fuel for the near foreseeable future is probably going to be the fuel required to move heavy buses and heavy trucks over long-range routes. But imagine that they are a mere fraction of those billions of gallons of gasoline that we burn and import every year from overseas. There is a huge application for hydrogen fuel cells in meeting consumer demand for vehicles that have long-range, high-load requirements, and quick refilling time.

But can hydrogen fuel cell vehicles become a reality? Let's look at the next chart just where we were in the year 2000.

There are four myths that are currently being discussed with respect to hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. One of them is fuel cells are too expensive, and they're not durable enough. The reality is the cost benefit of a hydrogen

fuel cell is measured in something called dollars per kilowatt. You measure the output in a kilowatt.

Now, just to bring this back to home, your average light bulb at home is 100 watts. So 10 of those turned on at the same time is one kilowatt. An Equinox extended-range hydrogen fuel cell vehicle today produces about 120 kilowatts of electricity, and significant cost reductions of this measurement have already been made just in the past 10 years from a plateau of \$275 per kilowatt all the way down to today at 61 kilowatts, well on the way to the commercialized requirement of a 45-kilowatt vehicle. That's \$45 per kilowatt.

Just last week the Department of Energy in its hydrogen program released a document confirming a current \$61 per kilowatt in 2009 dollars projection. As shown on this chart, this is a reality today. Cost will be, and soon are, comparable to all other advanced technologies at high volumes of production, a high volume of production being 500,000 vehicles per year.

It was an incredibly difficult challenge put forth by the technicians of the Department of Energy, and the goals have been met or exceeded as developed by major automotive manufacturers right here in the United States. In fact, GM is on track to release a commercial model that meets or exceeds all durability and cost guidelines by 2015.

Myth two as shown on the next chart: hydrogen from natural gas is not an ideal source, and we don't have other options.

Let's go back to chemistry class when we were in high school. Hydrogen gas comes from two main sources: either something called reforming natural gas or fundamental electrolysis. The reality today when you measure the amount of CO₂ that's expelled by a vehicle per mile driven as it is today, today's gasoline engines produce 540 grams, quarter of a kilogram, about half a pound, of CO₂ per mile. And we will be able to lower that to about 410 grams. If we just use and burn natural gas in a compressed tank, it's about 320. If we go to hybrid electric vehicles, of which there are four major types: gasoline, diesel, corn ethanol, and cellulosic ethanol, we can get it down to about 65 grams.

If we're talking about plug-in hybrids, today we have a gasoline hybrid that gives us a 240-gram-per-mile burn, and cellulosic ethanol can get it down to 150. It is only hydrogen fuel cell vehicles that meet the emissions requirements required for us to move forward.

If we take hydrogen and reform it directly from natural gas, technology available today, we achieve a 200-gram-per-mile equivalent. That's half of the very best that we can get out of gasoline today. And if we go to hydrogen made from central wind electrolysis, it's almost untraceable. We actually achieve the goal of leaving nothing behind the vehicle but water vapor.

Natural gas is an abundant, domestic resource. We have it in quantity. Eleven billion kilograms of hydrogen already produced from natural gas in North America and 60 percent of this, enough fuel to power 21 million hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, is used to clean up petroleum in refinery operations today.

Natural gas-based hydrogen used to power hydrogen fuel cell vehicles is less than half of the greenhouse gas emissions of a conventional gasoline-powered vehicle. And looking forward, hydrogen, with near zero greenhouse emissions is possible, both from nuclear biomass and renewable electricity. In fact, solar arrays are in operation today that are producing hydrogen at generation efficiency twice of the Department of Energy's 2015 goals. This is not future science. This is science of today.

Myth number three—this is associated with hydrogen fuel cells—is that no good storage mechanism is available for transportation.

Most companies today use a 10,000 PSI compressed hydrogen tank. Vehicles use the storage tank, technology has been able to hook up to 300 miles. It was the technology that was in the vehicle that I drove from my home in Corning, New York, all the way down to Washington, DC. Compressed hydrogen offers all of the capabilities needed to begin commercialization of vehicles today. This, like all continuing research that goes on around the world, will progress. But it is a reality as we know it today.

Let's talk about myth four, which is probably the most daunting issue facing America. And, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence in what is increasingly technological conversation.

Distribution infrastructure isn't there, and there are no plans to establish it. That's myth number four. The reality is that the infrastructure challenge is solvable. Stations are here now, and according to the National Hydrogen Association of the United States, we currently have 75 stations located around the country, most in New York and California, with 44 more planned over the next 2 years.

Like the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System or the international and national railroad systems, or our own aircraft and airport infrastructure, this will require a national involvement, a national government involvement, which will result in jobs and lots of them. It will create entirely new industries, industries that cannot be exported; and it will be a tremendous stimulus to the U.S. economy in and of itself.

To roll out this infrastructure, all we need to do is start with nodes and then connect them, and the work has already started. It doesn't require a miracle. It only requires the will and the national focus to do it.

Here we see to my right several of the stations that are already being designed and implemented for commer-

cial exploitation around the world. In places like the University of California Irvine, in Germany, right here in Washington, DC., where I refilled the hydrogen fuel cell vehicle that I drove from Corning, and in Berlin, Germany, where they have taken that design—and I will talk soon about its mass introduction throughout their entire highway system.

Again, it doesn't require a miracle, only the national will to do so.

Let us take a look at the next slide and see how we can actually manage this transformation and manage it quickly.

We start with select high-profile stations; and then we move to the next stage, about 40 stations per large metro area. Here we see both New York City and Los Angeles, just two examples.

Thirty metro stations for the entire metropolitan Los Angeles area will provide a network where no matter where you are, you are only 3.6 miles from a hydrogen filling station. Add 10 stations outside of the metro area, and that's what you need to allow consumers to meet their average weekly and weekend needs. And in Los Angeles, by the way, it's important to view the driving patterns of consumers.

□ 2230

There are consumers who want to be able to drive to Las Vegas, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Palm Springs and Big Bear, but they don't necessarily transit north to that extended range, and so this has a particular viability in southern California. Similarly, New York State, my home State, has the potential for a "hydrogen highway" as described in previous work by the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. You can build nodes and link them together along roads like Interstate 90.

But NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, recognizes that "as with any vision, barriers to achieving our goals exist. The support needed must come from collaborative efforts among industry, as well as between industry and local, State, and Federal Government. Communication and cooperation will be required to overcome the technical, market, and policy challenges impeding the implementation of hydrogen energy systems."

As a proof that this technology is here now, we only have to look at what is happening within the automotive industry, especially abroad where foreign governments and car companies are teaming up to tackle the challenges of commercializing hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles.

Let's take a look at some of those partnerships in the next slide. As I have said continually, the technology is here and here now, and those in the industry recognize the potential of hydrogen cars in the commercial market. The global automotive industry says that at the current pace, these vehicles will be on the road commercially by

2015. Major world automobile manufacturers have signed a Letter of Understanding as recently as September 9 of this year between Daimler, and they recognize the requirement of the synergy between hydrogen fuel cells and battery technologies. This letter went to energy companies all over the world and government organizations around their host countries.

To quote that letter, allow me to say, over the last decade, governments, original equipment manufacturers and automobile manufacturers and the entire energy sector have given special attention to the introduction of hydrogen as a fuel for road transportation, and they have given it the priority option to reach several goals associated both with emission management and CO₂ reduction. Battery and fuel-celled vehicles complement one another and can move us closer to the objective of sustained mobility.

Honda, Toyota, Renault Nissan, Opel and GM, Ford, Daimler, Kia and Hyundai have all made significant investments and are moving ahead aggressively, but it is here in the United States of America, quite frankly with American ingenuity, that we have taken a leadership position that today is being threatened by a lack of partnership and a lack of vision. Let me quote further from the letter that was put out by Daimler, in order to ensure a successful market introduction of fuel-cell vehicles:

"This market introduction has to be aligned with the build-up of the necessary hydrogen infrastructure. Therefore a hydrogen infrastructure network with sufficient density is required by 2015. The network should be built up from metropolitan areas via corridors into area-wide coverage."

Mr. Speaker, others get it. And many in this country understand it as well. Foreign governments in Germany and Japan are listening to their automotive manufacturers. They are collaborating with those manufacturers to put production vehicles in the market and in the marketplace by 2015 and explore simultaneously the need to overcome infrastructure challenges. Working to blanket their countries with a national hydrogen fuel-station infrastructure that will free their countries from foreign oil. And we will be left side-lined, wondering how this happened.

In our next slide, the flags tell the story. Our competitors are passing us by. They will soon have government-supported fuel-cell fleets on the road for research and development and prototype testing, as well as the infrastructure to support it. China, Korea, Japan and Germany are all in the fight competing with the United States, all moving forward aggressively and, in fact, faster than we are to commercialize technologies that we invented here in the United States. Their industries and their governments are working together. In Japan and Germany, long-term government industrial collaborations have existed, and they are

leveraging those collaborations and those partnerships to leapfrog over the United States and the work that we put in place initializing the very technologies that we may one day be threatened with having to reimport into this country.

China is also learning a lesson and watching us carefully and matching their incredible ability to literally reverse engineer anything and everything that is developed and placing their massive industrial strength behind it. There is no doubt that should they want to and should we surrender the lead, they will overtake us.

The bottom line is if we don't move on hydrogen fuel-cell technologies and the vehicles built from them and we do not move forward, someone else will, and we will end up buying it from them just as we have ended up buying hybrid technology from the very competitors who took it away from us after we invented it and moved that technology forward. We will be reliant on these foreign producers for this clean technology in the same way that we rely on foreign oil right now to power our automobiles.

