



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2009

No. 155

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 26, 2009, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2009

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose providence our forebears brought forth a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equal justice for all, give the Members of this body that same spirit as they seek to make a better world. May this quest for justice motivate them to eliminate those things that obstruct the coming of Your kingdom.

Each day, may they give primacy to prayer, seeking Your guidance as they strive to make decisions that honor You. Guide them by Your higher wisdom so that they will not give in to disappointment, doubt, or despair.

We pray in Your great name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONCERNS REGARDING FUNDING FOR HOME HEALTH CARE AGENCIES

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address concerns I have with the cuts in home health care agencies in the reform package. I applaud the hard work that has gone into crafting this legislation; however, I want to make sure that home health care services for our seniors are not interrupted in our efforts to target waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system.

Home health care agencies, for example, are one of the most cost-effective ways to provide health care, especially in rural areas. In Maine, 86 percent of the home health care agencies will be operating in the red if we pass the cuts in the bill.

It is crucial that we address these cuts in a way that promotes efficient, high quality care, but does not put the access to health care in rural areas at risk. I am hopeful that we will be able to make this legislation better and pro-

vide quality, affordable health care to all Americans, so that Maine's seniors and home health care agencies in Maine will not be faced with an 86 percent cut in Medicare reimbursements that will force them to operate in the red.

SOUNDS LIKE SOMEBODY'S GETTING A TAX HIKE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the new reformed, revised, special edition version of the Senate health care bill written in the dark, secret caverns of the Capitol is a whopping 1,500 pages long. Americans for Tax Reform did a word search on the bill and they found some interesting words.

Right here on this chart, the word "tax" is used 124 times. You know, that is the government's favorite word. "Taxes," 16 times; "excise tax," 12 times; "taxpayers," 79 times. Here is a bad one, "taxable," 158 times. That is a whole lot of taxes in this bill.

Of course, the words "tax exempt" are found only 15 times in the bill. There are some more bad words like "penalty" and "require" and "must." And here is a bad one, "shall," 2,585 times in this tax bill—I mean health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, these are some bad words, totaling 3,196 words about taking money from the American taxpayer.

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.

H111715

Sounds like somebody is getting a tax hike. No wonder the bill was written in the secret caverns out of public view in this Capitol.

And that's just the way it is.

POSITIVE UPDATE ON RECOVERY PACKAGE

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a positive update on the progress of the recovery package.

When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act came before Congress earlier this year, I had to make a tough decision on how I would vote. I am happy that I voted for the recovery.

We have had recovery funds go towards improving infrastructure, funding our medical research, and improving our schools for our children. Just last week, my district received over \$20 million in stimulus funds to improve water quality and almost \$2 million in medical research funding.

The positive impacts of this legislation are being seen across the State of Ohio and the country. A report recently shows that the Recovery Act has saved or created about 1 million jobs. In fact, in the last month, unemployment has dropped in each of the 12 counties that I represent in Ohio.

With almost three-fourths of the stimulus funds still set to be released, I expect to see additional jobs saved and created across the country and in my district. I am excited to see the progress that we are making and will continue to make.

SUCCESS IN AFGHANISTAN IS VITAL TO PROTECTING AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Obama was correct when he stated as a candidate for President last year, "Our troops and our NATO allies are performing heroically in Afghanistan, but I have argued for years that we lack the resources to finish the job . . . And that is why, as President, I will make the fight against al Qaeda the top priority that it should be. This is a war we have to win."

Our President has chosen CENTCOM Commander David Petraeus and General Stanley McChrystal to implement a strategy in Afghanistan that would train Afghani security forces, destroy terrorist elements, prevent the Taliban from providing safe haven to terrorists, and promote political and civil development in Afghanistan.

Moving forward, we must provide the reinforcements that General McChrystal has requested. Indecision will only endanger our soldiers and empower our enemies.

I agree with Vice President Dick Cheney: The President is dithering. Democrats and Republicans should join, as President Obama said in his Democratic acceptance speech, to finish the fight against the terrorists.

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

PROVIDING TRANSPARENCY IN HEALTH CARE PRICING

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, isn't it time we had transparency in all health care pricing? Wouldn't you like to know the price of a pill before you buy it? Wouldn't you like to know the price of the greatest discount a hospital offered at your location? Wouldn't you like to know the lowest price an insurance company accepted for payment in full for their health insurance policy?

This is a picture of several pills you can buy at a grocery store, and the price is always openly disclosed. Isn't it time that Congress passed legislation to guarantee that, at all times, any business entity that offers medical products and services for sale to the public openly disclose all of their prices and then accept the lowest price from everybody that they have accepted from anybody else? Isn't it time we had transparency in health care pricing?

THE FORGOTTEN U.S. TAXPAYER

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the forgotten U.S. taxpayer. On Wednesday, Neil Barofsky, the special inspector general overseeing TARP, said that recouping the billions of dollars given to the insurer AIG and automakers GM and Chrysler "is far from certain." He also noted that \$50 billion set aside to help struggling homeowners lower their mortgage payments will yield "no direct return."

Also on Wednesday, the former chief of the Obama administration's task force on the auto industry, Steven Rattner, commented on the \$20 billion previously lent to GM, "I don't think we are going to see it again," meaning that all the money is gone.

What is wrong with this picture? \$50 billion here, \$20 billion there. What am I missing? How can we spend, spend, spend without any accountability?

I am concerned as I travel across Kansas, my great State, that I hear countless Kansans express doubts that Congress and bureaucrats would make wise decisions with their tax dollars. They were right. With some of these unwise investment decisions that I mentioned today, I think a dose of Kansas commonsense is desperately needed in Washington, DC.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, many victims of domestic violence are afraid to tell their story. They are afraid to get help or don't know how. These men, women, and children need someone to stand up for them, to know where to turn. That is what Domestic Violence Awareness Month is all about. In fact, this October is the 20th anniversary of legislation to establish this event.

Domestic violence is shockingly common. One in four American women and almost 10 percent of men will be sexually or physically assaulted by a spouse, intimate partner, or acquaintance at some point in their life.

I strongly support full funding of domestic violence programs for fiscal year 2010. This money is sorely needed. According to a recent study, last year, on one day alone, 10,000 people were turned away from local domestic violence programs due to a lack of resources.

I pledge to work on behalf of domestic violence victims here in Congress. I want survivors to know how much I respect and commend them for their bravery, and I want them to know there are services and support groups that can help.

CONGRATULATING FORT BEND, TEXAS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my home county of Fort Bend, Texas, for having the third highest increase in jobs during the first quarter of last year among the Nation's largest 334 counties. It is impressive, given that of those 334 counties, only eight saw any job increase at all.

We already know what a special place Fort Bend is to live and raise a family. For more than 15 years, Fort Bend has been in the top 20 counties in the United States for economic excellence and population growth. Excellent schools, affordable housing, and extensive recreational facilities have attracted families with impressive demographic profiles. And this creates a local employment base that provides relocating companies with a diverse mix of professional, technical, skilled, and unskilled labor with the highest educational attainment levels in the region.

I am very proud of Fort Bend County for this economic accomplishment, and my family and I feel very fortunate to call it home.

SENATE EXERCISING PETTY PARTISANSHIP ON UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, exactly one month ago today the House cast aside partisanship to work together and overwhelmingly pass legislation to extend unemployment benefits, which are running out for an average of 7,000 Americans every day.

While my Republican colleagues in the House recognize that unemployment is an American issue that transcends politics, Senate Republicans are oblivious to the urgent need to pass legislation because people are hanging on by their fingernails. Instead, the Senate Republicans have a choke hold on legislation to extend unemployment insurance benefits, and Americans who need the help the House passed a month ago aren't going to get helped until Senate Republicans stop playing partisan games.

There are positive signs the economy has turned the corner, but the Senate Republicans know what everyone else knows, that unemployment always takes longer to recover. But they still have a choke hold on the bill, which is a choke hold on nurturing the economic recovery.

A caller to my office this morning put it best: There is one reason you may not be able to buy food for your family next week, and it is called the Senate Republicans. Maybe they are the ones who ought to be out of work.

Maybe then the Republicans in the Senate would understand what it means to look to Washington for leadership but see petty partisanship instead.

Release the choke hold and pass the bill to extend unemployment benefits. Thousands of Americans can wait no longer.

□ 0915

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING THE EFFECT OF PROPOSED HEALTH CARE REFORM ON SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the majority party's proposed government takeover of health care and its devastating consequences for small businesses across the Nation. Despite continued calls from me and my Republican colleagues for a bipartisan approach that expands access to affordable health care to all Americans, the majority party insists on engaging in closed door meetings that ignore the input of a significant proportion of Congress and the millions of constituents they represent.

Among the most damaging elements of their proposal is a punitive new tax on small businesses that cannot afford to provide the coverage the Federal Government decides is acceptable. My Republican colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee offered numerous amendments to protect the small businesses that drive our economy from these and other burdensome mandates that threaten their viability, but our attempts were rejected.

Madam Speaker, it is time to push the reset button on this flawed proposal. Members of all political persuasions need to start fresh and work in good faith to bring meaningful health care reform to our constituents and keep our small businesses thriving.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Pursuant to House Resolution 853 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3619.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 22, 2009, amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated No. 7.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 182, after line 14, insert the following:

(g) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated for the Fishing Safety Training Grants Program pursuant to section 4502(i) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment is straightforward and, I believe, non-

controversial. It should be familiar to those of us here. The underlying bill establishes a new competitive grant program called the Fishing Safety Training Grants program. This amendment would simply prevent the new grant program from being a vehicle for earmarking.

I try to offer this amendment as often as I can when new grant programs are established. The reason I do this is because, unfortunately, we have a history now of these grant programs being established and, even if the underlying legislation says that they are to be awarded on the basis of merit or on a competitive basis, then, oftentimes, a little down the road, many of these grant programs are earmarked, some of them, we have learned through sad experience, almost completely earmarked.

Competitive grant programs earmarked by Members of this body, we simply can't have that. Now, I question why the Federal Government is using taxpayer dollars to fund training for individuals who operate commercial fishing vessels. I think that that's something that commercial fishing organizations ought to do themselves. However, if we are going to do this, then we should at least ensure that these grants are awarded on a competitive basis and aren't earmarked.

And so I hope that this can be adopted. I should note that in the 110th Congress, this similar amendment was adopted to H.R. 2357, the Beach Protection Act. It was approved by a roll call vote of 263-117. And in the 111th Congress, this amendment was accepted on three separate occasions, each time by voice vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I do not intend to oppose the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I want to compliment the House's own version of Survivor Man, not only on surviving on a desert island and doing so very skillfully and astutely. Most of the time when Members of our body wind up with a story in The Washington Post, it's for some misdeed or misappropriation of funds. This was a remarkable story of personal strength and courage that I suspect derives from the gentleman's own upbringing and mission abroad for the church, and for his ability to survive under difficult conditions.

He's also been a survivor on his campaign, Mr. Chairman, to limit earmarks. And this is one case in which our committee agrees with the gentleman. On Page 177, Lines 4 and 5, the bill reads: the Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis. But also, as the gentleman has pointed out, notwithstanding such language in other bills,

there have been deviations from the programmatic language, often by the other body, but also, on occasion, in this body.

We feel that these grants ought to be awarded competitively and, for that reason, very specifically wrote this language into the bill. I suspect that after the vigorous hearings that Chairman CUMMINGS has held over the past 2½ years, exposing failures of the Coast Guard contracting program, that this language will be honored and will be adhered to.

As to the reason for the training grants, this is the deadliest industry by a great many measures. In fact, there is a program on television on fishing entitled "The Deadliest Catch," and it tracks those who put out to sea to earn their living in dangerous circumstances. The safety training grants will deal with those and other similar situations. So on the policy side, I simply want to defend the provision.

But I concur with the gentleman on his concern, and we will accept the amendment.

At this point, I would yield to the gentleman from Maryland, Chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Mr. OBERSTAR, for your comments. Thank you for yielding. I agree with you. We've already done basically what the gentleman wants done. And I just want to add something, Mr. OBERSTAR, and that is that this has been something that our subcommittee has—this fishing problem, and safety is something that we've taken extremely seriously. The Bureau of Labor Statistics names commercial fishing as the most hazardous occupation in the United States. For the 11-year period from 1994 through 2004, 641 fishermen and -women lost their lives on fishing vessels, and so we take it very seriously.

I also want to thank the gentleman for constantly making sure that we do what you're hoping that we would do. We did it. Congratulations. And so, therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair, and I thank the chairmen of the committee and subcommittee for their vigilance here to make sure that these awards, these grants, are awarded out on a competitive basis. That's what we're seeking here. I'm glad that's going to happen.

For the record, I found no earmarks on Jabonwod, the island that I stayed on. It was an incredible experience. Thanks for mentioning it.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. I'd like to rise in support of amendment, thank Mr. FLAKE, and say that the Republicans on the committee are supportive of the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 8.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 182, after line 14, insert the following:

(g) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated for the Fishing Safety Research Grant Program pursuant to section 4502(j) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical. It simply deals with a separate grant program established by the underlying bill. This one would refer to the Fishing Safety Grant, the fishing Safety Research Grant program, whereas the last one was the Fishing Safety Training Grants program. So I believe the same arguments apply here.

And with that, if the gentleman will agree to accept the amendment again, then I'll be prepared to yield back the balance of my time. But for now, I'll reserve.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise to claim time in opposition, though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The language of this provision is similar to the previous: to establish a Fishing Safety Research Grant program for academia, members of nonprofit organizations, businesses involved in fishing and maritime, to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of commercial fishing industry, vessel design, survival equipment.

The gentleman ought to be very concerned about survival equipment. He's a survivor himself. Vessel monitoring systems, de-icing technology and severe weather detection, the gentleman had none of those on the island. He didn't have any equipment to detect severe weather or absence of water. He didn't have a water finder; he had to create his own water using the sun. So he's the antithesis of this language.

But the issue is not the underlying policy. The issue really is competitive basis award of grants. I think the gentleman's language will reinforce the purpose of the committee.

Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Once again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for laying that out. And I thank the gentleman for his vigilance with regard to these types of issues. Similar to the previous amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE, which prohibits earmarking of the grants to be awarded under the Fishing and Safety Training Grant program, this amendment would prohibit earmarking of the grants authorized by H.R. 3619. The Fishing Safety Research grant is a complement of the Fishing Safety Training program. The research grant program would provide funding to individuals in academia, members of nonprofit organizations and businesses involved in fishing and other maritime matters and other persons with expertise in the fishing industry to support research to identify measures that will improve safety in this industry. And of course these would be bid on a competitive basis.

But the one thing I did want to say, and I know that the chairman of the committee will agree with me, I must give a lot of credit to Congressman BARNEY FRANK, who worked tirelessly on these issues. And I know I've had at least 10 to 12 conversations with him. I know he's met with the chairman, and I just wanted to make sure that we gave him credit because he has championed this like nobody I've ever known, and I just wanted to say that.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out, that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has been a vigorous advocate for his fishing community, which is largely a Portuguese immigrant community of long ancestry; and he really has been a strong advocate, along with Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. —. STRATEGY REGARDING DRUG TRAFFICKING VESSELS.

Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, acting through the Commandant of

the Coast Guard, shall develop a comprehensive strategy to combat the illicit flow of narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband through the use of submersible and semi-submersible vessels. The strategy shall be developed in coordination with other Federal agencies engaged in detection, interdiction, or apprehension of such vessels. At a minimum, the strategy shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the threats posed by submersible and semi-submersible vessels, including the number of such vessels that have been detected or interdicted.

(2) Information regarding the Federal personnel, technology and other resources available to detect and interdict such vessels.

(3) An explanation of the Coast Guard's plan, working with other Federal agencies as appropriate, to detect and interdict such vessels.

(4) An assessment of additional personnel, technology, or other resources necessary to address such vessels.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today because, while I speak about securing our borders to stop the illegal crossings of drugs, weapons, and people, it is important to remember that our physical border is just one line of defense.

Our fight against the drug cartels—which operate the smuggling routes—actually begins in the jungles of South America. Much of the cocaine that enters the United States today originates in South America before working its way north. For years, the United States, Colombian, and Mexican governments have increasingly cracked down on the major smuggling routes.

As these paths have been squeezed, the cartels have found new and innovative ways to move their product. Recently, the traffickers have begun resorting to semi-submersibles, which are submarine-like boats that skim just below the surface of the water.

To further avoid detection, these boats incorporate advanced technology, including a design that reduces their ability to be detected by radar and utilizing water-cooled exhaust mufflers to reduce their heat signal. They can travel up to 3,000 miles without stopping for refueling, allowing crews to move cocaine from secret shipyards along the Colombian coast to safe harbors in Mexico where they join the land trafficking routes that take the drugs across the land border and into the United States.

With these advances, semi-submersibles are extremely difficult for authorities to track or even locate once they take to sea.

With an estimated 70 boats being deployed this year alone with the sustaining cargo capabilities of up to 10 tons, it is not surprising that over one-third of the cocaine reaching the United States is shipped this way. Even worse, these boats can just as easily be used to smuggle weapons or potential terrorists into the country.

Although the Coast Guard does an excellent job with the resources available to stop these vessels, the fact remains that it is a tough task, and only a small percentage of semi-submersibles are captured.

My amendment calls on the Coast Guard to establish a comprehensive strategy to combat the illegal flow of narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband through the use of semi-submersible and submersible vessels.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Yes, I'll yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Even as we discussed this amendment, the U.S. Coast Guard has interdicted a self-propelled semi-submersible vessel in the Eastern Pacific with a multi-ton load of narcotics on board. Smuggling using submersible and semi-submersibles have become a part of the increasingly sophisticated smuggling operation.

We accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Thank you.

As part of this plan, the Coast Guard will address what additional resources they need to get the job done so we can make sure they get the help they need. Our fight against the cartels is constantly evolving, and we must continue to support those on the front line in adapting new strategies.

Therefore, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. As the gentlelady stated and the chairman stated, this is something that the Coast Guard plays a critical role in their interdiction. We have dealt with the issue of submersibles and semi-submersibles to combat the growing drug threat. We need to give the Coast Guard the authority to do this.

We're happy to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Yes, I'll yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much.

I'll be very brief, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to congratulate Mrs. KIRKPATRICK for this outstanding amendment. As our ranking member said, this is something the committee has been addressing for a while. But what we now want to do is make sure that the efforts of the Coast Guard are most effective and efficient, and the study and looking into this is what this

is all about. And I think this will allow us to accomplish a lot more with regard to the equipment that we have.

I've actually seen these submersibles many times. As a matter of fact, I was just in Colombia and Mexico and actually saw them and saw they had been used to get around the Coast Guard.

And I know for a fact that they welcome this amendment, and I want to thank you very much because basically what you've done, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, is you've made a very good bill even better.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVLIL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. KRATOVLIL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. KRATOVLIL:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE ON MISSION FULFILLMENT.

(a) STUDY.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall conduct a national study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's prescribed missions and capabilities, and ensure that the department in which the Coast Guard is operating maintains the ability to utilize the latest technologies.

(b) REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant shall submit a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. The report shall include—

(1) an assessment of any current shortfalls in facility infrastructure, including the extent of the use of temporary trailers and an inventory of the number and type of new facilities needed to meet the Coast Guards's mission needs; and

(2) a plan for how the Commandant will develop the appropriate facility infrastructure, including timelines, budgets, and any additional legislative authority the Commandant determines is required to implement such plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVLIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KRATOVLIL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3619 because I believe it is our duty to ensure the Coast Guard has top-notch facilities and infrastructure in order to

effectively play its part in keeping America safe.

My amendment requires the Commandant of the Coast Guard to conduct a national study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's prescribed mission and capabilities. This amendment is needed to assess the prevalence and effects of the Coast Guard operating out of temporary facilities and buildings.

In Maryland's First District, my district, as an example, the Coast Guard is operating out of a double-wide temporary trailer shared with NOAA operations in Oxford, Maryland. The Oxford Coast Guard does not own its own pier and must lease space from a commercial pier nearly 1 mile away from the temporary trailer. This temporary arrangement could be, obviously, affecting operations and mission capability.

My amendment requires a report to Congress that must include an assessment of any shortfalls in facility infrastructure, including the extent of the use of temporary trailers, an inventory of the number and type of new facilities needed to meet the service's mission, and a plan for how the Commandant of the Coast Guard will develop the appropriate facility infrastructure, including timelines, budgets, and additional legislative authority the Commandant determines is required to implement the plan.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a commonsense means towards ensuring those entrusted with protecting our coasts and shorelines are being given the right tools and facilities to do so effectively.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has repeatedly requested information on the condition and the need for additional Coast Guard shoreside facilities. The gentleman's amendment would require the service to submit a report detailing current shortfalls and future shoreside needs.

We congratulate the gentleman. We fully support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRATOVIL. The gentleman will yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I compliment the gentleman on this amendment. As Mr. LOBIONDO said just a moment ago, there are serious needs, a \$1 billion backlog in the Coast Guard's shore construction program, and the gentleman's amendment is right on point, and I commend him for offering it.

And if the gentleman would yield to the Chair of the subcommittee, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I will yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I rise in very strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL). This amendment will require the Coast Guard to develop a national inventory of its office buildings and other facilities to assess its facilities' shortfalls. However, we realize there is a service backlog, as the chairman just said, of \$1 billion, a shore facility repair backlog, that is.

So basically what this will do is allow the Coast Guard to more effectively and efficiently address this backlog.

And again, this is a very thoughtful amendment. I want to congratulate the Congressman and sponsor for submitting it. And again, I strongly support it and would urge our colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for their leadership. I appreciate and also thank the other side of the aisle for their support and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. NYE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. NYE:
Page 312, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ AUTHORITY OF THE COAST GUARD TO CARRY OUT ITS HOMELAND SECURITY MISSIONS.

The provisions of this Act that relate to the Coast Guard's marine safety mission shall not impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions, including—

(1) protecting ports, waterways, and marine transportation systems in the United States from acts of terrorism;

(2) safeguarding the United States' international borders from maritime intrusions by aliens seeking unlawful entry into the United States, and from individuals who aim to traffic in illegal drugs, firearms, and weapons of mass destruction in the United States;

(3) maintaining defense readiness, as one of the armed forces, to rapidly mobilize and deploy defensive security personnel during a national emergency;

(4) coordinating efforts with Federal, State, and local intelligence agencies to deter, detect, and take action against acts of terrorism;

(5) preventing human smuggling operations at ports, on waterways, and throughout the marine transportation system; and

(6) enhancing stability in the United States in support of the national security strategy of the United States as referred to in section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support a commonsense, yet necessary, amendment which will make clear the Coast Guard's critical role in the homeland security of America.

The Coast Guard security mission is not new. Since 1790, the Coast Guard has served as America's principal law-of-the-sea entity with a maritime responsibility of 6 million square miles. However, today the Coast Guard must manage multiple security responsibilities as it faces the extremely difficult challenge of enforcing increasingly complex laws against highly sophisticated adversaries.

Since 9/11, the U.S. has expanded dramatically its port security activities to the more than 300 U.S. ports and millions of Americans who live, work, or recreate near them. This is especially important to my constituents in Hampton Roads. I represent one of the largest ports in the United States, the Port of Virginia. The Port of Virginia is the deepest, newest, and biggest port on the east coast, capable of handling ships loaded 26 containers across.

Last month alone, Virginia's Norfolk International Terminal processed 89,359 container units. With the expanded reopening of the Panama Canal in 2014, the port will only grow, and it will be the mission of the Coast Guard to ensure the safety of all of those affected by its commerce.

The purpose of this amendment is simple. The Coast Guard is a multiple-mission armed force that must have uninhibited freedom to flex its military and security powers and respond to numerous concerns and threats in the maritime domain. This amendment makes clear that this is the most important mission of the Coast Guard, and nothing shall hinder that responsibility.

It is important to note that this amendment does not create new authorizations. It simply makes clear the continued importance of protecting our waterways and ports, maintaining defense readiness and coastal security, and securing our borders against aliens seeking to unlawfully enter the United States.

Americans deserve to know that they will continue to be safe from maritime threats. This amendment does just that by clarifying the Coast Guard's homeland security missions.

I commend to all of my colleagues this commonsense amendment, and I urge its support.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NYE. I will yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE). It's an outstanding amendment. This amendment states that none of the provisions relating to marine safety included in H.R. 3619 would impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions.

I support the amendment and its intention, and I urge its adoption.

That said, the Transportation Committee and the Coast Guard Subcommittee have examined the Coast Guard's performance of its marine safety mission in great detail and have significant concerns that the service has assigned inexperienced and unqualified individuals to conduct casualty investigations, vessel inspections, and other marine-safety functions.

The shortcomings in the program have been well documented by the Homeland Security's inspector general, by retired Coast Guard Vice Admiral James C. Card, and by the committee's own examination of the Cosco Busan allision in San Francisco. And so certainly the provisions of this amendment will be extremely helpful in helping us again help the Coast Guard be most effective and efficient in its efforts, and it can only improve the bill and improve an already great organization, the United States Coast Guard, our thin blue line at sea.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chair, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE) for the following reasons:

The amendment specifies that the marine safety provisions in H.R. 3619 shall not impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions.

The Coast Guard constantly monitors maritime transit zones and the Service's law enforcement authority enables it to apprehend foreign fishing vessels engaged in poaching and interdict vessels carrying illegal drugs, firearms and undocumented migrants.

The Committee has held several hearings regarding the Coast Guard's marine safety program over the past three years. Commandant Thad Allen was very concerned about the condition of the marine safety program, so he asked retired Admiral Jim Card to conduct a thorough analysis of the program. Admiral Card confirmed all of the problems that had been raised by industry and mariners during these hearings. H.R. 3619 addresses these programmatic shortfalls in the marine safety program.