Let's look at a specific on the next slide. Germany, an ally and an industrial partner, has developed a logical plan with government infrastructure developments and hydrogen fuel-cell automobiles to roll out H2 fueling stations over a very short period of time. To the far right we see in 2013 some 150 fueling stations, and by 2017, 1,000 hydrogen fuel-cell filling stations, allowing the Germans to access hydrogen technology all over their country. In just four short House of Representatives election cycles, they will be done. And we will be wondering how did it happen? How were we left behind? This is because countries all over the world have, or are developing, national hydrogen plans.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to show you in the next slide who some of those players on the global market are. Germany and Japan are leading globally and leapfrogging ahead of the United States. China is coming on strong and in the past has not respected other nations' intellectual property rights. This will allow them to not only catch up quickly but surpass us. And believe you me, they will and they are. Korea is also stepping up with its manufacturing partnership with Hyundai. All over the globe we see other countries realizing the promising future of this technology. We invented it here. We developed it here. We are manufacturing it here. And yet, we are at the cusp of surrendering it here.

In the big picture, manufacturers from Germany, Japan, Korea and China are now accelerating their movement forward, and they are doing so quickly with a massive government research and development program. They will likely soon have large fuel-cell fleets on the roads, even larger than General Motors' current research and development 119-car fleet. They are installing

thousands of hydrogen fueling stations that will relieve their countries from the burden of foreign oil and establish a viable energy infrastructure that supports clean, renewable energy production within their own countries independent of importation. And they will be creating the tens of thousands of new green jobs that should be created and kept here in the United States of America.

We have seen this before. Not too long ago, this country invested in battery electric vehicle technology. And I'm not talking about the investments that came out of the recent stimulus bill, but rather the investments that were made back in the 1980s. The Department of Energy invested to kick-start the technologies and advance them towards production, and a large automobile manufacturer in the United States built a small fleet of battery electric vehicles that were placed on the road with real world drivers, sort of like where GM is today with hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles. The United States, in particular one State in the United States, California, then shifted its focus, and the programs became economically unviable and went away quite dramatically.

Today, leaders in this technology, battery automotive technology, are in Korea, China and Japan. And yet, the research and development was done here in the United States of America.

By the way, this is not an anomaly. I could have told you the same story but replaced "battery" vehicles with the word "hybrid" vehicles. And yet, last year, as the price of gasoline spiked and the United States consumer market focused on hybrid vehicles, there were no commercially available, mass deployable, domestically manufactured hybrid vehicles. Why? Because we embarked on that technology and we allowed foreign manufacturers to capture it, thus forcing us to reimport it at significant capital costs to the United States. If all the other major countries have a very specific program in place, what do they know that we don't know?

Well, here is an aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to leave you with tonight. Allow me to conclude with one final slide. This is not necessarily only an issue of commercial capabilities or of industrial capabilities. It is an issue of national security. The United States military sees a need for independent energy capabilities. This was recently outlined in an independent report by the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy. In recent letters from senior DOD officials, one individual quoted "domestic leadership in advanced technologies such as fuel cells is of national importance."

□ 2240

The task force concluded that the Department of Defense faces two primary energy challenges. Department of Defense energy operations suffer from

unnecessarily high growing battle space fuel demand. Let's face it, an M1A2 Abrams tank powered by a gas turbine engine using aviation fuel burns a lot of gas. And we have seen over and over and over again in land, air, and sea warfare that the logistical requirements of moving fuel is one of the most important battlefield criteria.

In fact, in my own life, I learned at advanced war schools, such as the National War College and the Naval War College, that amateurs talk about bullets and guns and professionals talk about logistics. And logistics harbor around the movement of petroleum products for our aircraft, our tanks, and our ships. And we are increasingly and at farther ranges dependent on that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, just recently on the front page of a major Washington political newspaper the headlines read that a gallon of fuel used by the United States military in Afghanistan is costing the United States taxpayer \$400.

Likewise, military installations both overseas and, of some significant national security curiosity, right here at home are completely dependent on a civilian electrical infrastructure grid. When the lights go out in New York City, they go out on any military base on the same electrical grid. There is no independent powering sources. This is not a position that we want our military to be in.

Hydrogen fuel cells can help the military address its own petroleum reduction requirements. Nontactical vehicle applications, these are the everyday administrative vehicles used all over the United States by the DOD, are a wonderful place to introduce this technology and move forward. And stationary hydrogen fuel cell storage and requirements are also a significant national security increase for our shore-side installations.

Fuel cells and nontactical vehicles will later enable tactical applications. And while it seems far fetched that we may one day have a fuel cell-powered tank, Mr. Speaker, I offer for consideration that those on the battlefield of the Civil War would have had a hard time imagining a gas turbine power aviation fuel Abrams M1A2 tank. We simply cannot rely on surrendering the promise of this technology and shipping it overseas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with total transparency, I must confess that one of the reasons that I am so motivated and so passionate about this subject is that for the past 15 years, out of sight and out of mind, in a corner of my congressional district that most people did not even know existed, some 400 engineers, technicians, and support personnel have worked to bring the vision of petroleum-free transportation and independence from imported petroleum to reality.

Tonight and tomorrow, and hopefully into the future, the engineers and the

technicians at the Honeoye Falls advanced fuel cell research and development facility have brought the future today. Their leader, Mr. Matthew Fronk, a man who will soon retire from his position and seek a leadership role in academia, is to be commended for his vision and for his leadership. And it is not he alone, because it is a classic example of the ability of private industry, in this case, General Motors, a company often maligned and much in the press, who has brought to the Nation a unique, forward-looking capability that no other Nation in the world today has, and yet we are at the cusp of losing them. Right when we had the future in our hands, brought to us by hardworking and highly educated, incredibly passionate and dedicated technicians and engineers, we are about to surrender it as we surrendered battery technologies, as we surrendered hybrid technologies.

So, Mr. Speaker, allow me to conclude by reading an article that appeared in CNN Money magazine just last week. It is titled, "The Hydrogen Car Fights Back." President Obama is betting on biofuels and batteries, but that isn't stopping some automakers from investing in hydrogen fuel cars. As it appeared in Fortune magazine, I quote, "The valley of death is auto industry speak. It is a metaphorical desert where emerging technologies reside while car executives figure out which of the experiments ought to make their way into actual cars. Every automotive leap forward has done time in the valley, turbo chargers, fuel injections, even gasoline electric hybrids like Toyota's Prius. Hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, the alternative energy flavor of the month back in 2003, are the ones languishing today, along with hovercraft and other assorted concept cars, but perhaps not for much longer.

A number of automakers are now renewing their push for hydrogen, and now it is looking as though hydrogen cars will make its way out of this conceptual vehicular valley of death. Last month, Daimler, the German Government, and several industrial companies announced a plan to build 1,000 hydrogen fuel cell stations across Germany. Days later, Daimler's CEO, Dieter Zetsche, showed off Mercedes Benz's latest hydrogen fuel cell effort, the F-Cell hatchback. Toyota, this summer, announced it will put hydrogen fuel cell cars into production by 2015. Honda, GM, and Hyundai all have hydrogen fuel cell programs running, and Honda has actually put vehicles—heavily subsidized by the car maker to be sure—in the hands of some real customers as opposed to its own engineers. Parenthetically, GM, today, is focusing most of its energy on the plug-in hybrid Chevy Volt, but the company still says it expects to have fuel cell technology ready for commercialization by 2015.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate the great issues of the day, and there are many to debate, we hear them on the floor of

this House every afternoon and every evening, be it national foreign policy issues that weigh heavily on our minds in Iraq and Afghanistan, whether it be a contentious debate about health care, allow us not to lose the vision of the future. Allow us not to do what has been done before. Allow us not to forget and give away the decades of advancement and work that have accomplished so much in this very focused area of technological development that holds so much promise not only for the automotive fuel sector, but for energy independence. We speak on the floor of the House in great and grand and umbrella arching metaphors, and yet now it is time to speak of specifics.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I thank you that for this last hour I was given the opportunity to highlight a specific technology that holds so much promise, because back home at the Honeoye Falls research and development facility it can truly be said that not often in history have so few done so much for all of us.

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

ENERGY

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 am honored to have the privilege to address you here tonight on the floor of the House of Representatives. And having been privileged to listen to the gentleman before me speak of the energy issue, and not taking particular issue with the delivery that he has given nor the facts that he has such a good handle on, I would just make this point, Mr. Speaker, and that is that a little over 1 year ago, 1 year ago last August, many of us Republican Members stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and argued that we needed to expand the energy for the entire United States of America; all energy all the time.

We started that debate before the adjournment for the August recess, and the Speaker didn't want to hear the debate on energy. And so there was a motion that was delivered to adjourn abruptly, which was passed on a purely partisan vote. We kept debating energy. We were geared up to come here and debate energy 1 year ago August. And as we debated energy, the microphones were cut off, the lights were shut down, and the House of Representatives would have been cleared by order of the Speaker except we do have enough sovereignty here to bring in the citizens of the United States and our constituents. And even though Speaker PELOSI shut down the microphones, turned the C-SPAN cameras off to the side and tipped them down and dimmed the lights—didn't shut them completely off—we continued to debate energy every single business day all the way through August and into Sep-

tember and after Labor Day and back again.

□ 2250

Our argument was not to reject hydrogen. Our argument was to expand access to all energy in America. It was the case the American people wanted. It remains the case of what the American people want, and the American people want access to all energy all the time.

We are a country that's blessed with a tremendous amount of energy. We can produce the nuclear energy that we need and more than we're using by far right now. We're blessed with a lot of coal. We have a lot of natural gas. If we would utilize the resources that we have, we could expand our ethanol, our biodiesel, our wind energy as we're doing. If we would develop the energy that we have, we would have a surplus of energy.

It strikes me as a bit odd that the gentleman would focus exclusively on hydrogen. I don't take issue with his hydrogen argument; but I will say that, as the gentleman says, if we expand our hydrogen energy instead of importing a large percentage of our energy, we will be exporting renewable energy. That is a long, long way from a reality; and we will never be to the point where we can export renewable energy unless we're willing to develop all of America's energy.