The Coast Guard is a multi-mission agency and it is important that it carries out all of its missions in an effective manner—from marine safety and search and rescue, to homeland security.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment that clarifies that nothing in the marine safety portions of H.R. 3619 will affect the Coast Guard's legal authority to execute its homeland security mission.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

□ 0945

Mr. NYE. I thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for their support, and I yield back the balance my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise as the designee of Mr. STUPAK to offer the amendment on his behalf.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

At the end of title 11, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall conduct a study and analysis of the feasibility of the restoring the Fresnel Lens in the Presque Isle Light House in Presque Isle, Michigan to operating condition to meet the safety needs of commerce and submit within 180 days the report to the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the Presque Isle Lighthouse at Presque Isle Township on the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is very important, has served a very important navigational purpose over many, many years on those stormy waters of Lake Superior. Those are treacherous waters. Unlike the ocean where waves have a long distance, hundreds of miles to play themselves out, the waters of the Great Lakes, and particularly of Lake Superior, even with a surface of 33,000 square miles, are short and choppy and harsh and brutal in the coming months of November, December, January, February.

The Presque Isle Lighthouse has saved many a mariner. It continues to operate, but its light has been replaced by one of more modern quality and capability with much greater candle power, much greater visibility, and longer distance than the Fresnel lens that the Coast Guard has used for probably 150 years; not only the Coast Guard, but other marine navigation services. Fresnel lenses are treasured historical pieces, but they are not navigational pieces any longer.

The gentleman's amendment would require the Coast Guard to do a study

of the feasibility of reinstalling the Fresnel lens in the lighthouse in a condition so that it can provide safe navigation to commercial vessels on Lake Huron or at the juncture point of the upper waters and also serve as a supplement to the existing light.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. We are happy to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. LOBIONDO:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ USE OF FORCE AGAINST PIRACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding title X of this Act, chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 8107. Use of force against piracy

“(a) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—An owner, operator, time charterer, master, or mariner who uses force, or authorizes the use of force, to defend a vessel of the United States against an act of piracy shall not be liable for any injury or death caused by such force to any person participating in the act of piracy.

“(b) PROMOTION OF COORDINATED ACTION.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall work through the International Maritime Organization to establish agreements to promote coordinated action among flag-and port-states to deter, protect against, and rapidly respond to acts of piracy against the vessels of, and in the waters under the jurisdiction of, those nations, and to ensure limitations on liability similar to those established by subsection (a).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“8107. Use of force against piracy”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, pirates attacked two American-flag vessels transiting waters off the Horn of Africa. If it were not for the heroic actions of our Special Forces, the bravery

of the captain and the crew of these vessels, a terrible tragedy would have been at hand. Just yesterday we got reports that a Panamanian-flagged vessel had been seized by pirates with hostages being taken. We cannot allow this to continue.

Knowing this would be an ongoing problem, the bill, as it was reported from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, included a very carefully worked out bipartisan agreement that we worked with Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, and myself that would shield U.S. merchant mariners, ship owners, operators, and captains from liabilities in U.S. courts following any action taken to defend a U.S.-flagged vessel, for instance, taken to defend the United States of America against a pirate attack.

Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee objected and requested Chairman OBERSTAR add language to his recently adopted manager's amendment that appears to be an entanglement for getting the right thing done. The way the Judiciary Committee has worded this in the manager's amendment, a crewmember would be forced to go through a checklist in his mind or her mind of what legal entanglements could occur because of this.

The language in the manager's amendment only grants relief liability to the crew owner, meaning the vessel owners or operators and captains would still be sued. They would not be held without harm. They would have monetary damages, possibly.

Our amendment restores this bipartisan agreement. It's a commonsense agreement, something that the people on the committee worked out. It makes no sense in the heat of an attack, when you have got pirates coming at a U.S.-flagged vessel with automatic machine gunfire, with rocket-propelled grenades, or whatever else may happen, to suggest that a crewmember is going to be able to take the time to check through what is substantially or in excess or whatever the case is. We need to protect American interests.

Under our amendment, an American crewmember would only need to prove that the person attacking the vessel was a pirate in order to receive liability relief.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I fully share the desire of the sponsor of the amendment to effectively combat piracy on the high seas, but I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

As he has pointed out, the manager's amendment does address this issue and does so consistently with well-established, long-observed legal traditions

which go back to the ancient civilizations of Rome and Babylon. The language in the bill, now with the manager's amendment, incorporated language of the Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary Committee in place of what was in the introduced bill.

Now this amendment, unfortunately, goes too far. It grants absolute immunity within the United States on our lakes and rivers to violence against our own citizens. Now, the difference in the two provision, one carefully crafted by the Judiciary Committee and now the one being offered on the floor, is not about enabling ship's crews to respond to piracy. Both do that fine. The difference is that this amendment would eliminate all legal restraints. There will be no legal accountability, not even under criminal law. When they say no liability, the way the bill is drafted, it would be you could commit crimes against people and still be exempt.

Now, I can't imagine that the sponsor actually meant to do this. I think he is talking about civil liability. But when he says—the language in the bill, with the manager's amendment, says that you are totally immune unless you knew what you were doing was substantially in excess of what was necessary.

The language in the amendment, however, is not even limited to a civil liability. It's not even limited to during the attack. It could be after the attack when no one is under any danger, and there is no limit on what crimes can be committed at that point.

I would hope, whether this amendment is adopted or not, if there are still concerns about the amendment, that we would work together cooperatively as we go forward to make sure that we give the crewmembers all of the flexibility they need in these situations without going too far and allowing crime and torture and everything else under criminal law.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, while I know the Judiciary Committee may be well-intended—the Judiciary Committee has the responsibility to make certain and ensure that citizens' rights are protected—we are not talking about any act that is committed within waters of the United States. In fact, there are laws and definitions that rule enforcement and legal proceedings. We are talking about an act of piracy on the high seas.

We are talking about the way the Judiciary Committee has constructed this language that we now have a piracy or a pirate protection provision in the bill that we worked so hard on in a bipartisan manner to make certain that we give every tool possible to those who man our vessels, American-

flagged vessels on the high seas, to take on pirates with whatever force they need. We don't need to have a test and read them their Miranda rights and a whole host of normal, civil procedures.

What we need to do is give those who are being attacked, when we see murder and mayhem on the high seas, give them the tools to respond adequately. Just like a citizen would defend their own home or their own property, we have American-flagged vessels that deserve the protection of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

I urge its adoption.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a couple of questions to the sponsor of the amendment, if he would respond.

My first question would be whether it's his intent, because the language under the amendment does not limit it to the high seas, is it your intent to limit this application to high seas?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Well, under title 18, an act of piracy is defined as happening on the high seas. The intention is to defend against an act of piracy and, as defined by law, it has to be on the high seas.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, I would ask another question, Mr. Chairman.

Is it your intent to limit this to the application of civil law and not criminal law? Would you exempt owners and operators from criminal acts?

Mr. LOBIONDO. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, you do exempt them from criminal acts?

Mr. LOBIONDO. For civil.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Just civil.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Just civil.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the wording, as it is, says that an owner-operator who uses force or authorized the use of force to defend a vessel of the United States against an act of piracy shall not be liable for any injury or death caused by such force.

That does not limit it, in its present version, to civil. It would actually exempt him from any liability, that would include criminal. I would hope that the gentleman, whatever happens to the amendment, would work cooperatively so that we would limit it to the intent as he has articulated today.

Mr. LOBIONDO. We certainly would be happy to work with you to make sure that we are in synchronization with what we are all understanding.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Just to close, again, the manager's amendment, the crewmember of the vessel would have to prove in court that he knew at the time, she knew at the time, that the defensive actions were not substantially in excess of what is reasonable. That's not what's going to happen if a piracy attack occurs.

I don't think any Members are going to even want to be close to voting for a piracy protection provision in line with what's going on. What does substantially in excess of reasonable mean? A crewmember is going to have to think through this checklist as a pirate attack is happening?

That's not what we have in mind. I don't think it's the right way to go. I would urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this amendment to make sure that U.S. interests are protected.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment printed in House Report 111-311 on which further proceedings were postponed:

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. KRATOVIL of Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVIL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 0, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 812]

AYES—398

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocciari
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher

Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Boyd
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Duncan

LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
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
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Quigley

Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
NOT VOTING—40
Davis (TN)
Dreier
Engel
Faleomavaega
Forbes
Gohmert
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Inslee
Jones
Lofgren, Zoe
Maffei
Maloney

□ 1040

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 812 I was not able to vote on the House floor on the amendment to H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act offered by Representative KRATOVIL due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 812 the amendment offered by Representative KRATOVIL from Maryland, which requires the USCG to conduct a study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's missions and capabilities and report the findings within 180 days. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendments being in order, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 853, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the question on adoption of the further amendments will be put en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 11, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 813]

YEAS—385

Ackerman Donnelly (IN) Lance
 Aderholt Doyle Langevin
 Adler (NJ) Driehaus Larsen (WA)
 Akin Duncan Larson (CT)
 Alexander Edwards (MD) Latham
 Altmire Edwards (TX) LaTourette
 Andrews Ehlers Latta
 Arcuri Ellison Lee (CA)
 Austria Ellsworth Lee (NY)
 Bachmann Emerson Levin
 Bachus Engel Lewis (CA)
 Baird Eshoo Lewis (GA)
 Baldwin Etheridge Linder
 Barrow Fallin Lipinski
 Bartlett Farr LoBiondo
 Barton (TX) Fattah Loeb sack
 Becerra Filner Lowey
 Berkley Fleming Lucas
 Berman Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
 Berry Foster Luján
 Bilbray Foxx Lummis
 Bilirakis Frank (MA) Lungren, Daniel
 Bishop (NY) Frelinghuysen E.
 Blackburn Fudge Lynch
 Blumenauer Gallegly Mack
 Blunt Garrett (NJ) Manzullo
 Boccieri Gerlach Marchant
 Boehner Giffords Markey (CO)
 Bonner Gingrey (GA) Markey (MA)
 Bono Mack Gonzalez Marshall
 Boozman Goodlatte Massa
 Boren Gordon (TN) Matheson
 Boswell Granger Matsui
 Boucher Graves McCarthy (CA)
 Boustany Grayson McCarthy (NY)
 Brady (PA) Green, Al McClintock
 Brady (TX) Green, Gene McCollum
 Bright Griffith McCotter
 Brown (SC) Grijalva McDermott
 Brown, Corrine Guthrie McGovern
 Brown-Waite, Gutierrez
 Ginny Hall (NY) McHenry
 Buchanan Hall (TX) McIntyre
 Burgess Halvorson McKeon
 Burton (IN) Hare McMahan
 Butterfield Harman McMorris
 Camp Harper McNeerney
 Campbell Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)
 Cantor Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)
 Cao Heinrich Mica
 Capito Heller Michaud
 Capps Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Carnahan Herger Miller (MI)
 Carney Herseth Sandlin Miller (NC)
 Carson (IN) Hill Miller, Gary
 Carter Himes Miller, George
 Cassidy Hinchey Minnick
 Castle Hirono Mitchell
 Castor (FL) Hodes Mollohan
 Chaffetz Hoekstra Moore (KS)
 Chandler Holden Moore (WI)
 Childers Holt Moran (KS)
 Chu Honda Moran (VA)
 Clarke Hoyer Murphy (CT)
 Clay Hunter Murphy (NY)
 Cleaver Inglis Murphy, Patrick
 Clyburn Israel Murphy, Tim
 Coble Issa Murtha
 Coffman (CO) Jackson (IL) Myrick
 Cohen Jackson-Lee Nadler (NY)
 Cole (TX) Napolitano
 Conaway Jenkins Neal (MA)
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA) Neugebauer
 Conyers Johnson (IL) Nunes
 Cooper Johnson, E. B. Nye
 Costa Johnson, Sam Oberstar
 Costello Jordan (OH) Obey
 Crenshaw Kagen Olson
 Crowley Kanjorski Olver
 Cuellar Kaptur Ortiz
 Cummings Kennedy Pallone
 Dahlkemper Kildee Pascrell
 Davis (CA) Kilpatrick (MI) Pastor (AZ)
 Davis (IL) Kilroy Paulsen
 Davis (KY) Kind Payne
 Deal (GA) King (NY) Pence
 DeFazio Kingston Perlmutter
 DeGette Kirk Perriello
 Delahunt Kirkpatrick (AZ) Peters
 DeLauro Kissell Peterson
 Dent Klein (FL) Petri
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kline (MN) Pingree (ME)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kosmas Pitts
 Dicks Kratovil Platts
 Dingell Kucinich Poe (TX)
 Doggett Lamborn Polis (CO)

Pomeroy Schock
 Posey Schrader
 Price (GA) Schwartz
 Price (NC) Scott (GA)
 Putnam Scott (VA)
 Quigley Serrano
 Radanovich Sessions
 Rahall Sestak
 Rangel Shea-Porter
 Rehberg Sherman
 Reichert Shimkus
 Reyes Shuler
 Rodriguez Shuster
 Roe (TN) Simpson
 Rogers (AL) Sires
 Rogers (KY) Skelton
 Rohrabacher Slaughter
 Rooney Smith (NE)
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NJ)
 Roskam Smith (TX)
 Ross Smith (WA)
 Rothman (NJ) Snyder
 Roybal-Allard Souder
 Luján Space
 Ruppersberger Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
 Salazar Spratt
 Sanchez, Linda Stark
 T. Stearns
 Sanchez, Loretta Stupak
 Sarbanes Sullivan
 Scalise Suttton
 Schakowsky Tanner
 Schauer Taylor
 Schiff Teague
 Schmidt Terry

Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Friday, October 23, 2009. If I were present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall 812, On Agreeing to the Kratovil of Maryland Amendment to H.R. 3619 and "yea" on rollcall 813, On Final Passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3619, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3619, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) the majority leader, for the purposes of finding out about next week's schedule. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 A.M. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We'll consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 3854, the Small Business Financing and Investment Act of 2009. We also will consider the conference report, H.R. 2996, on the Department of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and also a House joint resolution making further appropriations for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, otherwise known as a CR. The CR, as the gentleman from Virginia knows, will run out on the 31st of this month.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the gentleman about some reports that we've been hearing about other bills that could perhaps come to the floor next week, and I wonder if he could add

NAYS—11

Broun (GA) King (IA) Sensenbrenner
 Courtney Paul Shadegg
 Flake Royce Tiahrt
 Franks (AZ) Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie Cardoza Maffei
 Baca Culberson Maloney
 Barrett (SC) Davis (AL) McCaul
 Bean Davis (TN) Melancon
 Biggert Dreier Richardson
 Bishop (GA) Forbes Rogers (MI)
 Bishop (UT) Gohmert Rush
 Boyd Higgins Thornberry
 Braley (IA) Hinojosa Walden
 Buyer Insole Wamp
 Calvert Jones Wexler
 Capuano Lofgren, Zoe Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute is left in the vote.