Here are some of the answers: All energy all the time. Let's drill in ANWR. Why would you leave hydrocarbons underneath Mother Earth? Why would we not go out into the gulf and drill for the natural gas and for the oil that's out there? Why would we not go up to ANWR and drill up there where we have proven on the North Slope that we can drill effectively and in an environmentally safe fashion and where the most extreme environmentalists can fly over the North Slope or walk across it or ride around on Todd Palin's snowmobile?

They couldn't find an oil well if you directed them to it because they aren't big, wooden derricks with oil bursting into the air from a gusher or a geyser. They are submersible pumps in casings that are underground, and they are wells that are drilled on permafrost, and they are roads that are accessed only during the time of the many months when there's actually frost there for them to run on ice roads. You can fly over that countryside, and you can't see the wells unless you know exactly what you're looking for.

We need to drill in ANWR. We need to drill in the Outer Continental Shelf, in all of our Outer Continental Shelf. We need to open up the leases on it. We need to drill it for oil. We need to drill it for gas. We need to expand our nuclear.

JOHN MCCAIN, in his Presidential campaign, said we need to build 45 new nuclear plants in the United States in a short period of time. Now, I don't know if that's the right number, but I

know that zero is the wrong number. The people on the other side of the aisle, the Pelosi majority, are opposed to nuclear; they're opposed to ethanol; they're opposed to biodiesel. They argue some food versus fuel argument that's completely specious, and they can't make the argument with me.

I'd be happy to yield to any one of you who thinks you can. I'll take you on directly right now. The facts are in my head, and they're not even in your data because they don't exist.

We need to expand more and more of this energy. They're opposed again to anything that is petroleum. They're opposed even to the expansion of natural gas, although the Speaker was informed a year and three or four months ago that natural gas is actually a hydrocarbon. It isn't one that puts as much CO₂ into the air as burning oil or gas or diesel fuel does.

I'm having trouble finding a source of energy that's suitable to the liberals and to the environmental extremists in this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

I look across the spectrum of the energy that we have, and I'll tell you the energy that I'm for. I'm for hydroelectric. I'm for hydrocarbons of all kinds. I'm for drilling every place that I have said for gas and oil. I'm for coal. I'm for nuclear. I'm for wind, ethanol, biodiesel, solar. There are a number of them I'm probably forgetting. I want all energy all the time. I want the whole energy pie to grow, and I want to be able to use American energy. We can be energy independent. It doesn't necessarily have to be our goal, but we have to be where we have the capability to be energy independent.

The idea that comes from the other side of the aisle is to make energy more expensive. I mean, I listened to the gentleman talk about let's follow the European model. Let's hurry up because the Germans are going to be ahead of us. Well, they are all right. Their \$9 gasoline is ahead of us. They've had a policy that has been costly energy, fewer cars and more bicycles for a long time; and the Germans aren't the champions in Europe of bicycle riding. I will submit that the Danes may well be the ones in the running for first place in bicycle riding in Europe, but their idea is that there is no such thing as bad weather. It's just bad clothing. It rains 170 days a year in Denmark, and they ride bicycles 365 days a year in Denmark.

That's all right. Ride those bicycles, but you don't have a mountain in that country, and you barely have a hill. In this country, we have long distances between places. Grandma is not going to put chains on her bicycle and ride it to town through the hills and through the mountains in America. We have a different lifestyle. We have different demands. We have different priorities.

Let's let the markets decide. Let's not drive up the price of gas as they've done in Europe and make it scarce and costly, \$7.50 to \$9 a gallon. Let's keep it competitive, because energy, like

money, Mr. Speaker, is fungible, and it takes energy to make anything that we decide to make. Whatever we decide to manufacture takes energy. Even if you sold a minimal amount of energy to manufacture it, it still takes energy to deliver.

So every component of our economy is linked to the cost of energy; and if we're going to compete against the rest of the world, it's our responsibility to have a price of labor that's competitive, a lower regulation so the burden of government is not too high on our businesses that are producing products and services, and we have to have an intellectual property and know-how and low energy costs so we can compete with the rest of the world.

If you look at America's industrial might, a lot of it grew during the period of time when we led the world in energy production. They discovered oil in Pennsylvania; and shortly after that, they discovered oil in Texas. They developed the ability to drill and to produce oil, which was a cheap, compressed, concentrated form of energy; and it remains that way. We developed the skills also, and those skills that we market around the world, this source of energy and the knowledge base that came from drilling and developing wells, is something we've sold to the rest of the world. It has had great profit to the United States.

We simply cannot be a Nation, a huge Nation as we are, that is shifting over into this idea of green jobs. Green jobs are not green jobs. They're government-regulated, -created jobs. That means that they're not market-driven jobs, but they're jobs that are driven by government regulation. When you drive jobs by government regulation, that means they're more costly than the market would have them. The costs go up because of the regulation that's produced by government. So the argument that we will create green jobs is a false promise argument because it's the government that sets the regulations that produces the necessity to have green jobs.

Now, I want renewable energy. I want it to compete with the rest of the energy in this country and on the planet. It's clearly true, in looking at my record, that I have been a long-time supporter of renewable energy. There are 435 congressional districts in America. I have the privilege and the honor to represent the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa. That is one of 435 districts, the western third of the State, roughly speaking.

We raise a lot of corn and soybeans and cattle and hogs and eggs. When you add up the BTUs that are generated from ethanol, from biodiesel and from the wind generation of electricity and when you put it into the common denominator of British Thermal Units, the 5th District of Iowa, out of 435 congressional districts in America, produces more renewable energy than any other.

Now, there are a few reasons that we've done that. One is to meet the de-

mand. We have the resources, and we've created the know-how, and now we've become the knowledge base that can export that knowledge to the rest of the country and, one day, to the rest of the world.

Even though I'm in the middle of renewable energy and even though I've been engaged in it for many, many years and even though I've watched, let me say, the successes, the victories and some of the calamitous defeats that have taken place and the resurgence of the business model that shows that they can compete against the other sources of energy, at least given the structure that we're working with today, I work with all of that.

Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you that we have to have all energy all the time, not a simple focus on a single kind of energy, not a lockout of petroleum because some people say that it produces more CO₂. I'll not argue the science of that, but this myopic belief that we can limit the emissions of CO₂s and that somehow or another we can set the thermostat of the Earth is simply false.

The premise of the science is wrong. Some will say, Well, just argue the economics because you can't win the argument on science. No, Mr. Speaker. When you have a huge policy like cap-and-trade that's built upon a flawed premise such as CO₂ emissions by the United States have dramatically increased the temperature on the planet and if we significantly reduce the CO₂ emissions in the United States it will turn the Earth's thermostat down, it's a false scientific premise, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2300

And I have looked at this and asked some simple questions that aren't answered very well by the people who claim to be the scientists, and they fall into this category.

How much volume is the Earth's atmosphere altogether? So if you would take the total metric tons of the volume of the Earth's atmosphere and draw it into a circle, a graph that would describe how much that is, and draw it into an 8-foot circle, because that is what fits on the wall, a foot higher than my hand, an 8-foot circle in diameter, and that represents all of the Earth's atmosphere, then Mr. Speaker, you draw how big would the circle be, the circle of CO₂, carbon dioxide that has been emitted by U.S. industry into the atmosphere of the Earth and that is suspended in the atmosphere that might—might, but not certainly—but might affect the Earth's temperature, that CO₂, the cumulative level of all CO₂ emitted by the United States into the atmosphere since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, Mr. Speaker, how much is that?

What have we done? And my data goes back 205 years. What has the United States industrial might and the totality of its emissions in burning all the coal and all the natural gas and all the crude oil in the form of gasoline

and diesel fuel and other forms, kerosene and jet fuel, the other forms, propane, all of those forms of energy that have been burned and then the CO₂ that has been emitted and suspended in the atmosphere, how much in 205 years, as compared to all of the Earth's atmosphere that you might draw in an 8-foot circle, how big would that circle be, the cumulative total of all U.S. CO₂ in the atmosphere be in 205 years?

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to boil these numbers down to the real truth. An 8-foot circle of all the Earth's atmosphere, the cumulative, and that means 205 years' worth of CO₂ from the United States put into the atmosphere, that circle is certainly not 8-foot, that is all the atmosphere, or 7 foot or 6 foot or 5 foot or 4, 3, 2 or 1. We might think that circle is a couple feet, if we listen to the environmental extremists.

But the real size in relation to all the Earth's atmosphere as drawn in an 8-foot circle, the real diameter of the cumulative total of CO₂ is .56 inches, Mr. Speaker. That is about like this, about the size of a bullet, the tip of my little finger. That is how big that circle would be, .56, just a little over half an inch in diameter. That is the cumulative total of all the CO₂ in 205 years.

The Waxman-Markey bill proposes that if we would just reduce one year of that, in annual figures that would be $\frac{1}{205}$ of the cumulative total, by 17 percent for a few years and then raise that up a little more and finally reduce it to 83 percent by the time we get to the year 2100, and by that year they believe that the Earth will have diminished its increased temperature by let's say 1.5 degrees centigrade.

That is their calculus. And we here on the floor of the House of Representatives would conclude and America would accept the leadership of this Congress because they don't know and they don't have access to the truth, and they are certainly not hearing it from both sides of the aisle, they accept the idea that surely no person in this Congress and certainly not a majority would be cynical enough to advance some idea of science that was bogus in an effort to try to create a plan called cap-and-trade, which would be the largest and most insidious tax increase in the history of the world. And for every dollar it collected, only about one out of five would get into the United States Treasury, and the rest of it is wasted in the process like friction in a motor.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what we are dealing with with cap-and-trade. And when I listened to the gentleman talk about hydrogen, I don't take issue with his data or his argument. I will just add that there is much more that we need to do to see the big picture. The big picture means all energy all the time, and let's go ahead and use it.