□ 1057

So 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:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813 I was not able to vote on the House floor on the passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813, final passage of the Fiscal Year 2010 U.S. Coast Guard Authorization Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor today, Friday, October 23, 2009, due to illness. As a result, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 812 and 813.

Had I been present: On rollcall vote No. 812 I would have voted "aye" and on rollcall vote No. 813 I would have voted "yea."

some clarity to that. There have been reports that perhaps an estate tax bill would be coming to the floor next week. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We're working with the Ways and Means Committee and would like to bring to this floor in the next few weeks, at least, if not next week, a bill to deal with the estate tax issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, would ask further whether we can expect that bill to include the statutory PAYGO provisions and whether that bill would be compliant with those provisions. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yes on both questions. We will probably have, either in the bill or by rule, we'll adopt statutory PAYGO, which we pledged to do in our budget, as you know, and it will be compliant.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to reiterate so, in my understanding, that would mean that the estate tax bill would be paid for if it came to the floor of the House. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman will recall, I would remind the House, Mr. Speaker, the budget that we passed provided for baseline spending for four items, that is to say, that the baseline which is, essentially, the premise that I think your party has adopted with respect to tax legislation, that the estate tax, the alternative minimum tax, the middle income tax cuts and the so-called "doc fix," the sustainable growth rates, would be scored at baseline, which means effectively you would not pay for them.

And I would expect us to comply with that budget provision, giving those four exceptions of which the estate tax is one.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, what I'm hearing is that neither the estate tax bill nor the other items included in the budget resolution passed would be paid for, and that there would be an assumption somehow that that money would just be taken care of. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It's sort of like your assumptions when we have tax bills on the floor, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that observation. Again, I just wanted to make the point that, again, as we are in unprecedented times incurring debt unlike we have ever in this country, that these obviously very important bills that need consideration are coming to the floor without being paid for contributing to the exacerbation of the debt situation on our children and their children. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, further—

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I would yield to the gentleman, sure.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman, of course, knows that if we don't act on

the estate tax that there will be a great cost next year. The gentleman's aware of that which will itself exacerbate the budget.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd respond to the gentleman, he and I both know that we actually have shared position on the fact that we need to address the uncertainty surrounding the cliff, if you will, in the estate tax expiration of the repeal.

But, again, if we are in the age of being very concerned about the deficit, the Members, I believe, on our side need to know that the bills coming to the floor are not paid for. They may be compliant with provisions in the budget resolution, but simply are not paid for. And the assumptions made about baseline are just those.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield again?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Given my friend's concern, would the gentleman join me in supporting and getting the votes for a statutory PAYGO on its own? I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOYER. Because of our concern about the deficit, which I share.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say, that I, as well as other Members of our leadership and our conference certainly would be willing to engage in crafting solutions as to how we go about implementing PAYGO provisions without raising taxes because, as we know now, families across this country are hurting, small businesses are having difficulty keeping lights on. And now, certainly is not the time for us to see increased taxes on the working families or small businesses of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman further about what we could expect in terms of the reports surrounding the so-called "doc fix" on the sustainable growth rate formula and whether we can expect such a bill to come to the floor next week and whether that bill would be paid for. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As you know, when the former administration was in office, we regularly passed the doc fix which, as you know, wasn't paid for. We think that's not appropriate. But we agree with you that now is not the time to raise taxes. However, we also understand that if we do not address the sustainable growth rate for doctors, that Medicare recipients won't have doctors to go to. We want to ensure that Medicare recipients do in fact have providers who can meet their medical needs.

As a result, Senator REID, as you know, tried to pass the sustainable growth rate modification so there wouldn't be a 21 percent cut in January to doctors. Unfortunately, all of your party voted against that and 13 of my party voted against that, so it lost 47–53. But we believe that that's going to be addressed one way or another so

that we assure and we intend to do that, to assure our Medicare recipients that they will not lose the services of their doctors.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman again, might we expect that bill to come to the floor next week? And if not, when could we expect such a bill to come to the floor? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm not sure that we're going to have it next week, but I can assure the gentleman that we do intend to address the issue so that doctors do not confront a 21 percent cut in their Medicare reimbursements for Medicare patients, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And if I could, Mr. Speaker, turn the gentleman's attention to the question of the bill that Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN and Chairman BERMAN are working on in terms of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has indicated to me, as well as to the chief deputy whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, last week that that bill would be coming to the floor within the next few weeks, and would ask the gentleman, does he expect the bill on the floor next week or the week following? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As I have said, Mr. BERMAN expected to mark up the bill, as is my expectation, and Mr. BERMAN will be marking up the bill. As the gentleman probably knows, that bill is subject to joint jurisdiction or co-jurisdiction by three other committees, the Oversight Committee, the Financial Services Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, so they will have to do their work on that bill as well.

But I do look forward to moving that bill, as the gentleman, as I've indicated in the past, and not only that, I want to say to the gentleman, I look forward to discussing it with him in the next couple of days.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that, and appreciate his efforts to try and bring that bill to the floor. I know he and I share a commitment to try and make that happen as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman where we stand as far as the schedule for November and December. As we know now, we are within a week or so of the October 30 targeted adjournment. I guess all of us understand that that is not going to be met. But we've not been given a schedule; and as the gentleman knows, Members on his side as well as ours are used to having some advance notice about scheduling their lives and when they can be home with their families, their constituents, when they will be asked to be here in Washington performing their duties. And I don't recall that we've ever been in a situation where there's not been an official schedule issued this far or this close up to an adjournment.

So I'm asking the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if he could tell us, officially,

what the schedule could be for the next month and the month succeeding that. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have, for at least 3 weeks now, been indicating what I thought the schedule was going to be in November. As you know, a little earlier this week I modified that. As I caveated when I announced that we would be meeting the first and third weeks of November, and not the second week of November—because Veterans Day, which all of our Members want to be home with those memorializing those we have lost in the defense of freedom and celebrating those who have served in defending freedom and democracy. Our Members want to be with their fellow citizens at home accomplishing that objective, including myself and, I'm sure, yourself.

The fact is, however, I also caveated that with, if we could pass health care we may use a portion of that week. Therefore, let me make it very clear officially, if you will, that I do not expect and do not plan that we'll be here Thanksgiving week. I expect us to be here the first and third weeks, from Monday through Friday of November.

On the second week of November, which starts with the 9th of November, I want Members to make available and ask their schedulers now for Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th as possible dates, possible on which we would meet. The contingency will be whether or not we can move the health care bill, which we believe is the most important piece of legislation that we'll consider, and probably both sides believe that, whatever their view of what they're going to do on that legislation, that we will consider.

And if, in fact, it's possible to pass it prior to Tuesday the 10th, then we will possibly be in on Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th. On Tuesday the 10th we would meet no later than 3 p.m.

In December—I've had discussions with the majority leader in the Senate. We are of the opinion that we certainly ought to make every effort and will make every effort to be out of this session, the first session of this Congress, by Friday the 18th of December. The following week is Christmas week and we certainly, my view is, want to have people home on Christmas week. And I have no intention of meeting the following week either. We are in discussions about the first, the month of January, not just the first 2 weeks, but the month of January. I'm hopeful that fairly soon I'll be able to announce what we want to do on that.

□ 1115

As a matter of fact, I would be glad to have discussions with the gentleman from Virginia on that issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I would just reiterate the custom, which is to release an official schedule so that, as he knows, Members can do their planning.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. We all want that. But I think anyone who has served any time in the House or the Senate knows that as you begin to wind down a session—in this case the first session of this Congress—legislation passing between the two bodies dictates your schedule more than simply arbitrarily saying we'd like to be out on this day. And as a result, we will have to see where we are as we move along.

The Interior bill I was hopeful that we would consider 2 weeks ago, it's on the schedule for this coming week. As you know, we were unable to get to agreement. We now appear to have got an agreement in the conference, and we're ready to move forward.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Again, whether we are in or whether we are out, I don't think we're advocating a position of being out and certainly not completing work.

But, again, it is rather unprecedented where we are without the ability for us to have an official schedule, which is why I continue, Mr. Speaker, to prod on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if I could then turn to the question of the piece of legislation that the gentleman referred to, health care reform, and about its timing and, frankly, the inclusion of a public option.

We've been hearing a tremendous number of reports—many of them conflicting—about what will be the timing of the health care bill coming on the floor of this House, what may be included. Again, we are in a position being kept in the dark, which is rather odd given the repeated insistence by this White House and the President—both as he is our President now and when he was a candidate for President, when he proclaimed that negotiations over important bills—and, of course, this would be one of them—would occur in the light of day and even appear on C-SPAN. That's obviously not been the case.

We've heard yesterday from the Speaker quoted in the press that she had the votes for a public option. We then have heard today reports indicating that there isn't the support on your side for a robust public option.

Again, this just underscores the fact that there is so much movement on one side of the aisle without any participation by the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to clarify and give us some clarity on this notion and whether he could define for us what is included in a robust public option, what is the difference between a robust public option or something else which seems to have now captured the interest of everybody in this body and certainly those in the press.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that I am going to get into a long, extended discussion about the substance of this bill or we could be here until late tonight.

I will tell the gentleman, however, that no one ought to be surprised, having watched this bill being considered over the last 6 to 7 months, some 70-plus hearings that have been held over the last 2 years, to know this is a very difficult subject of great magnitude of impact on the American public and the American economy. One-sixth of our economy is health care expenditures.

No one should be surprised that it's receiving a lot of discussion and attention. No one should be surprised that there are differences as to how to get from where we are—which is a system that is escalating at a very rapid rate. Family costs are increasing by probably \$1,800 a year, families are being forced out of the market, and the uninsured grow. So we are trying to deal with that issue.

The fact is that in terms of the public option as has been discussed, there are a number of ways to provide an alternative assurance of coverage to individuals other than simply an exchange, which would be like the Office of Personnel Management's Federal employee health benefit exchange—which is private sector—folks competing for our business and the business of those that are employed by the Federal Government. There is a lot of discussion about that.

That discussion continues, and I will tell the gentleman that as the Speaker said and I've said, we will bring the bill to the floor when we think it's ready to come to the floor. And I've further asserted emphatically that we will give the 72-hours notice that we had indicated we would give.

I would tell you further that until such time as we've resolved what the bill is going to look like, it is impossible for CBO to give a final score.

We had pledged that we're going to be deficit free, that is to say the bill will be paid for, will not add to the deficit. The President indicated that in his speech to the joint session, and we intend to do that.

So I tell the gentleman we're having continuing discussions on not just the public option, to which the gentleman refers, and to how that will be configured, but there are other matters as well of concern to the public and to all of us.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman makes one of the points I am trying to convey, and that is these discussions, these continuing negotiations are occurring behind closed doors, they're occurring just on one side of the aisle in and around issues of health care that affect every American—young, old, Republican, Democrat, male, female. It is universal in its application, the issue of health care.

So it is troubling, at the very least, for us to sit here and witness these ongoing negotiations behind closed doors when we on our side, I think, have posited alternatives. The gentleman and I have met on discussions surrounding some points that we can agree upon.

But what's troubling right now is the insistence that we continue to read about that there be a public option. My office has received reports about their being three different public options that your side is considering.