There is no reason to store a lot of hydrocarbons underneath the crust of mother Earth in the territory of the sovereign United States of America and not use it. The only reason I have

heard, and it is not a very good one, is the Speaker of the House's statement, "I am trying to save the planet. I am trying to save the planet." And, yes, it was a broken record delivery, Mr. Speaker.

So, that is the energy issue that needed to be talked about for a long time. We have talked about health care for so long we have about forgotten to take up the energy issue.

I would take us then to a contemporary issue that emerged today in the news, and it is something that the American people do need to know about, Mr. Speaker, as any subject matter that comes up here on the floor, the American people need to know. There are more subjects than we can possibly have time to address.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my talk I will introduce this article into the RECORD, The Washington Times published at 4:45 a.m. and updated at 7:25 a.m. today, October 20, 2009, by Ben Conery entitled "Justice Concludes Black Voters Need Democratic Party. I will make that available at the conclusion.

Here is the article. The Justice Department concludes that black voters need the Democratic Party. This is a Washington Times article, and I will go through some of the highlights here and then seek to summarize it, Mr. Speaker.

Voters in the small city of Kinston, North Carolina, have decided overwhelmingly to do away with party affiliation for their local elections for mayor and city council. They didn't want them to be labeled as Democrats or Republicans or Libertarian or Communist or whatever they might be—I don't know if there are any down there in Kinston, actually—but they wanted to eliminate the party label and just run candidates in a nonparty way. But the Obama administration overruled the overwhelming majority of the electorate of the city of Kinston, North Carolina, and decided that they couldn't offer ballots and elect their local candidates unless they had a party label.

The Justice Department's ruling, and it affects the races for city council and mayor, went so far as to say this: Partisan elections are needed so that black voters can elect "candidates of choice" identified by the Department as those who are Democrats and almost exclusively black.

The Justice Department—I would say they are questionable in the way they are currently named—the Department ruled that white voters in Kinston will vote for blacks only if they are Democrats. What that means, that is veiled language for, white voters that aren't Democrats are racists. That is what it says in this article. It is a conclusion drawn by the Justice Department. And I will say their conclusion and their decision on its face is racist, Mr. Speaker.

It says, therefore, that the city cannot get rid of party affiliations, this is

a Department of Justice ruling, for local elections because that would violate black voters' rights to elect candidates they want.

What does this possibly mean? It doesn't fit the logic where I come from. It says that several Federal and local politicians would like the city to challenge the decision in court, and I would too.

Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the city of Kinston to challenge this Justice Department decision in court. They have a right to hold their local elections, and the Department of Justice should not be making the presumption based on the racist presumptions that they are.

The voter apathy, they say, is the largest barrier to black voters' election of candidates they prefer. A little code word, "candidates they prefer." How do they know who these candidates are who are preferred? The way you have to register who you prefer is, go to the polls and vote. Voter apathy cannot be fixed by a wrongly made decision on the Department of Justice.

There is some language here by Mr. Steven LaRoque, who led the drive to end the partisan local election. He called the Justice Department's decision "racial as well as partisan." And he went on to say, "On top of that, you have an unelected bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., overturning a valid election. That is un-American." Steven LaRoque, Kinston, North Carolina.

Continuing on, the point is made that this is the Justice Department, the Eric Holder Justice Department, that ended and dismissed the voting rights case against the New Black Panthers Party in Philadelphia.

□ 2310

Now, I have seen this film, and I've examined this case, at least to a respectable depth, where they have, let me say, as the New Black Panthers in Philadelphia, there is videotape that's in the possession of the Department of Justice, unless somehow they have destroyed the evidence on their hands, of four members of the Black Panther Party in Philadelphia in quasi-paramilitary garb standing before the polling places in Philadelphia, one of them at least wielding a billy club and intimidating white voters that came in to vote in the polls, and the video that I heard, one of those Panthers called a white voter a "cracker." This was the most open-and-shut case of voter intimidation in the history of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, and the Eric Holder Justice Department cancelled the case and dropped it even though there was, and I'll go down through some of the details of this, a judgment that was, I believe, agreed to.

Now, going on, then in Kinston, here are some comments that come from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and this is Abigail Thernstrom, whom I know and whose judgment that I respect tremendously. She said, the Voting Rights Act is supposed to protect

against situations when black voters are locked out because of racism. This is Abigail Thernstrom, Civil Rights Commission, U.S. Civil Rights Commission. She continues, and I quote, "There is no entitlement to elect a candidate they prefer on the assumption that all black voters prefer Democratic candidates"; Abigail Thernstrom, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

So Kinston, the city that decided they didn't want to have partisan elections, now is essentially ordered by the Department of Justice to have partisan elections on the assumption of the Department of Justice that apparently black voters won't know who to vote for if they go to the polls and they don't have a Democrat label on the names of the candidates that are apparently black Democrat candidates.

And that's been the history of what's going on in Kinston. They should have the right to select candidates without regard to race, and this is a decision that is based on race at its core. It says that the city had uncommonly high voter turnout in the last election with more than 11,000 of the city's 15,000 voters casting ballots, but Kinston's blacks voted in greater numbers than whites the last election, presumably because Barack Obama was on the ballot, where he won in that city by a margin of 2-1, and that was—excuse me. He won a victory in that city, but the election, the vote to determine that they would be electing their local candidates on a nonpartisan ballot passed by a 2-1 margin in Kinston, and yet the Justice Department overturned that decision because they concluded that black candidates—or, excuse me, black voters wouldn't know who to vote for unless they had a D beside their name.

That is pandering. That is a racial decision on its face, Mr. Speaker, and America can't tolerate that kind of thinking from a Justice Department that shut down the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in history, Philadelphia.

And so I go on. One of the statements made is in a letter dated August 17. The city received this letter from the Justice Department. Their answer was elections must remain partisan because the change's effect will be strictly racial. In other words, if you don't label the candidates as Democrats or Republicans and you look at the anticipated result of the elections, there might be somebody that's not black that gets elected to office. This is the logic of the Justice Department.

What happened to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream"? What happened to the content of the character rather than the color of the skin? We have come 180 degrees, Mr. Speaker, from the time when Martin Luther King, Jr. stood down here in front of the Lincoln Memorial and gave his "I Have a Dream" speech and inspired a people of this Nation, the people of this Nation and the people of the world

when he talked about content of character, not color of the skin. That's the dream that I've had for America. I was inspired by that speech, and I don't know any American that wasn't inspired by the speech.

But I'm now watching Americans in positions of significant power that have forgotten the philosophy of Martin Luther King, Jr., and they have fallen back to a purely partisan philosophy. This is an Attorney General that declared people that were Republicans as not being willing to discuss the issue of race and being cowards when it comes to the issue of race. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've shown no reticence to discuss that. I think it's important for us to have those open discussions, and if we don't have the open discussions on race, we'll never get to the point where we can actually joke and laugh with each other and be people that are God's children pulling together in the same country for the same cause, which I believe we can and must do, and I think it's God calling to us.

Continuing on in the article, and I will quote Loretta King, who made this, issued this statement from the Department of Justice, and she said, and I quote, "Removing the partisan queue in municipal elections will, in all likelihood, eliminate the single factor that allows black candidates to be elected to office"; Loretta King, who at the time was the Acting Head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, wrote in a letter to the city of Kinston, North Carolina.

She also wrote that voters in Kinston vote more along racial than party lines, and without the potential for voting a straight Democratic ticket, I quote again, Loretta King, "The limited remaining support from white voters for a black Democratic candidate will diminish even more."

Purely a bald-faced racial decision coming from the Department of Justice, and, by the way, from the very DOJ official that formerly killed the case of voter intimidation that was already made in Philadelphia with the new Black Panthers and their billy clubs out in front of the polling places in Philadelphia. That's tolerated by this Justice Department, but being able to go to the polls and vote for someone in a local city election like city council or mayor and not having a party label on them, Democrat and Republican, is not tolerated because this Justice Department does the calculus that somehow it will diminish the elections of Democrats if they're not labeled as Democrats, and they presume that African Americans can't make that decision without the label.

And actually, looking at the Presidential results, you have to wonder, if 96 percent of African Americans voted for Barack Obama, one would be able to draw that as an indication that certainly ethnicity was a factor when they went to the polls. I don't think that can be denied. But again, Loretta King's statement that the limited re-

maining support from white voters for the Democratic candidate will diminish even more. Now, she is, as I said, the same official that put the brakes on the New Black Panther case of voter intimidation.

And then we have a situation where, after a judge ordered a default judgment against the Panthers who refused to answer the charges or appear in court, the Justice Department dropped the charges against all but one of the defendants saying, and I quote, this is very likely Loretta King's statement, "The facts of the law did not support pursuing them."

Really? The most open-and-shut case in the history of the United States of America of voter intimidation, videotaped witness after witness, what facts were not there to support pursuing a case of voter intimidation?

I recall the cases in Florida during the Presidential election of the year 2000 when the case was argued that a mile and a quarter away a traffic check was voter intimidation because some people were going to drive through the traffic stop and show up at the polls. That was the argument made by the party of the same people that have decided that you have to have a label of Democrat on the ballot so that African Americans know who to vote for.

□ 2320

That's what's said here. That's Loretta King's decision. She's in the Department of Justice. Eric Holder is her boss; President Obama is his boss. And they are all accountable for this breach of a constitutional concept, if not the Constitution itself.

Ms. King's letter in the Kinston statements said that because of the low turnout, black voters must be viewed as a minority for analytical purposes and that minority turnout is relevant to determining whether the Justice Department should be allowed to change election protocol.

Really.