Now, we've heard reports that you have whipped those three distinct public options. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman is, what are those three public options? I think the public deserves the right to know. The public has rejected the notion of a public option replacing their health care. That is really the impetus, I believe, that the gentleman would want to put on display about this discussion about the so-called public option and the three versions that are discussed.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I reject the gentleman's conclusion, which I think is incorrect, the premise that the public has rejected. In fact, as the gentleman probably knows, hopefully, the polling data indicates that the support for the public option has risen since August—has risen, I tell my friend. And there are a number of different ways to get there.

The Senate has one that's on public display, has been on the Internet. The House Education and Labor Committee has one option with Ways and Means that has been on the Internet. It's been on the Internet since July. Energy and Commerce has one—a different correlation of that—and it's been on the Internet since July. There have been a lot of discussions, and I would refer my friend to the Internet, and I am sure he has copies of all of those bills.

Nothing is secret, nothing is behind closed doors.

Now, are we having discussions with ourselves about how we want to get there and with people who will vote for the bill?

The gentleman has made it very clear, I don't think your side is for a public option. We disagree on that. That is a fair disagreement. You're not for a public option, and I haven't talked to anybody on your side that's for a public option.

We disagree. We believe that the public option is an option that the public ought to have and not simply be in the sights of insurance companies who may or may not give them the price or the coverage that they could either afford or need. That's the difference. But I haven't talked to anybody on your side who wants a public option no matter how it is configured.

So very frankly, I will tell my friend that discussions with your side on a public option seem somewhat pointless.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'm a little taken aback by the gentleman's statement saying it's pointless for him to have discussions with Republicans regarding health care.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't say that.

The gentleman, as he cited, we had a meeting. Am I incorrect in saying that the gentleman indicated to me he was not for a public option? Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is not incorrect because Republicans believe that a public option doesn't bring about competition. I think both of us, Mr. Speaker, agree that competition is what is needed to bring down prices to increase access.

We believe that real competition comes from the ability for individuals to choose not just from two or three insurance companies that may have 50 percent of market share; we believe real competition comes from the ability for an individual to choose from a thousand different insurance plans for that individual and his or her family. That's where we begin to—that's what we can agree on. The competition brings down prices. We don't believe public option brings competition.

And that is the essence. The end shouldn't be public option.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will yield when I finish.

And I would further say again to the gentleman's representation about where the American public is because of a poll that was taken this week, I think there have been numerous articles written on debunking the methodology behind that poll. In fact, the question when posed, do you support a public option to compete with private insurance, is and would yield a different response than if you were to ask, would you support a public option that replaces the current health care coverage that you have.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is our position. We believe that if you introduce a government that also makes the rules as a competitor, that there will no longer be an even playing field for competition, that you are on a path to single-payer health care in this country. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker. But I don't think that the gentleman is correct in his saying it is fruitless to have discussions surrounding health care because we have a difference of opinion.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman misstates what I said. I said discussion regarding a public option when I had talked to nobody on your side who was for a public option.

It seems pointless, from my perspective, to talk to somebody about how a public option ought to be configured if, as you have just stated, you're not for a public option. Therefore, a discussion about a public option does in fact to me seem pointless.

Furthermore, let me say this: The gentleman was here when we—I believe you were here—when we adopted the current part D of the Medicare program. The gentleman will recall in that bill you provided for a public op-

tion. You provided for a public option to provide competition and availability of a health care prescription-drug coverage. Now, you provided it in the event that there was no private sector, or at least not more than one, available in any one segment of our society.

So I tell the gentleman, in your own bill—that I think you supported; I don't know that off the top of my head—but my presumption is you supported it or certainly the overwhelming majority of your party supported with very few Democratic votes, and that provided for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman there are a lot of differences to the construct of the MMA, the legislation passed that created part D than what is being discussed today.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that. But it did provide for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time.

So I would say if the gentleman is of that opinion that there is an ability to discuss things surrounding health care, then why is it that we continue to see closed door negotiations?

So the gentleman points to the different options, public options or versions thereof, being discussed in the three different committees in the House. Are those the public options that the gentleman and his side have whipped and are being discussed now behind closed doors?

□ 1130

Frankly, any imposition of a public plan is going to cost taxpayers and small businesses money. I would certainly think the gentleman would share the notion that Republicans should be involved, and it would be of concern to both Republicans and Democrats throughout this country that the American people would want their right to know being realized in these discussions, which is my point as to why is it that we can't hear what these three different public options are and what the differences are therein.

Mr. HOYER. I would repeat, you know exactly what the options are. As I just told you, they are online. They have been discussed. They were discussed extensively in the committee on television. Surely the gentleman would not want the Speaker or anybody else to be misunderstood as the fact that your party doesn't have discussions among yourselves as to what options you want to pursue.

If that's your representation, frankly, I tell my friend, I don't think many people are going to believe that. Are we having discussions? We are. I don't believe either you individually or anybody that I have talked to on your side of the aisle is for a public option.

We are discussing how public option ought to be configured. You don't believe there ought to be a public option, period, for the reasons you have stated. We understand that. We have a difference of opinion on that.

Now, if you are for public option on some configuration, then if you will submit that to me, I would be glad to talk to you about it.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we have always and continue to represent that we are ready to work with him, his leadership and the other side in crafting and affecting positive health care reform. Again, shutting down discussions is not a route to achieve that that could fairly produce what the American people want.

I don't think it could produce fairly or unfairly what the American people want if it is going to be about my way or the highway as far as health care discussions and a bill that passes on this floor.

I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

SUFFERING AT HANDS OF HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents across my district who are suffering at the hands of health insurance companies.

I have heard from doctors who do their best to treat those without insurance.

I have heard from entrepreneurs who want to start their own businesses but fear that they won't be able to find coverage for their sick children because they have preexisting conditions.

I have heard from women who can't replace their ill children's used catheters because they were denied by their insurance companies.

I have heard from small business owners struggling to afford coverage that their employees depend on.

They need us to act, they are asking us to act, they are demanding us to act, and that's why we must.

We need to fix our broken health insurance system. We need a health insurance system that works for men, for women, for children, seniors and families, for everyone. We need action to combat rising health care costs to make health care more accessible and to offer real choice.

We need a public option. We must demand a public option.

HONORING GREATER MIAMI YMCA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the wonderful work of the YMCA of Greater Miami and the addition of its new chief development officer, Pat Morris.

Every day, YMCAs across the country help improve our communities and provide positive programs for youth and adults. Over the past year alone, the YMCA of Greater Miami has cared for 4,700 children. The Miami Y has coached and instructed more than 3,650 children in sports, held summer programs for more than 2,900 kids, and mentored over 100 teens.

The YMCA of Greater Miami is working with other community groups to build affordable homes for families and seniors and will open a brand-new preschool in the near future.

With the help of Pat Morris, the YMCA of Greater Miami will continue to foster positive growth in our neighborhoods.

I congratulate my good friend, Pat, for his position as chief development officer. He has dedicated himself to helping our south Florida community, first as cofounder of the community service organization Hands On Miami and now as a member of the YMCA team.

Congrats to the YMCA of Greater Miami, and I wish the agency continued success as they improve the lives of all of our neighbors.

AMERICANS SUPPORT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

(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, a recent survey by Rasmussen Reports shows that a growing majority of Americans want our immigration laws enforced.

Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed believe law enforcement officers should conduct surprise visits at locations where illegal immigrants are employed. Only 19 percent opposed the visits, compared to 24 percent last April. By a 13-point margin, Americans believe that the Federal Government should not prevent local law enforcement officers from checking on individuals' immigration status.

The Phoenix Business Journal and the Washington D.C. Examiner both reported the poll's findings, but coverage in news outlets that regularly cover immigration issues was glaringly missing.

Mr. Speaker, the media should report all of the facts, not omit those they disagree with.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I have one question. Where are the jobs?

We are now more than 7 months from passage of the so-called stimulus package, yet it is more apparent than ever that the bill has fallen woefully short. In my home State of West Virginia, the White House predicted that this legislation would create 20,000 jobs. Well, guess what? At this point, since February, the reality is that we have lost 13,000 jobs. Sadly, the stimulus isn't living up to its promise of job creation.

Additionally, the policies of this administration are actually contributing to job losses in my State. Cap-and-trade legislation will put an economic target on the back of our States, States like mine. Meanwhile, the EPA has continued to hold up mine permits across Appalachia, creating an unprecedented sense of unease and uncertainty that's already costing us mining jobs and threatening thousands more.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents deserve better now, and they certainly deserved better when we first debated this bill. I join them in asking: Where are the jobs?

HEALTH CARE REFORM SHOULD NOT BE ON BACKS OF OUR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we need health care reform, but not on the backs of our small businesses. The proposed plan would impose more than \$820 billion in new taxes, something hardworking Americans and small businesses can't afford.

In a letter, Gilbert Travis of Travis Lumber Company in Mansfield, Arkansas, described how his company and many other lumber companies have been forced to cut back on the number of days a week in operation. Some have met an even worse fate—closure.

Gilbert is not optimistic that the outlook for these businesses will get better any time soon and writes there is no way the American economy, with it's hardworking people, can afford the absolutely wasteful spending and tax increases that Washington is trying to impose at every angle they can possibly think of.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Gilbert. We cannot be imposing new taxes on hardworking American businesses that are struggling to make ends meet in this economic climate. Let's craft a real reform that will decrease health costs, allowing more persons to get the care they deserve.

THE STIMULUS: IS THAT ALL THERE IS?

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time to ask: Is that all there is?

Yesterday, President Obama's economic adviser, Christina Romer, testified before Congress' Joint Economic Committee on the so-called stimulus plan. Her testimony was illuminating. She indicated that the stimulus plan's greatest impact on economic growth happened between April and September of this year. We lost hundreds of thousands of jobs during each of these months.

How could they possibly consider this a success? If the greatest impact of the trillion dollar stimulus is behind us and we still experience a terrible loss of jobs, that seems the opposite of success.

This whole scenario reminds me of a Peggy Lee song from 40 years ago, called, "Is That All There Is?"

Where are the jobs we were promised in this stimulus? According to President Obama's economic adviser, the main impact is behind us. Really? Is that all there is?

Republicans have better solutions to get Americans back to work that don't involve reckless, ineffective borrowing and spending that drive us further into debt. Americans deserve better.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF OUR HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I must say the news coming out of Washington is all bad when it comes to the government takeover of our health care.

Just last night, Speaker PELOSI got the news that she does not have the votes to pass it. The Senate expects the debate to spill over into next year, and even Democrat candidates back home are turning against this crazy idea.

Why is this happening? Simply put, they can't find a way to pay for it. There are not enough taxpayers and insurance policyholders to pay the exploding tab, and the polls show a continued decline in support. Also, they can't depend on the wealth of the Federal Government anymore as we are broke, broke.

This is not a case of Republicans wanting sick people to die quickly. It is a case of wanting this sick, expensive, ineffective, and wasteful government takeover of health care to die quickly.

PEOPLE OF AMERICA TALKED TO US IN 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, one of the problems we have here in Washington, DC, is we often seem to be disconnected

with our folks back home. That is a problem. It's sort of an institutional problem, and that's bad enough. When we do it on purpose, that's even worse. We seem to have selective memory, maybe convenient amnesia.

The other side of the aisle appears to have forgotten that there is a month in the year called August. It was when the people of America talked to us, and they told us that they had grave concerns about the proposal that was before us with respect to health care.

Now we are told, well, look at the ABC poll instead. Forget about August. What else have they told us that we can forget about? Oh, that's right, Fox News doesn't exist.

August doesn't exist, Fox News doesn't exist. Maybe next month we will hear that the American people don't exist and we are just here creating a make-believe America with make-believe problems and make-believe solutions. Let's remember August where the real people live with the real problems and the real need for real solutions.

□ 1145

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. PENCE. For every American President, there are moments of decision, moments where the credibility of the United States and the fate of people in foreign lands hang in the balance. President Obama faces such a moment in Afghanistan. The President must decide whether to adequately equip our military in Afghanistan or lose the war to al Qaeda and the Taliban.

General Stanley McChrystal was brought on to implement the counter-insurgency strategy the President himself endorsed in March. And that commander has made it clear what resources he needs to get the job done. If we fail in Afghanistan, we risk that country turning into a training ground again for al Qaeda, increasing instability spilling over into nuclear-armed Pakistan. The consequences to our people would only be a matter of time.

Our soldiers and the people of Afghanistan cannot afford to wait any longer. Now is not the time to risk the hard-fought, blood-bought gains in this critical front in the war on terror by extended deliberations and indecision. Now is the time for our President to act decisively, to give our commanders and our soldiers the resources they need to win the war in Afghanistan and come home safe.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest when our whip and the majority leader were talking a while ago about how they would like to work with us so we can reach some kind of agreement on the public option plan, the government plan. It brought to mind when President Obama came to our caucus, our conference, early on in his administration. He indicated he wanted to work with us and he wanted to have our input. He came with great fanfare, and the media was there saying here is this man, he wants openness, and he wants to work with the Republicans. This is the kind of President we need.

He smiled, he shook our hands, he left the room and then wouldn't talk to us anymore. We have had absolutely no input whatsoever into this health care plan, and yet the facade has been created that we have. And they blame us because things haven't happened. It's because their own caucus can't get together on a plan.

The American people know that there is chicanery going on behind closed doors. And they promised us we would be able to participate in the planning for health care reform. Yeah. That was a lot of baloney then, and it's a lot of baloney now.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). 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.

HONDURAS: A DEMOCRACY IN SPITE OF THE U.S. INTERVENTION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is trouble in Honduras, and the United States has chosen sides in this conflict. Here are the facts: the people of Honduras are holding an election on November 29. Honduras is a democracy. Their elections will fill 3,000 offices nationwide and all 128 seats of the national congress, and they will elect a new President.

They've had some trouble recently with their current President. Manuel Zelaya attempted to stay in office and be on the November ballot, which is not allowed by term limits in their Honduran Constitution. Zelaya wants to become a permanent President of Honduras and has tried to illegally change the Constitution to keep himself in power.

The people have followed the rule of law, however. They followed their own Constitution. Just as the people of this country would follow our Constitution under similar circumstances, they took proper, legal action to stop Zelaya's illegal behavior, and they removed him from office through the legal court system.

Article 239 of the Honduran Constitution states: "The citizen who has already held executive power"—that would be the President—"may not be President or designee. Anyone who violates this provision or proposes its reform and supports those who do directly or indirectly, must immediately cease the discharge of their duties, and shall be disqualified for 10 years from the exercise of any public function."

Those are pretty simple words. It sounds like the Constitution prevents Zelaya from trying to hijack the government.

The self-governing people of Honduras set forth in their Constitution that a tyrant could not abuse the process and become a dictator. They set rock solid term limits to one term for President. These good people legally removed Manuel Zelaya, the man who would be dictator, a tyrant, and a special friend of Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. Now that's special.

Here's how the people acted legally. After several attempts by legal means to prevent Zelaya from staying in power, the Office of Public Prosecutor filed a criminal complaint. The charges were treason, abuse of authority and usurpation of power in violation of the Honduran Constitution. The Supreme Court of Honduras agreed with the charges and issued an arrest warrant for the armed forces to arrest Manuel Zelaya. So Zelaya was legally arrested. And because he violated the Constitution, he was exiled from the country.

We should be applauding the people of Honduras for following their rule of law. In America, we honor the rule of law. We believe in self-determination and constitutional limits on government power, but we picked the wrong side in this case. We took the side of the tyrant versus the people of Honduras.

Now why would we do that? We cut off foreign aid to Honduras. We have refused to recognize the interim government that followed the rule of law. This is a Honduran Government that is doing everything despite America's interference to make sure that their elections take place as scheduled, to make sure their democracy survives according to the Constitution.

In the meantime, Zelaya, who was exiled, has slipped back into the country. He's holed up in the Brazilian Embassy. He's being funded by guess who? The Communist dictator, Hugo Chavez. Zelaya's thugs are targeting select groups with violent acts, including attacks on Christians. Zelaya is attempting to create chaos, but the popular will does not exist to return this would-be dictator to power. The people want their free elections to take place as scheduled.

One of our Senate colleagues, Senator DEMINT of South Carolina, recently returned from Honduras. He said that the only person he found in Honduras interested in putting Zelaya back in power was guess who? The American ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, it is a moral imperative that we back the rule of law, that we honor the decision of the democratically elected institutions of Honduras, that we support the elections in November, and that we recognize the new government, whoever wins the race.

Why do we, as a Nation, say we believe in self-determination but deny self-determination to Honduras? Why do we say we believe in a constitutional government but bash the nation of Honduras for following their own Constitution? Why do we support the likes of a deposed ruler like Zelaya? And how is it any of our business to determine who should be President of Honduras anyway?

Honduras has been an ally of the United States, yet appears to be another example of how we treat our allies worse than we treat our enemies. We are on the wrong side of things when we stand by the bandit dictator Hugo Chavez and his buddy, Manuel Zelaya.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

LET AMERICA'S HUMANITARIAN VALUES SHINE IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan appears to be headed for a runoff election in the next few weeks. The United States must insist and we must expect that a credible, democratic Afghan government emerges from this political process because so very much is at stake. A democratically elected government in Kabul that has the trust of the Afghan people is necessary because it's our best weapon in the fight against violent extremism in Afghanistan.

Such a government, a stable, honest government, would stabilize the country. It would encourage Afghanistan's neighbors to engage in a regional diplomatic effort. And it would be the strong partner America needs to deliver humanitarian and economic aid to the Afghan people. Afghanistan desperately needs this aid. It has seen two foreign invasions in the last three decades and years of political turmoil.

Afghanistan is also very, very poor. By some measures, it is just about the poorest country in the world. The United Nations issued its annual Human Development Index earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, and it ranks the countries of the world on criteria such as life expectancy, literacy, school enrollment and gross domestic product. Afghanistan ranked 181st out of 182 countries—next to the last.

That's why the United States must put far more emphasis on economic de-

velopment, reconstruction, humanitarian aid and improved governance if we are to succeed in Afghanistan. To do this, we must redouble our efforts to bring a "civilian surge" of aid workers to Afghanistan. In fact, President Obama announced this initiative 7 months ago with a great deal of fanfare, but the results so far have been disappointing.

An adviser to General McChrystal, our commander in Afghanistan, told *The New York Times* last week that "our entire system of delivering aid is broken and very little of the aid is getting to the Afghan people." Another adviser said that the effort has been a "nightmare" and that "vast amounts of aid money have been wasted."

One of the reasons for this problem, Mr. Speaker, is the violence in the country. The aid workers who are on the ground now in Afghanistan are brave and truly dedicated. But some of them are understandably reluctant to leave the relative safety of Kabul and venture out into the countryside.

There are several ways to improve this situation. Some American military personnel could be directed to protect the aid workers. The United States could step up its efforts to train the Afghan army and police so that they can provide local protection. The White House must also provide better benchmarks for measuring the progress of our civilian effort.

We must prove that we are doing a better job of delivering American humanitarian aid, and this can be accomplished with three extremely important goals: it would improve the lives of the Afghan people and give them a reason to reject violence. It would demonstrate that America offers the Afghan people a better future than the extremists offer them, and it would help to remove the impression that the American Army is an occupying army.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to succeed in Afghanistan, we must let America's humanitarian values shine through. That's the best way to help build a stable Afghanistan that can't be used by the Taliban or other extremists to threaten our security, their security, and the peace of our world.

□ 1200

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

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

TAKE A LESSON FROM PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration, led by its Council of Economic Advisors, indicated that if we spent \$1 trillion with

the stimulus bill, that we would create 3.5 million new jobs. Well, here it is, what, 8, 9 months later, we've spent a great deal of the stimulus money, and instead of creating 3.5 million new jobs we've lost 3 million jobs. That's a 6.5 million job swing.

Yesterday, Dr. Christina Romer, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, said that the economic stimulus package, \$1 trillion—and remember, we're \$1.4 trillion in the hole this year—that the economic stimulus package at \$1 trillion wasn't going to work anymore for the next several months and we should expect the economy to continue to drift downward, with unemployment reaching 10 percent. The reason I bring this up is because 49 out of the 50 States have lost jobs while we spent \$1 trillion to create the jobs.

Now, just stop and think about that. We're throwing money at this situation as rapidly as possible, the government is getting its nose into every aspect of our economy, moving toward a European socialist-type economy, and the economy continues to drift downward. And why is that? Because we're taking more and more money and spending it that we don't have, number one. And number two, they're going to tax us to death at a time when we're suffering economic calamity in this country.

What should we be doing? Well, Ronald Reagan came into office back in 1980 when Jimmy Carter had 12 percent unemployment—worse than now—and 14 percent inflation—worse than now—with a misery index of 26 percent. And they said you had to raise taxes because we had such problems, we had to have more money. Ronald Reagan said, well, I think we ought to cut taxes. And so they cut taxes across the board, and he was criticized severely for it.

They said, well, there is going to be a shortfall in money coming into the Treasury. We were bringing in \$500 billion a year in taxes at the time, and 4 years later we were bringing in \$1.3 trillion. Do you know why? Because when you cut taxes, you give people more disposable income, business has more money to invest. And so business invests, people buy more products because they have more money, because of that they produce more products, more jobs are created, and the economy expands. It makes common sense; if you have more money, you're going to be able to spend more money.

And so what happened was we had the longest period of economic expansion in the history of this country because we had a President that could see what really needed to be done—let the free enterprise system work and let people have more of their money to spend. Cut government spending and cut government taxes. Well, Reagan did the job.

So what are we doing today? We've got a government that thinks they should control everything, and they're moving toward a socialist economy very similar to what you see in France

and England and other parts of the world that are really suffering and continue to suffer through economic chaos.

All I can say, if I were talking to the President, is, Mr. President, get real. Wake up. Forget this socialist nonsense. Take a look at the history book and look at what Ronald Reagan did. And if you would do that, and instead of raising taxes cut taxes, you would stimulate economic growth, put people back to work, and get this economy heading in the right direction.

I don't know if the President pays attention to what we're saying around here, Mr. Speaker, but if he does pay attention, I hope he'll listen and look at the history books and check out what Ronald Reagan did.

WALL STREET, WE ARE WATCHING YOU

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week, The New York Times reported that Credit Suisse, the largest Swiss bank, stated how it will overhaul compensation for its banking executives. The changes go into effect in January and include their compensation for 2009 and 2010.

Importantly, Credit Suisse ties compensation and bonuses to the firm's future performance and return on equity. In other words, if your decisions yield solid performance, you will be rewarded on that, not on arbitrary bonuses taken just because you can. I'd like to commend Credit Suisse's experience to other big banks in our country. We should follow suit in an even more rigorous reimposition of discipline.

By contrast, in a speech on September 9, 2009, Goldman Sachs' Chief Executive Officer Lloyd Blankfein put forth some principles on compensation. We asked when Goldman Sachs was going to implement those changes; we haven't heard back. But Credit Suisse already did it; they did it in line with the principles established by the G-20 in Pittsburgh earlier this year.

In their press release, Credit Suisse reaffirms the bank's commitment to fair, balanced, performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests.

So, once again, Wall Street could have led the charge and embraced, for the sake of our Nation, reforms of employee compensation which rewarded short-term gains and encouraged excessive risk-taking as well as increased moral hazard. Instead, Wall Street stood up only for themselves again, first, last, and always. They simply have too much power.

Moreover, Credit Suisse's approach claws back bonuses if the banks perform poorly. Why should America accept that if a bank performs poorly,

that bonuses should be paid out when our taxpayers' money is propping them up and at risk? In particular, if the government saved your bank and therefore your pay despite your poor performance, why should you get a huge bonus? It makes no sense.

Congress and the administration, by allowing huge bonuses in the wake of huge bailouts, have ceded our people's power to Wall Street. These individuals are making three, four, five, six—10 times as much as the President of the United States.

Today, Obama pay czar, Kenneth Feinberg—who was not vetted by the Senate through normal procedures—is supposed to address this situation for our country. Feinberg is expected to cut the average pay only of the top earners at the seven bailed out firms, AIG, Bank of America, Citigroup, General Motors, Chrysler, GMAC, and Chrysler Financial. Remember, the American taxpayer saved them all—for example, they saved Citibank from its downfall. So their jobs were saved, their companies were saved by us, yet they get bonuses?

Some say we would be a lot worse off if this lopsided approach had not been imposed, but far too many Americans find it hard to imagine that as they have lost their jobs, their homes, their access to credit, their sense of hope, and their self-respect. Meanwhile, they see Wall Street titans enriching themselves even more and the biggest banks getting even bigger. That's what is happening across our country.

Wall Street should have been leaders for our republic, helping the Americans whose money saved them, but their culture of ordinary greed continues to stampede forward. They simply don't care about the rest of us. The distance between those elites and our people are growing, and with each step the have-nots suffer more and pay for those that have far too much.

Amidst the compensation fiasco is the core problem: These megabanks are too unaccountable and too big—some call them “too big to fail.” As many have said, those institutions too big to fail are actually too big to exist. It's time to break up the biggest banks, sell off their healthy parts, and never let another bank or financial institution become too big to fail. Wall Street comeuppance is long overdue.

Main Street USA is paying close attention to your shenanigans. We don't intend to take the spotlight off until justice prevails and the stampeding bulls are put back in very tight cages.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 2009]

CREDIT SUISSE OVERHAULS COMPENSATION

(By Graham Bowley)

As Wall Street looks forward to a new era of blowout bonuses, the unthinkable is happening, at least at Credit Suisse, the big Swiss bank. It said on Tuesday that it would radically change the way it paid its employees.

In a break with longstanding industry practices, Credit Suisse intends to alter the

mix of salaries and bonuses for its top employees, tie the bonuses to a specific financial measure and effectively claw back the payouts if the bank's fortunes dim.

The move will not necessarily reduce compensation at Credit Suisse, which is moving aggressively to compete with American banks on Wall Street. But the shift nonetheless brings Credit Suisse in line with pay practices endorsed in September by the Group of 20 nations and puts the bank ahead of resurgent rivals like Goldman Sachs, some of which are contemplating similar changes but have yet to make their plans public.