Can't we get back again to the content of the character? Is it not possible for someone of good conscience and good character and good judgment to represent other people of good conscience, good character, and good judgment? It had better be, Mr. Speaker, because if we can't, if somehow skin color trumps good conscience, good character, and good judgment, this country is in a very sad shape indeed. How in the world with this logic did this Nation then elect Barack Obama as the President of the United States?

And that would be my question. And I don't think it can be answered by the logic, if you call it that, that's been delivered in this decision that's imposed upon the City of Kinston, North Carolina.

Continuing. Loretta King wrote: "Black voters have had limited success in electing candidates of choice during recent municipal elections." Again, that's candidate of choice. Who's to determine what a candidate of choice is?

That would be the candidate that was voted for by the people who went to the polls. And if people of one color show up in a lower percentage than people of another color, that doesn't mean that they're unrepresented; it doesn't mean that you're supposed to jigger the game in order to produce a different result.

If you don't like the results, look at the way you're represented, make a decision upon the people that are elected to the city council and to the mayor's position in Kinston, North Carolina, and everywhere else in America. But don't base it on skin color as the basis.

This is so un-American, so unconstitutional, and it echoes back to the majority decision that was written by Justice O'Connor in the affirmative action cases at the University of Michigan where Justice O'Connor looked at the formulas that were used to produce the proper color and gender of the people that got into the school in Michigan, be it the broad student body at the University of Michigan or the University of Michigan School of Law. And in her decision, her majority opinion, she wrote that, you know, the Nation wasn't—and I am paraphrasing here—the Nation wasn't quite ready for a colorblind admission process, that we really needed to have a quota system as long as that quota system was based on individual analysis of individual applicants rather than a broader application that would be used as a formula.

And Justice O'Connor also wrote, and again this is paraphrasing, she also wrote that but even though that is the case today, perhaps we should come back and revisit this in 25 years or so. Maybe America will be ready for the kind of a policy that allows for merit rather than skin color or gender to be the qualifications that allows people into law school, Mr. Speaker.

That is breathtaking to me to think that a Supreme Court Justice of the United States, with the support of a bare majority, but a majority of the Supreme Court, could write, could put in print something so utterly illogical that only one could conclude that the decision was if we're going to go back and revisit this in 25 years and determine if the equal protection clause in the 14th Amendment actually will apply if society is ready for equal protection in 25 years, Justice O'Connor concluded that the Constitution itself needed to be suspended for 25 years and maybe we could come back and adhere to the Constitution if it was convenient at a later date in a subsequent generation.

This is the rationale of Justice O'Connor that opens the door for this kind of rationale and Department of Justice, civil rights division, and you could have Loretta King write, Black voters have limited success in electing candidates of choice during recent municipal elections—even though the city is about 2-1 black in turnout—doesn't reflect that and she needs to rig the game so the candidates of her choice

are more likely to be elected without regard to justice. And this is the Justice Department of the United States of America.

Abigail Thernstrom of the Civil Rights Commission blasted the Department's interpretation of the law. And I would agree with Abigail Thernstrom when she said, "The Voting Rights Act is not supposed to be compensating for a failure of voters to show up on Election Day."

And she continues, "The Voting Rights Act doesn't guarantee an opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. My candidate of choice loses all the time in elections." So does mine.

Are we really going to rig the game because our candidate of choice didn't win?

And then also continues, "The decision that employs similar reasoning and language as in other cases of the Kinston ruling"—and here's the decision—"implementation of nonpartisan elections appears likely to deprive black-supported candidates of meaningful partisan-based support and to exacerbate racial polarization between black and white voters."

What could more exacerbate racial polarization between black and white voters than a decision by the Department of Justice, Mr. Speaker, based strictly upon skin color that's designed to give an advantage based upon skin color that disregards the idea that a man or a woman can represent another man or a woman with logic and character and understanding and decency without regard to skin color?

Martin Luther King has got to be rolling over in his grave to see where racial politics have taken the United States of America, Mr. Speaker.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would shift on to a few more subject matters.

As I spoke about the energy issue and the Kinston, North Carolina, issue, I'll take up the issue of Kevin Jennings.

Kevin Jennings, the appointee of President Obama to be the safe and drug-free schools czar. Now, paint that image out in one's mind's eye. All of the schools in America got along fine without someone who was in charge of safe schools. That was a local issue. Drug-free schools, local issue. Nancy Reagan said, "Just Say No," and that got published through our schools and that was a good thing. But we didn't need a safe and drug free schools czar.

Well, now we have one, one of 32—maybe as many as 47 czars—that have been appointed by President Obama. And, Mr. Speaker, these czars have not come under the confirmation hearings, open hearing scrutiny of the United States Senate even though a number of them have power that eclipses that of the Cabinet members themselves. No, these czars are appointed to sometimes circumvent the confirmation process and the vetting process that takes place and just simply give them a job and grant them a power and authority eclipsing, in some cases, that of the Cabinet members who have been vetted

and had hearings and had been confirmed in the United States Senate.

So we have Kevin Jennings, the safe and drug-free schools czar. Kevin Jennings, the man who—and I will go through a list of things—but the part that caught my attention the most and first was as a teacher in Massachusetts—and by law, Kevin Jennings, as a teacher in Massachusetts, was a mandatory reporter, which means under the laws of Massachusetts—and they may have had a different name for it—that is the name for people in Iowa who have to report—if a child that is in your care and custody and responsibility in the class is being abused mentally, physically, or sexually, it's the obligation of the mandatory reporters, which are listed, and all teachers are mandatory reporters, to report to—in Massachusetts, I believe it's their equivalent of HHS, Health and Human Services Department.

Kevin Jennings had a student come in, whom he has written in his book in 1994 and addressed it in the speech in the year 2000. This is Kevin Jennings' words and his analysis, not mine, Mr. Speaker; but his speech and his writings are about a 15-year-old boy who came in and sought the counsel of teacher Kevin Jennings.

□ 2330

He said, Well, I have been having sexual relations with an adult male in the restroom at the bus stop, and I want to talk to you about it. Kevin Jennings' advice was, I hope you knew to use a condom. It seems to be the sum total of his advice, Mr. Speaker. And that is the focus of his repeated narrative of the 15-year-old boy.

Now here are some problems. As a mandatory reporter, this child was being abused. It was a violation of the law. It was statutory rape under Massachusetts law. Kevin Jennings was compelled by law to report this as a teacher, a mandatory reporter. He did not. But he wrote about it in his book. He talked about it in his speeches. And some have argued, after the fact, that the young man was actually 16, not 15. But as long as Kevin Jennings argues that he is 15, then what he knew or what he thought he knew is a controlling factor, and he was obligated to report the sexual abuse of a child, the intergenerational sexual abuse, statutory rape of a child. He did not do that.

And he has repeated himself up until recently, by my documentation, and probably after that, by the year 2000. Now he has been appointed the "Safe and Drug-Free Schools" czar, a man with such a colossal lack of judgment that he couldn't follow the law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to protect the safety of the children. The legislature of Massachusetts, as left-wing as they are, saw fit to put into the law guidelines for their teachers and their other mandatory reporters. And Kevin Jennings, the czar of "Safe and Drug-Free Schools," couldn't see

fit to even follow the law in Massachusetts, let alone possess a moral compass that would have been a prudent one. He has since said he could have made a better decision.

Now I wouldn't argue that a man that made a single mistake in, I believe the year was 1988, should be punished for that in perpetuity. I would argue, though, that a man that made that mistake, that saw fit to highlight it in his book in 1994 or 1995 and highlight it in at least one speech in the year 2000—it happened to be in Iowa, by the way, Mr. Speaker—a man that has that kind of flawed judgment that is standing in front of groups that promote homosexuality and making the case that he has been a protector and advocate of that lifestyle was pretty proud of his decision to advise this young man whom he referred to as "Brewster," "I hope you knew to use a condom."

That is a colossal lack of judgment. The momentary flaw in his judgment in his advice to Brewster, the colossal lack of judgment and repeating it as if it were a merit rather than a demerit in his book and in his speech in Iowa in the year 2000, and I would suspect many times before and after until he has been called on it, a single incident is not enough to judge a man by and not enough to disqualify him by, but it is something to get our attention.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we can look at Kevin Jennings in a broader view. What has been the totality of his record as an adult professional? And his focus has been on the promotion of homosexuality. In at least four books and perhaps five that he has written, every single one at a very minimum touches on the issue. Most of the material focuses on the issue. He has written the foreword to a book called "Queering Elementary Education." Now I will submit that kids that are in kindergarten, first-, second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade in elementary school don't need to be burdened with those kinds of decisions. They don't need an advocate for homosexuality or any kind of sexuality in those years. They need to be left alone to find their way, to study academically, to go outside at recess and play sports, and get to make friends and build an understanding of parental, adult and teacher guidance. They don't need to be burdened with the idea of trying to queer elementary education, to quote the title of the book that Kevin Jennings has written the foreword to. And by the way, on the back cover is William Ayers' comments on the value of that book, "Queering Elementary Education." This is Kevin Jennings.

Now, we can continue with Kevin Jennings, the hostility towards religion that he has demonstrated clearly. He has written about it in his book, "Mama's Boy, Preacher's Son." He has written cavalierly about his own drug abuse. And rather than put that into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I will just say that if students read

the language, the narrative that Kevin Jennings writes about his own drug abuse and being at the airport watching the planes land, they can only draw one conclusion: That it's all right to use drugs and probably won't end up in a bad result. In fact, if you use drugs, you can end up the "Safe and Drug-Free Schools" czar in the United States of America. That is the model that is there if Kevin Jennings remains as the czar of "Safe and Drug-Free Schools."

So what does he have to offer? What does he have to offer about school safety? Well, the only thing he has to offer is his relentless advocacy to pass anti-bullying laws in the State legislatures across the land. About 20 States have adopted some legislation to that effect. Anti-bullying laws are designed to exclusively protect kids who are viewed as homosexual kids. Now I want to protect all kids. And I don't want any children bullied. By the same token, I don't believe that we need to have special laws that are based upon the perceived notions that go on in people's heads. We can punish the overt acts that are used as violence or intimidation against these kids in school, and we can protect all kids.

Kevin Jennings' advocacy has only been to protect those kids he views as homosexual. He has been offended by what he called the "promotion of heterosexuality." And for want of finding the actual text, Mr. Speaker, I will paraphrase this, Kevin Jennings, in one of his speeches—and I actually typed this up with my hands from the YouTube—said that every time kids read "Romeo and Juliet," they are being aggressively recruited to heterosexuality. Kids are being aggressively recruited to heterosexuality by reading "Romeo and Juliet."

So here is a man who is now today the "Safe and Drug-Free Schools" czar who is opposed to "Romeo and Juliet" because the implication is it's a young man and a young woman who are attracted to each other and who are in love. And he objects because he believes they are being aggressively recruited to heterosexuality. What would please and satisfy Kevin Jennings if "Romeo and Juliet" are anathema to his beliefs?

This goes on. But the lifetime career of 20 years and the totality of his professional engagement has been the promotion of homosexuality, much of it within our schools, and much of it that was within our schools was focused on elementary education. And some of the pamphlets that they handed out, one called "Little Black Book," at Brookline schools in Massachusetts was referred to by then-Governor Romney as something that should never fall in the hands of school kids. This man would be a czar of "Safe and Drug-Free Schools."

And when I asked one of the top principals in the United States of America with the medal commemorating his achievement hanging around his neck

if a man of the resume, the bio, of Kevin Jennings had been hired by his school inadvertently and the resume had been discovered and reviewed, could he continue to teach on the faculty of this top-notch principal's school? And the principal's answer was, No way. No way we could keep someone like that on our faculty.

So, Kevin Jennings, Mr. Speaker, at least in the mainstream schools in America, couldn't teach in the classroom because he has been such a proponent of activism when it comes to dealing with a narrow component of sexuality in America. And he has been pushing it on our kids in this country.

He has also been a supporter of and an admirer of Harry Hay. We saw the White House official just a few days ago who said she was inspired by Mao Tse Tung, the murderer of 70 million Chinese. Kevin Jennings has been inspired by Harry Hay, who is the cover boy for NAMBLA magazine, the North American Man Boy Love Association.

□ 2340

That organization that promotes intergenerational sex between men and boys and says it's all right and it doesn't hurt them—in fact, it may give them pleasure and be healthy for them—this person who has been on the cover of their national magazine was lauded by Kevin Jennings, and Jennings said of Harry Hay, I am always inspired by Harry Hay. Astonishing.

A man of this caliber and this philosophy cannot be the safe and drug-free schools czar in the United States of America. Surely, out of 306 million people, we can find one—can't there be one that has lived an exemplary life? One who wouldn't be objectionable to any parents? One who has advocated for the safety of all of the kids, not a narrow view of those whom he would label as a homosexual kid? Couldn't we find somebody that at least hasn't been public about their drug abuse so as to tell these kids to stay away from drugs, that drugs will ruin your potential, if they don't kill you and end your potential, they will ruin your potential? Can't we have somebody that hasn't been obsessed with sexuality, but someone who has been obsessed with the well-being of our children on the whole? Yes, we should. And the kids in this country do not have the ability to discern on a judgment call when you have an activist like Kevin Jennings as the czar of safe and drug-free schools. And those kids trust the adults that put people in positions of authority and power; they only discern that adults have made the decision to approve Kevin Jennings.

The President of the United States needs to fire Kevin Jennings and put someone in place who is an example for parents and children or else eliminate the position entirely, Mr. Speaker.

And now I have vented myself on that particular issue. I continue onward. And in my pocket, as I will carry for a long time until we get to the bottom of this, Mr. Speaker, is, out of one

of the trees right here outside the United States Capitol, another acorn. Now, never fear, Parliamentarian, I'm not going to ask to introduce this acorn into the RECORD. I just point out that this is something that America needs to be focused upon.

The ACORN organization and their 361 affiliates, headquartered at 2609 Canal Street in New Orleans, Louisiana, originating in Arkansas and having powerful influence in cities such as Chicago, Philadelphia, New York—Brooklyn, for example—Baltimore, Washington, D.C., San Diego—name your city, 120 cities in the United States, ACORN has a presence; ACORN, the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now. And these are the people that started out advocating for bad loans in bad neighborhoods under the Community Reinvestment Act, shaking down lenders and intimidating lenders to make those bad loans in bad neighborhoods; the people that came to the Capitol building and lobbied to reduce and lower the standards of underwriting for a secondary mortgage market for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, lowered their capitalization, their regulatory standards so that they could push these lenders into making more bad loans in bad neighborhoods.

They criticized lenders for red-lining neighborhoods and refusing to loan into these neighborhoods that they had a red line drawn around. And then they had the audacity—that's the President's word, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? Then ACORN had the audacity to go back to these lenders, shake them down, demand a check so that they would move their demonstrations away from the doors of the banks so people would come in and do business. Once they were paid off, they left, but then they came back with another ruse, which is, you need to make more bad loans in these bad neighborhoods—that's the shorthand version. They didn't use that language, I'm sure.

And ACORN got to the point where they drew their own red line. Instead of the lenders drawing a red line around areas and communities and refusing to make loans, ACORN drew a red line around areas and communities and demanded that the lenders make loans into that area, and they demanded specific dollar amounts of loans on real estate, in particular, going into those areas. And so then they positioned themselves to actually broker the loans.

And ACORN Housing opened up, and people walked into those doors like Hannah Giles and James O'Keefe. They walked in with a video camera, and there they posed themselves as a pimp and a prostitute and said that they wanted to borrow some money to buy a home so they could set up a house of ill repute to put teenage girls in as prostitutes, 13-, 14-, 15-year-old girls from El Salvador, obviously illegal kids, in a sex slave arrangement being organized and facilitated by workers at ACORN

in Baltimore, to start out—the film is in sequential order—then Washington, D.C.; then Brooklyn, New York; then San Bernardino, California; then San Diego, California.

All of that unfolded, and what we saw inside the doors of ACORN was essentially the same thing. We saw the face of a criminal enterprise that was set up to draw down tax dollars of all kinds, primarily Federal tax dollars, in a corrupt criminal enterprise to help facilitate child prostitution and gaming the IRS for child tax credits, for—I didn't hear him say first-time homeowners credit, but I did hear them say earned income tax credit.

And so the taxpayers of America are writing checks that are being brokered by ACORN in any way that they possibly can, passing that through into the hands of the individuals who are the beneficiaries of government largesse. And the administration of it is that it's ACORN that takes a cut out of the dollars that go through.

Five cities we saw the film. I believe, tomorrow, we will see the sixth city, the film from the sixth city. And I believe that there are more beyond that yet, Mr. Speaker.

And so this country has got to clean this up. We have an ACORN that has corrupted the home mortgage loan process. They have demanded and maneuvered for bad loans in bad neighborhoods. They have precipitated the decline, and the toxic mortgage component of this economic decline very much traces back to ACORN.

ACORN has admitted to over 400,000 fraudulent or false voter registration forms turned in in the last election cycle. They have denied that that turns into fraudulent votes, Mr. Speaker. Now, why would anyone spend millions of dollars to register hundreds of thousands of fraudulent voters and at the same time argue, well, we paid for all of that—on commission, by the way, so many registrations per pay day—but we didn't get anything out of it because these 400,000 were fraudulent or false, so don't worry, nobody voted illegally? Not true. It is unconceivable, Mr. Speaker. And I have made that argument for months, but here and a couple of weeks ago the story hit the news about Troy, New York, bringing prosecutions against ACORN because of dozens of fraudulent votes that were introduced in Troy, New York, and the ones that I read about were absentee ballots.

So we have the convictions of 70 ACORN employees. We have ACORN under indictment in the State of Nevada as a corporation to be in violation of the election laws in Nevada, and 361 affiliates. All of this we've got to get to the bottom of, Mr. Speaker.

I do appreciate your attention and your indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 20, 2009]

JUSTICE CONCLUDES BLACK VOTERS NEED
DEMOCRATIC PARTY
(By Ben Conery)

KINSTON, N.C.—Voters in this small city decided overwhelmingly last year to do away with the party affiliation of candidates in local elections, but the Obama administration recently overruled the electorate and decided that equal rights for black voters cannot be achieved without the Democratic Party.

The Justice Department's ruling, which affects races for City Council and mayor, went so far as to say partisan elections are needed so that black voters can elect their "candidates of choice"—identified by the department as those who are Democrats and almost exclusively black.

The department ruled that white voters in Kinston will vote for blacks only if they are Democrats and that therefore the city cannot get rid of party affiliations for local elections because that would violate black voters' right to elect the candidates they want.

Several federal and local politicians would like the city to challenge the decision in court. They say voter apathy is the largest barrier to black voters' election of candidates they prefer and that the Justice Department has gone too far in trying to influence election results here.

Stephen LaRoque, a former Republican state lawmaker who led the drive to end partisan local elections, called the Justice Department's decision "racial as well as partisan."

"On top of that, you have an unelected bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., overturning a valid election," he said. "That is un-American."

The decision, made by the same Justice official who ordered the dismissal of a voting rights case against members of the New Black Panther Party in Philadelphia, has irritated other locals as well. They bristle at federal interference in this city of nearly 23,000 people, two-thirds of whom are black.

In interviews in sleepy downtown Kinston—a place best known as a road sign on the way to the Carolina beaches—residents said partisan voting is largely unimportant because people are personally acquainted with their elected officials and are familiar with their views.