Goldman, for its part, announced new pay principles in May, which it says embrace best practices on compensation.

A year after Washington rescued the financial industry, bonuses are once again front and center as some big banks roar back in profitability. Goldman, for instance, is on track to award bonuses that could rival the record payouts it made at the height of the boom.

But the likelihood that Wall Street will enjoy big paydays as many ordinary Americans are struggling has angered some policy makers and created a public relations headache for banks. Many are struggling to defuse the resentment directed at the industry.

The Credit Suisse plan will cover roughly 2,000 employees in the United States. Top executives will receive a greater portion of their total compensation in the form of their monthly cash salaries, while bonuses will be split evenly between cash and stock.

The stock will vest over four years, and the cash portion will pay out in three. But both components will be adjusted based on the bank's performance over that period, with a particular emphasis on its return on equity, a closely watched financial measure. The performance of an executive's business will also be taken into account.

By tying payouts to a specific measure like return on equity, Credit Suisse will essentially be able to take back bonuses in the event the bank's fortunes take a turn for the worse. Credit Suisse earlier introduced a bonus plan linked to some of the bank's troubled assets.

Claw-back provisions are becoming increasingly common on postcrisis Wall Street. Critics say the industry's decades-old bonus culture, which focused on short-term profits, encouraged the excessive risk-taking that led to the crisis. Morgan Stanley introduced provisions for a portion of its employees' bonuses last year, and another Swiss banking giant, UBS, imposed similar rules on deferred pay.

But Credit Suisse executives and compensation experts said the bank's plan was the most detailed and comprehensive yet to take back pay if senior executives—and the bank—failed to perform adequately.

"As far as we know, we are the first major bank to announce a compensation structure that is consistent with the best practices laid out at the recent G-20 summit," Brady W. Dougan, chief executive, said in a statement.

The bank is also introducing a minimum share ownership requirement for members of management committees and the executive board to align the most senior executives' pay with shareholders' interests, although it did not specify the new thresholds.

Lynn A. Stout, professor of securities law at the University of California, Los Angeles, said Credit Suisse's four-year stock deferral was at the outer limit of what many banks were considering.

She said many other banks were thinking of changing compensation practices along similar lines to rein in practices that made multimillionaires out of many financial executives during the housing bubble.

"You get a sense that there is a cultural shift in boardrooms and a new awareness about looking to the longer term," she said.

At a meeting of the G-20 last month, leaders agreed on recommendations to defer bonus payouts for several years and reduce the incentives for people to take short-term gambles, although they avoided any explicit call for a ceiling on remuneration. The return to big profits at some banks and big bonus payouts, even at firms that received billion-dollar federal bailouts, has raised questions about whether compensation should be even more tightly controlled.

In the summer, the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, a financial industry trade group, put forward guidelines on best practices, which included tying bonuses more closely to long-term performance and a more independent role for bank compensation committees.

The Federal Reserve is now preparing to release its own guidance on compensation for the more than 5,000 banks it regulates. It would cover staff at all levels within banks, not just at the most senior levels, and would apply to Goldman and Morgan Stanley, which became bank holding companies last year.

In broad scope, the new rules being considered depart from the largely hands-off approach that dominated bank regulation in the United States for the last three decades. They give banks freedom in how they structure their compensation. The rules are intended to inhibit pay plans that encourage reckless behavior by rewarding only short-term gains. But they would not stop million-dollar pay packages or address issues of fairness.

The stimulus bill that President Obama signed into law this year restricts companies that accept federal bailouts from paying bonuses that exceed one-third of an executive's total annual compensation.

Now, Kenneth R. Feinberg, the administration's pay czar, is due to publish by Oct. 30 his finding on pay at the seven major banks that still have not returned large amounts of federal support.

His report will include judgments on the 25 most heavily compensated executives at each of the banks—citing pay levels and composition of pay, and whether compensation is properly aligned with performance.

CREDIT SUISSE ANNOUNCES ITS COMPENSATION STRUCTURE FOR 2009 AND 2010

ZURICH.—October 20, 2009.—Credit Suisse today announced its compensation structure for 2009 and 2010. The new structure is consistent with the guidelines for best practice that were recently announced at the G-20 summit and reaffirms the Bank's commitment to fair, balanced and performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests.

Brady W. Dougan, CEO of Credit Suisse Group, said: "At a time of strong focus on executive compensation, we are announcing a compensation structure that enables us to strike the right balance between paying our employees competitively, doing what is right for our shareholders and responding appropriately to regulatory initiatives and political as well as public concerns."

"We have been using deferred, share-based compensation instruments for many years and we continue to be committed to these principles. They are at the heart of our compensation structure for 2009 and 2010."

"The changes to our compensation system follow a number of measures Credit Suisse has taken over the past two years in response to changes in the financial services sector. These measures include making adjustments to our business strategy, signifi-

cantly reducing our risk exposures, including introducing a reduced-risk, capital-efficient business model in the Investment Bank, and strengthening our capital base."

OVERVIEW OF KEY FEATURES

The changes announced today will be effective from January 1, 2010 and will apply to compensation awarded for the year 2009. The most important features of the structure are:

1. A shift in the mix of discretionary variable (bonus) and fixed compensation for Managing Directors and Directors, which will result in a change in the proportion of non-deferred compensation paid as fixed base salary.

2. The introduction of two new instruments for deferred variable compensation awarded to Managing Directors and Directors: Scaled Incentive Share Units (SISU) and Adjustable Performance Plan Awards (APPA). A significant proportion of this population's variable compensation will be delivered in these new type of awards (50% each).

SISU are similar to Incentive Share Units (ISU), an equity based instrument that has been in place for the past three years. The new SISU will deliver a base share amount on a four-year pro-rata basis. Delivery of additional shares will depend on the average share price as well as return on equity (RoE) over four years.

APPA is a cash-based award which will have a notional value that adjusts upward annually based on Credit Suisse's RoE over three years. A mechanism will adjust the outstanding awards downward, should the business area of the employee be loss-making.

The principles and instruments used for Managing Directors and Directors also apply to members of the Executive Board but not to employees at the level of Vice President or below.

In addition, Credit Suisse will introduce minimum requirements relating to Credit Suisse share ownership for members of Divisional and Regional Management Committees and for the Executive Board.

CONFORMITY WITH G20 GUIDELINES AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

The new structure and the new vehicles are consistent with the guidelines for best compensation practices that were recently announced at the G-20 summit and reaffirm the Bank's commitment to fair, balanced and performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests. Credit Suisse will continue to refine the provisions of the plan as well as the governance process for compensation decisions and disclosure to shareholders, based on competitive factors and the evolving regulatory environment.

DETAILS OF THE CHANGES IN COMPENSATION 2009/2010

The following is a brief summary of the changes and the new compensation instruments announced today. A detailed description will be included in the Group's Annual Report 2009.

CHANGES TO BASE SALARY FOR MANAGING DIRECTORS AND DIRECTORS

In order to strike an appropriate balance between fixed and variable compensation, Credit Suisse is planning a shift in the mix of variable and fixed compensation for Managing Directors and Directors. This will result in the payment of an increased proportion of compensation in the form of fixed base salary. Employees up to and including Vice Presidents will continue to be reviewed for potential annual salary adjustments, consistent with previous practice.

VARIABLE COMPENSATION

Cash Awards

Discretionary variable compensation will continue to be paid in unrestricted cash for amounts below CHF 125,000 / USD 100,000 (or the local currency equivalent). For higher amounts, table will indicate the proportion of variable compensation subject to deferral. Deferred compensation will be split 50/50 between SISU and APPA.

SCALED INCENTIVE SHARE UNITS

Scaled Incentive Share Units (SISU) are similar to the existing Incentive Share Units (ISU) with a new element that increases or decreases in value based on Credit Suisse's average RoE. As with traditional ISU, the base share amount vests annually, in the case of SISU on a four-year, pro-rata basis. My additional shares will vest on the fourth anniversary of the award date, based on the price of Credit Suisse Group AG registered shares. A new feature will link the final number of additional shares to an additional factor: If Credit Suisse's average RoE over the four-year period is higher than a pre-set target, the number of additional shares will be adjusted upwards, and if it is below the target, the number of additional shares will decrease.

ADJUSTABLE PERFORMANCE PLAN AWARDS

Adjustable Performance Plan Awards (APPA) will have a notional cash value subject to a three-year, pro-rata vesting schedule. Awards adjust upward on an annual basis using Credit Suisse's RoE in the respective year as a multiplier. However, should a business area be loss-making, outstanding APP awards held by employees of that business area will be adjusted downwards. The metrics within the revenue divisions will be based on each business area's financial contribution. The metrics for Shared Services, Regional Management and embedded support functions within the divisions will be based on the financial performance of Credit Suisse Group.

[From Reuters, Oct. 22, 2009]

CZAR TO SUBSTANTIALLY CUT PAY: SUMMERS
(By Caren Bohan and Karey Wutkowski)

WASHINGTON (Reuters).—Top White House economic adviser Lawrence Summers said on Wednesday the administration's pay czar will "substantially reduce" the paychecks at firms that have received billions of taxpayer dollars.

"With respect to the companies that have been major recipients of federal support, Ken Feinberg is reviewing them . . . (and) will, I suspect, produce an outcome where they will be very substantially reduced," Summers told the Reuters Washington Summit.

Feinberg, the pay czar appointed by President Barack Obama in June, is expected to cut total compensation by an average of 50 percent for the top earners at seven bailed-out firms, sources familiar with the matter said on Wednesday.

The administration has faced public outrage, as Wall Street firms that were recently propped up by federal assistance have brought their bonuses back to pre-crisis levels even as the general population faces the highest unemployment level in 26 years.

Summers said Feinberg's rulings—which are expected to be publicly released in the coming days—will ensure taxpayers' interests come before those of shareholders and incumbent management at the beleaguered firms.

The seven bailed-out firms under Feinberg's jurisdiction are AIG, Bank of America, Citigroup, General Motors, Chrysler, GMAC and Chrysler Financial.

SEES FINANCIAL REFORM BY YEAR END

Summers also said he was still hopeful that legislation to broadly rewrite U.S. fi-

ancial regulations would pass by the end of the year.

"I don't see any reason why it can't get done this year," Summers said.

Analysts following the debate on Capitol Hill have become increasingly skeptical that Obama can meet his goal of enacting it by year-end. Some say that early next year might be a more realistic time frame.

While some critics say the bill is not robust enough, Summers said he believed the changes would have a chance to have a major impact on financial stability for years to come.

He said that while the administration wants to guard against efforts by the financial industry to water down the bill, he said the main principles behind it were not at risk.

"I've always put this in terms of some core principles," Summers said.

If an institution is big enough and interconnected enough that its failure could damage the financial system, then it must have a regulator that is accountable, he said. "And there has to be a plan in place for managing your failure if it comes."

Summers said the proposals under consideration achieve that goal.

TAXPAYERS FIRST

The administration is also committed to fundamentally reforming pay, starting at the firms that have received multiple government bailouts, Summers said.

"It is important where taxpayers have made a central contribution to make sure that taxpayer interests are being put first rather than those of shareholders and certainly rather than those of incumbent management and that's why Ken Feinberg is involved in reviewing compensation levels at the companies where the TARP has made the most major investments."

Officials have also proposed a broad crackdown on pay, including giving shareholders more say on compensation packages, forcing firms to disclose more on their pay practices and encouraging regulators to shut down risky compensation schemes.

"With respect to companies that are not currently recipients of major support, the focus is really going to be more on process and more on the incentives they create," Summers said.

Amid the rhetoric of a strong clampdown on compensation that encourages risk taking, the administration has been careful to say it does not believe in setting explicit caps.

Summers said the administration is sensitive to the need for firms to keep top talent and remain competitive, while not letting Wall Street return to its old ways.

"We are concerned that some in the financial sector would like to go back to the regulatory nonculture and risk management nonculture of the recent past. That wouldn't be acceptable to us," he said. "But the president's always said that we think it's very important that people succeed in America so framing this in terms of the goal being to reduce profits or to eliminate compensation, that would not be our approach."

[From Financial Times, Oct. 21, 2009]

UK BANK GOVERNOR CALLS FOR LENDERS'
BREAK-UP

(By Chris Giles)

Banks should be split into separate utility companies and risky ventures, governor of the Bank of England Mervyn King urged last night, saying it was a "delusion" to think tougher regulation would prevent future financial crises.

Mr. King's call for a break-up of banks to prevent them becoming "too important to

fail" puts him sharply at odds with the direction of domestic and international banking reform.

Mr. King borrowed Churchillian language in a speech in Scotland to highlight the burden banks had placed on taxpayers. "Never in the field of financial endeavour has so much money been owed by so few to so many. And, one might add, so far with little real reform."

The forcefulness of Mr King's language reflects his belief that the structure of the banks needs to be put firmly on the international regulatory agenda, where focus has been on strengthening capital and regulating bankers' pay. The Bank governor wants to see the utility aspects of banking—payment systems and deposit taking—hived off from more speculative ventures such as proprietary trading. "There are those who claim that such proposals are impractical. It is hard to see why," he said.