"To begin with, 'nonpartisan elections' is a misconceived and deceiving statement because even though no party affiliation shows up on a ballot form, candidates still adhere to certain ideologies and people understand that, and are going to identify with who they feel has their best interest at heart," said William Cooke, president of the Kinston/Lenoir County branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Cooke said his group does not take a position on this issue and would not disclose his personal stance, but expressed skepticism about the Justice Department's involvement.

Others noted the absurdity of partisan elections since Kinston is essentially a one-party city anyway; no one among more than a half-dozen city officials and local residents was able to recall a Republican winning office here.

Justice Department spokesman Alejandro Miyar denied that the decision was intended to help the Democratic Party. He said the ruling was based on "what the facts are in a particular jurisdiction" and how it affects blacks' ability to elect the candidates they favor.

"The determination of who is a 'candidate of choice' for any group of voters in a given jurisdiction is based on an analysis of the

electoral behavior of those voters within a particular jurisdiction," he said.

Critics on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights are not so sure. "The Voting Rights Act is supposed to protect against situations when black voters are locked out because of racism," said Abigail Thernstrom, a Republican appointee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. "There is no entitlement to elect a candidate they prefer on the assumption that all black voters prefer Democratic candidates."

Located about 60 miles from the Atlantic Coast in eastern North Carolina, Kinston has a history of defying governmental authority. During Colonial times, the fledgling city was known as Kingston—named for King George III—but residents dropped the "g" from the city's name after the American Revolution.

In Kinston's heyday of manufacturing and tobacco farming, it was a bustling collection of shops, movie theaters and restaurants. Now, many of those buildings are vacant—a few have been filled by storefront churches—and residents are left hoping for better days.

In November's election—one in which "hope" emerged as a central theme—the city had uncommonly high voter turnout, with more than 11,000 of the city's 15,000 voters casting ballots. Kinston's blacks voted in greater numbers than whites.

Whites typically cast the majority of votes in Kinston's general elections. Kinston residents contributed to Barack Obama's victory as America's first black president and voted by a margin of nearly 2-to-1 to eliminate partisan elections in the city.

The measure appeared to have broad support among both white and black voters, as it won a majority in seven of the city's nine black-majority voting precincts and both of its white-majority precincts.

But before nonpartisan elections could be implemented, the city had to get approval from the Justice Department.

Kinston is one of the areas subject to provisions of the landmark 1965 Voting Rights Act, which requires the city to receive Justice Department approval before making any changes to voting procedures. Kinston is one of 12,000 voting districts in areas of 16 states, almost exclusively in the South, that the Voting Rights Act declared to have had a history of racial discrimination.

In a letter dated Aug. 17, the city received the Justice Department's answer: Elections must remain partisan because the change's "effect will be strictly racial."

"Removing the partisan cue in municipal election will, in all likelihood, eliminate the single factor that allows black candidates to be elected to office," Loretta King, who (at the time) was the acting head of the Justice Department's civil rights division, wrote in a letter to the city.

Ms. King wrote that voters in Kinston vote more along racial than party lines and without the potential for voting a straight Democratic ticket, "the limited remaining support from white voters for a black Democratic candidate will diminish even more."

Ms. King is the same official who put a stop to the New Black Panther Party case. In that case, the Justice Department filed a civil complaint in Philadelphia after two members of the black revolutionary group dressed in quasi-military garb stood outside a polling place on election day last year and purportedly intimidated voters with racial insults, slurs and a nightstick.

After a judge ordered default judgments against the Panthers, who refused to answer the charges or appear in court, the Justice Department dropped the charges against all but one of the defendants, saying "the facts and the law did not support pursuing" them.

Ms. King's letter in the Kinston case states that because of the low turnout black voters

must be "viewed as a minority for analytical purposes," and that "minority turnout is relevant" to determining whether the Justice Department should be allowed a change to election protocol.

Black voters account for 9,702 of the city's 15,402 registered voters but typically don't vote at the rates whites do.

As a result of the low turnout, Ms. King wrote, "black voters have had limited success in electing candidates of choice during recent municipal elections."

"It is the partisan makeup of the general electorate that results in enough white cross-over to allow the black community to elect a candidate of choice," she wrote.

Mrs. Thernstrom of the civil rights commission blasted the department's interpretation of the law.

"The Voting Rights Act is not supposed to be compensating for failure of show up on Election Day," she said. "The Voting Rights Act doesn't guarantee an opportunity to elect a 'candidate of choice.' . . . My 'candidate of choice' loses all the time in an election."

When asked whether Justice had ever "either granted or denied" requests either "to stop partisan elections or implement partisan elections," Mr. Miyar, the department spokesman, said it was impossible to retrieve past decisions on that basis.

But he did provide, based on the recollection of a department lawyer, a single precedent—a decision during the Clinton administration denying a bid from a South Carolina school district to drop partisan elections.

That decision employs similar reasoning and language as the Kinston ruling: "Implementation of nonpartisan elections . . . appears likely to deprive black supported candidates of meaningful partisan-based support and to exacerbate racial polarization between black and white voters."

But the 1994 decision doesn't mention the necessity of the Democratic Party and doesn't mention low turnout among black voters in that school district as a factor affecting their ability to elect candidates they prefer.

Kinston City Council member Joseph Tyson, a Democrat who favors partisan elections, said nothing is stopping black voters in Kinston from going to the polls.

"Unfortunately, I'm very disappointed with the apathy that we have in Kinston among the Afro-American voters," he said.

Mr. Tyson, who is one of two black members of the six-member City Council, said the best way to help black voters in Kinston is to change the council's structure from city-wide voting to representation by district. Kinston voters currently cast as many votes in the at-large races as there are council seats up for election—typically three, or two and the mayor.

"Whether it's partisan or nonpartisan is not a big issue to me, whether or not the city is totally represented is what the issue is to me," he said. "If you have wards and districts, then I feel the total city will be represented."

Partisan local elections are a rarity in North Carolina. According to statistics kept by the University of North Carolina School of Government in Chapel Hill, only nine of the state's 551 cities and towns hold partisan elections.

The City Council could take the Justice Department to court to fight decision regarding nonpartisan elections, but such a move seems unlikely. The council voted 4-1 to drop the issue after meeting privately with Justice Department officials in August.

"What do I plan to do? Absolutely, nothing," Mr. Tyson said. "And I will fight, within Robert's Rules of Order, wherever necessary to make sure that decision stands."

The Justice ruling and Kinston's decision not to fight it comes in the wake of a key Voting Rights Act case last year. In that decision, the Supreme Court let a small utility district in Texas seek an exemption from the law's requirements to receive Justice Department approval before making any changes to voting procedures. But the court declined to address whether the law itself is constitutional.

Critics of the law argue it has changed little since its 1965 inception and that the same places the law covered then no longer need Justice Department approval to make changes to voting procedures.

Proponents, including Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr., said the law is still necessary to ensure equal voting rights for all Americans.

In Kinston, William Barker is the only City Council member who voted to continue discussing whether to challenge the Justice Department's ruling.

He said he voted against eliminating partisan elections because the proposed new system would declare a winner simply on who received a plurality of votes instead requiring candidates to reach certain threshold of votes based on turnout.

"Based on the fact that the voters voted overwhelmingly for it, I would like to see us challenge it based on that fact. My fight is solely based on fighting what the voters voted on," he said. "It bothers me, even though I'm on the winning side now, that you have a small group, an outside group coming in and saying, 'Your vote doesn't matter.'"

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. SHADEGG (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. WALDEN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending a memorial service in Alaska for his late wife.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUIGLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 23, 26 and 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 23, 26 and 27.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 23.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, today and October 22.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, October 21.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, October 26 and 27.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, October 23, 26 and 27.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today, October 21, 22 and 23.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3183. An act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, 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 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 21, 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:

4160. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C10-C18-Alkyl dimethyl amine oxides; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0690; FRL-8437-3] received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4161. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0713; FRL-8793-2] received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4162. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a letter on how the office will obligate the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 HIDTA discretionary funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Navy, transmitting a letter notifying Congress of a performance decision by the Department of the Navy to convert to contract the training and administrative support functions performed by 78 military personnel at various locations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4164. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indi-

ana; Extended Permit Terms for Renewal of Federally Enforceable State Operating Permits [EPA-R05-OAR-2008-0031; FRL-8963-4] received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4165. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Operating Permit Programs; Flexible Air Permitting Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0087; FRL-8964-8] (RIN: 2060-AM45) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4166. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Coal Preparation and Processing Plants [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0260; FRL-8965-3] (RIN: 2060-AO57) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 102-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4168. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 097-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4169. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 070-09, certification of a proposed agreement for the export of defense services or defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4170. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 079-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4171. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 101-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 126-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4173. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 107-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4174. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 100-09, certification of proposed issuance of an ex-

port license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 106-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4176. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 026-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 116-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4178. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 096-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 114-09, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4180. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4181. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4182. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4183. A letter from the Solicitor, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4184. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 111-68); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

4185. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting first annual report entitled, "Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008", pursuant to Public Law 110-403; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4186. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operaton Regulations; Raritan River, Arthur Kill and their tributaries, Staten Island, NY and Elizabeth, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0202] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4187. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Parker US Open Nationals; Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0474] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4188. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0884] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4189. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Anchorage Areas; Henderson Harbor, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0854] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4190. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1852-DR for the State of Maine; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security.

4191. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1853-DR for the State of Nebraska; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security.

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. POLIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 846. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3585) to guide and provide for United States research, development, and demonstration of solar energy technologies, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-304). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3792. A bill to amend title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for providing life-saving care for those with HIV/AIDS (Rept. 111-305). 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. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 3845. A bill to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism and protect civil liberties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 3846. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide additional civil liberties protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. CONYERS:

H.R. 3847. A bill to provide appropriate authority to the Department of Justice Inspector General to investigate attorney misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3848. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to provide authority for Inspectors General to subpoena former agency employees, agency contractors, and employees of contractors for testimony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3849. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to require notice to Congress of certain declassifications of intelligence information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. KRATOVIL (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 3850. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of nutria in Maryland, Louisiana, and other coastal States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3851. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to publish physical activity guidelines for the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3852. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve and reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KOSMAS (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 3853. A bill to provide for the establishment of Commercial Space Transportation Cooperative Research and Development Centers of Excellence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona):

H.R. 3854. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve programs providing access to capital under such Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 3855. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to make clear that each decennial census, as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, shall tabulate the total

number of persons in each State, and to provide that no information regarding United States citizenship or immigration status may be elicited in any such census; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3856. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for osteoporosis and related bone disease education, research, and surveillance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 3857. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to make service performed as an employee of a nonappropriated fund instrumentality after 1965 and before 1987 creditable for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3858. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to alter the terms and conditions applicable to members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3859. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions and expenditures by multi-candidate political committees controlled by foreign-owned corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3860. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Propanenitrile, 3-[[4-(substituted)azo]phenyl] (substituted)amino]-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3861. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,1'-[(6-phenyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diyl)diimino]bis[3-acetyl-4-amino]-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3862. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benz[cd]indolium, 1-ethyl-2-[1,2,3,4-

tetrahydro-1-(2-hydroxyethyl)-2,2,4-trimethyl-6-quinolinyl]-,chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3863. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Chromate(3-), bis[3-(hydroxy-kO)-4-[[2-(hydroxy-kO)-1-naphthalenyl]azo-kN1]-7-nitro-1-naphthalenesulfonate(3-)-, trisodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3864. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (Alkylamino-hydroxyphenyl)azohydroxysubstituted benzene, substituted [(hydroxy-naphthalenyl) hydroxybenzene], chromium complex, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3865. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-Propanaminium, 3,3'-[(9,10-dihydro-9,10-dioxo-1,4-anthracenediyl)diimino]bis[N,N,N-triethyl-, bis(ethyl sulfate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3866. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1H-Pyrazole-3-carboxylic acid, 4-[[4-[(2,3-dichloro-6-quinoxaliny)carbonyl]amino]-2-sulfophenyl]azo]-4,5-dihydro-5-oxo-1-(4-sulfophenyl)-, trisodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3867. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cuprate(4-), [2-[[[3-substituted]-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]-2-hydroxy-5-sulfophenyl](substituted)azo], sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3868. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,5(or 1,8)-diamino-2-bromo-4,8(or 4,5)-dihydroxy-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3869. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ethanol, 2,2'-[[6,13-dichloro-3,10-bis[[2-(sulfooxy)ethyl]amino]triphenodioxazinediyl]bis(sulfonyl)] bis-, bis(hydrogen sulfate) (ester), potassium sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3870. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,5-diamino-4,8-dihydroxy(4-hydroxyphenyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3871. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 5-[[4-(acetylamino)-2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]azo]-6-amino-4-hydroxy-, monosodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3872. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Substituted cyan acetic acid pentyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3873. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Anthracenesulfonic acid, 1-amino-9,10-dihydro-4-[[4-[[methyl[(4-methylphenyl)sulfonyl]amino]methyl]phenyl]amino]-9,10-dioxo-, sodium salt (1:1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3874. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Anilino-5-cyano-(3-(substituted)-6-(substituted))-4-methylpyridine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3875. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 100 percent cotton woven color wall fabric, dyed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3876. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 100 percent cotton narrow woven fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3877. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 100 percent cotton dyed knit fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3878. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1-amino-2-[[4-[(hexahydro-2-oxo-1H-azepin-1-yl)methyl]phenoxy]-4-hydroxy-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3879. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 100 percent dyed cotton single knit fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3880. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on b-Alanine, N-[3-(acetylamino)-4-[[2,4-dinitrophenyl]azo]phenyl]-N-(3-methoxy-3-oxopropyl)-, methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3881. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 7H-Benzimidazo[2,1-a]benz[de]isoquinolin-7-one, 9(or 10)-methoxy-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3882. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1H-Indene-1,3(2H)-dione, 2-(4-bromo-3-hydroxy-2-quinolinyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3883. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ethanol, 2,2'-[[4-[[3,5-dinitro-2-thienyl]azo]phenyl]imino]bis-, diacetate (ester); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 3884. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1-amino-4-hydroxy-2-phenoxy-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 844. A resolution honoring Dr. Earnestine Thomas-Robertson for 31 years of service in Academia at Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC), in the Los Angeles Community College District, the largest community college district in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H. Res. 845. A resolution recognizing the United States Air Force and Dyess Air Force Base for their success in achieving energy savings and developing energy-saving innovations during Energy Awareness Month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr.

LANCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MACK, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATTA, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H. Res. 847. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any conference committee or other meetings

held to determine the content of national health care legislation be conducted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. BLUNT):

H. Res. 848. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should support repairing and rehabilitating United States national transportation infrastructure, including bridges not located on a Federal-aid highway; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 849. A resolution recognizing the 16th anniversary of the Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) program, a program funded by the Government of the United States to provide an opportunity for high school students from the countries of the former Soviet Union to study and live in the United States in order to promote democratic values and institutions in Eurasia, and supporting the mission, goals, and accomplishments of the FLEX program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 850. A resolution supporting the establishment and full funding of a staff exchange program between the House of Representatives and the Parliament of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada, as soon as possible; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H. Res. 851. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 40th anniversary of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, headquartered in Sacramento, California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 211: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 275: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 333: Mr. JONES and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 422: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 460: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 471: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 482: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 503: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 504: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 510: Mr. ARCURI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 558: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 571: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 616: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 635: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 644: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 678: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 739: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 745: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 776: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 847: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 855: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 932: Mr. HOLT and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 950: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 953: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 988: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. HARE.

- H.R. 1017: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1019: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1030: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1168: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1175: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1177: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1189: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 1207: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1215: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1245: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1255: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1298: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 1324: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1326: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1428: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1458: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1523: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1526: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1549: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CHU, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1552: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1677: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1681: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1685: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1690: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1719: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1721: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1751: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1766: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1792: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1835: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1846: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1849: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1908: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1916: Mr. CHILDERS.
H.R. 1925: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1927: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2002: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2017: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2024: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2030: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2046: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2057: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 2084: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2106: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2107: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 2109: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2138: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2177: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2205: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2214: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2246: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2251: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2254: Mr. BARROW, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2256: Mr. MARSHALL and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2266: Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 2269: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2329: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2339: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2361: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2381: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2452: Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2478: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2480: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 2490: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2502: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 2541: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2548: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2567: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2573: Mr. CAO.
H.R. 2672: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 2736: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2753: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2777: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2807: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2866: Mr. GRAVES and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2874: Mr. NYE and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 2894: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2906: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2937: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2964: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2995: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3010: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3069: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3075: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3100: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3126: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 3202: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 3226: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3227: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3238: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3245: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3264: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 3276: Mr. INSLLEE.
H.R. 3286: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3328: Ms. WATERS and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3355: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3359: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3365: Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3375: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3421: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3457: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 3458: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3463: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 3485: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3545: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 3554: Mr. HODES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3560: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3564: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3569: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3586: Mr. DRIEHAUS and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3589: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HODES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3596: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 3602: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3611: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3613: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 3633: Mr. WEINER and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3636: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3644: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3654: Mr. CAO.
H.R. 3677: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3683: Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3691: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 3700: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3712: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3723: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 3724: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3728: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3731: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3734: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3749: Mr. SPACE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3766: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3772: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3789: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARP-ER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3790: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BARROW, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3791: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 3792: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 3797: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3800: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3820: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 3837: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. REYES.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. UPTON.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. MINNICK.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H. Con. Res. 161: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 198: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H. Res. 22: Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 89: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 159: Ms. HIRONO.
H. Res. 213: Mr. CUELLAR.
H. Res. 236: Mr. MINNICK.
H. Res. 255: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 558: Ms. CLARKE.
H. Res. 615: Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 619: Mr. MANZULLO.
H. Res. 648: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. REYES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 656: Mr. WOLF and Mr. ROONEY.
H. Res. 660: Mr. CLYBURN.
H. Res. 672: Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 699: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. MCKEON.
H. Res. 700: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 704: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 711: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KILROY, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. FOX, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 716: Mr. PERRIELLO.
H. Res. 727: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 729: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 736: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H. Res. 740: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H. Res. 749: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Res. 752: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H. Res. 756: Mr. REYES and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H. Res. 761: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 764: Ms. SPEIER.
 H. Res. 773: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. COBLE.
 H. Res. 780: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. TITUS.
 H. Res. 783: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H. Res. 787: Mr. BARROW, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H. Res. 796: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 797: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MASSA, Mr. COBLE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
 H. Res. 801: Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Res. 811: Mr. FOSTER.
 H. Res. 817: Ms. CHU, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 819: Mr. LEE of New York.
 H. Res. 823: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H. Res. 831: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CAO.

H. Res. 838: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H. Res. 840: Mr. CAO and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Section	Description of provision	Requested by
1302	Certificate of Documentation for St. Mary's Cement.	Thomas E. Petri Bart Stupak
1302	Certificate of Documentation for Dry Dock #2.	Don Young

Furthermore, the manager's amendment contains no limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(f) or 9(g) of rule XXI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GORDON, or a designee, to H.R. 3585, the Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The Amendment No. ___ to be offered by Mr. OBERSTAR, of his designee, to H.R. 3619 contains the following earmarks as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI:

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 874: Mr. SCHRADER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

[Omitted from the Record of October 16, 2009]

Petition 5 by Mrs. BLACKBURN on H.R. 391: John A. Boehner.