Although he said ideas to force banks to hold debt that automatically turns into equity in a crisis were "worth a try", he downplayed their likely effect. "The belief that appropriate regulation can ensure that speculative activities do not result in failures is a delusion."

Many experts believe the governor will get his way on separation but by default rather than by design, because proposals for tighter capital regulations on risky parts of banking will make these unprofitable and banks will choose to ditch them.

U.S.-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE
AGREEMENT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my long-standing support for the Colombian people, the Colombian-American community in south Florida, and to urge my colleagues to approve the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement as soon as possible.

Colombia is one of our strongest allies in the fight against extremism and drug trafficking, not only in our hemisphere, but around the world.

When I was first elected, Colombia was under siege. Leftist rebel groups and drug cartels such as the FARC and the Medellin and Cali Cartels had taken over large areas of that country. Colombians were prisoners in their own land, fearful for their lives, and watching their country descend further into chaos and darkness. Now, however, after many years of bravery and sacrifice, the Colombian people and its government have taken back their country, and each year Colombia becomes more secure and more prosperous. Colombians have continued to do so despite the unrelenting attack and assault by known FARC sympathizers and supporters of Hugo Chavez and Fidel Castro to derail Colombia's progress. Well, the government and the people in Colombia have persevered.

At a time when U.S. interests throughout the hemisphere are under attack, Colombia has remained a steadfast ally, an indispensable partner in ensuring our security and freedom in the region. The pending U.S.-Colombia

Defense Cooperation Agreement will further strengthen that alliance and will serve as a major boost to our joint efforts to fight narco-traffickers and leftist rebels.

In discussing this agreement last month, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton highlighted, "This agreement ensures that appropriate protections are in place for our servicemembers. It will allow us to continue working together to meet the challenges posed by narco-traffickers, terrorists, and other illegal armed groups in Colombia."

Together, the U.S. and Colombia have had enormous success in battling those groups, but much more remains to be done. This agreement will ensure that we are fully equipped to do so.

The United States and Colombia also share growing economic ties. The U.S. is the largest source of foreign investment in Colombia, which has quadrupled over the past 7 years. My own district in Miami, Florida, had nearly \$6 billion in total trade with Colombia in 1 year alone.

Colombia is Miami's number one trading partner in volume and second leading international market. But although U.S.-Colombian economic ties are strong, we have only just begun to tap their potential. That will require passage of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Unfortunately, the free trade agreement has been in limbo for 3 years, largely because of partisan opposition. But opponents fail to understand that the primary purpose of this trade pact is to eliminate Colombia's barriers to U.S. goods. Colombia would immediately eliminate a majority of its tariffs on U.S. exports, with all remaining tariffs eventually phasing out gradually. More exports means more sales, which means more jobs here in the U.S. The benefits would be felt immediately.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that U.S. exports to Colombia would quickly increase by over \$1 billion, and that's not even counting a major increase in service-related exports.

Given today's difficult economic climate, with so many hardworking Americans striving to make ends meet, it is unbelievable that Congress continues to refuse to take the simple step to expand trade and create jobs in this country.

But there is more at stake, Mr. Speaker. By strengthening Colombia's ability to fight drug traffickers and fight leftist guerrillas, and by demonstrating that the U.S. will stand by its loyal ally, passage of this trade agreement will advance U.S. security and economic interests not only in that country, but throughout the hemisphere. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement and to do so as soon as possible.

Again, I would like to commend the people of Colombia for their remarkable progress that they have achieved

and express my ongoing support for the strong ties between our countries. We are blessed in south Florida to have a wonderful, robust, patriotic, American-loving, Colombian-American community. They have, indeed, enriched our area.

DEMOCRATS' PLANS TO REFORM HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Democrats' plans to "reform" our health care system.

You know, many promises have been made by the other side of the aisle about what these reforms would actually do, but now we actually have a definitive analysis, performed by the chief government actuary of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, to look at the consequences of these reforms. Well, Mr. Speaker, the diagnosis is not that good.

Both the President and his economic advisors have said that whatever bill the President signs he wants to make sure that he bends the cost curve. Well, how does the Democrat health care stack up to that pledge?

□ 1215

According to that chief actuary whom I just mentioned, total spending on health care would actually increase by \$750 billion more than if we did nothing at all. That's right. The Democrats' plan would bend the cost curve all right, but it would bend it in the wrong direction. You see, the real overall cost of this bill would be \$1.2 trillion. That's with a T. By 2019, the annual cost of the entitlement expansion would be \$236 billion, and that would be rising at an annual rate of 9 percent every year. After all of this spending, there would still be around 20-some-odd million uninsured Americans. So, for those folks who are trying to keep score of all of this, that comes out to be about \$35,000 per uninsured person out there.

Now, another promise that the President made was that he said, "if you like your current coverage, you keep it." Well, again, look back to that government actuary whom we talked about before. According to that chief actuary, that's not true if you're a senior on Medicare, because 8.5 million seniors on Medicare today would lose their current coverage, and they would be forced into some different coverage.

Also contained in the bill are what we call arbitrary, across-the-board payment cuts to hospitals, to nursing homes and to home health agencies. Again, let's see what the chief actuary says. The chief actuary says the cuts could force such organizations, such as nursing homes and home health agencies, to leave the Medicare program and, thus, "possibly jeopardizing access

to care for beneficiaries." That doesn't really sound like keeping the coverage you want, does it?

So maybe now, finally, the Democrat leadership in Congress will start to listen to at least a few of the ideas put forward by the Republicans. What we want to do is try to increase the access to health care coverage, to increase access to the health care delivery system and to make insurance more portable and affordable. What we want to do is try to reduce those long-term spending plans and to reduce the curve downward in order to bring down the cost of medical liability and to create a sustainable health care system.

Finally, at the end of the day, Republicans stand today, as we have always in the past, ready to work with the Democrats to enact real reform to our health care delivery system as soon as they are ready to work with us.

UNCLE SAM IS GOING BROKE

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this is a poster of Uncle Sam going broke. America is going broke, and we are taking away the future economic security of our children, grandchildren and of everyone listening.

The national debt is racing toward \$12 trillion, and it is growing at rates that haven't been matched since World War II. It will double over the next 10 years.

Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, hit the nail on the head in this week's National Journal when she said, "It's like fiscal jenga, where people are piling on more and more debt, and finally, something's going to be the cause of it collapsing, but no one believes their thing is going to be the tipping point."

Why is this Congress, Mr. Speaker, willing to keep piling on the debt? Why are we turning a blind eye toward our children and grandchildren?

The FY 2009 fiscal year ending September 30 registered a \$1.4 trillion deficit, leaving red ink as far as the eye can see, and leaving trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. Medicare and Social Security add up to a massive \$57 trillion in promises Uncle Sam has made but can't keep.

Make no mistake. Unsustainable spending has far-reaching implications for the United States. It touches every sector from health care to job creation, and it gives the foreign investors who hold America's debt more control.

What is this administration doing? Is Congress prepared to let America sink? How can this Congress stand by record joblessness that is almost reaching 10 percent? Does Congress care?

Our manufacturing base is crumbling. The state of the dollar is falling. Foreign lenders own nearly 40 percent of our domestic economy, and China

and Saudi Arabia have now become our bankers. If lawmakers in this body were serious about the debt and about the deficit issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress would have an honest conversation and would do something about it.

In June of 2006, they stood in the same place, and spoke about the introduction of a bill called the SAFE Commission Act. They explained that the country is having trouble. It's a bipartisan commission, and it puts every spending program on. It comes back and requires—it requires, Mr. Speaker—that Congress vote up or down. In a bipartisan manner, Congressman COOPER and I have had this bill in now for 3 years.

I have little faith that this Congress will act through regular order and will tackle this enormous, growing problem. It will take this approach: Instead of dealing with these issues, Congress will ignore them.

In closing, it reminds me of the Simon and Garfunkel song, which they sang in Central Park, called "The Boxer." It says: Man hears what he wants to hear, and disregards the rest. I would change the words to say: Congress hears only what it wants to hear, and disregards the rest.

Therefore, this Congress is allowing Uncle Sam to go broke. It is time for us to deal with it in a bipartisan way for the good of our children, for the good of our grandchildren and for the good of everyone who lives in this country.

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MOVING GUANTANAMO DETAINEES TO U.S. SOIL AND CONGRESSIONAL TRANSPARENCY

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

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Yesterday was a very interesting day in an open hearing in the Intelligence Committee. It's something that doesn't happen very often. We had the opportunity to hear from a small business person from Standish, Michigan—Dave Munson. The hearing was about congressional notification.

When is it the requirement of the executive branch, of the President and of the executive agencies, to fully brief Congress in a timely manner on the actions that they are taking?

The law is fairly clear. Congress needs to be fully and currently informed of intelligence matters.

So why would David Munson, a small business man from a small town in northern Michigan, be testifying in front of the Intelligence Committee?

David Munson is asking that this Congress, that the Michigan legislature, that the city council in Standish, and that the citizens of Standish, Michigan be fully and completely informed and be on a timely basis informed on what this administration's policies are for moving Guantanamo prisoners to the United States.

On January 22, the President made a statement that he now is finding is very, very difficult to finish. He promised that, within 12 months, the prison in Guantanamo would be closed and that the Gitmo detainees would be moved somewhere else, either overseas or perhaps to the United States. Many of us who have been working on this issue for years recognized how ill-advised the President's statement could be.

President Bush had said that he wanted Guantanamo closed, and as he started taking a look at how he would make it happen, he found out it was very, very difficult to do. He diminished the number of detainees in Gitmo, but he wasn't able to close it completely. President Obama, really with no analysis, said he would close it in 12 months. He has now found out how difficult that is.

Other countries don't want to take these detainees. They don't want to take them into their countries. We don't want them in the United States. As soon as they move from Cuba to the United States, they get a whole new set of legal rights and legal authorities. So why would we want to do that for some of the most dangerous people in the world? Yet the President seems committed to moving these people to the United States.

One of the sites that he is supposedly investigating, or that the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice are considering, is a closed corrections facility in Standish, Michigan. The Department of Defense has been there. Mr. Munson believes that some of the elected officials in the commu-

nity are having ongoing discussions with the Department of Defense about moving these detainees, these prisoners, to the State of Michigan even though the community is opposed.

Just like most of Michigan, this is a community that is hurting. We've got a 15.3 percent unemployment rate—the highest unemployment rate in the country, so we need an economic stimulus; but what the people of that community have said is we don't need an al Qaeda stimulus in our community. If the President is considering moving these prisoners to Michigan, what they do want is transparency. They would like to know exactly what the status of the negotiations is.

Are there negotiations actually taking place? If there are, then they'd like to know: What's the impact on our community going to be? They'd like to have a better understanding.

As Mr. Munson said yesterday, exactly who are these individuals we're considering moving into our community? What are their backgrounds? Why are they being held in Gitmo? Why have we detained them for years? He would also like to know, as would other people in the community, if we've held these people in Gitmo for a number of years, what have we learned while we have held these people in detention? What kinds of risks and challenges might they pose to the people who are guarding them and to the community where they are housed? What has been our experience in holding al Qaeda and radical jihadists in prisons around the world? Have there been attempted prison breaks? Have there been attempted prison entries where people outside have targeted the communities where these facilities are held?

These are the kinds of questions that the people in Standish, Michigan and the people of Michigan want answers to. The people in Standish have asked for that information. The Michigan legislature has asked for transparency. I have asked for transparency as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, but consistently, Secretary Gates and the Obama administration have replied with stone silence. They are totally unwilling to share any information with elected officials or with the citizens of Standish about what their plans and intentions may or may not be.

For an administration that said we are going to be transparent, to have a hearing in the Intelligence Committee where we're saying we want to talk about transparency and about what some would say is a lack of transparency by the previous administration and now by this administration and about keeping Congress fully and completely informed on a timely basis, it was the perfect hearing in which to have that discussion.

What David Munson clearly articulated is that people in Michigan and people in Standish are concerned, and they want answers. This administration has been unwilling to keep the

citizens of Standish informed on this issue. It is disappointing. This is a community that is concerned about their economic future. They are concerned about the character of their community. They are concerned about the future. With the closing of the corrections facility in Standish recently, the city faces some very, very tough economic times. The community faces tough economic times. A lot of people have lost their jobs because of the decisions that have been made by the State of Michigan.

So they're trying to wrestle, and they're trying to deal with those issues, but the thing that they realize is that, as they move forward and as they look toward the future as to how they're going to fill it, they would just like some information. They would like some information and some transparency from this administration, and they're disappointed that they're not getting it.

Today, again, we reiterate the request to the Department of Defense, to the Department of Justice and to the Obama administration: Please, please be more transparent in what your plans and intentions are for the Gitmo detainees because there are two debates. There are many of us who believe that even considering moving the Gitmo detainees to U.S. soil is a genuinely bad idea.

□ 1230

Let's have that debate. Let's have that debate first, and then if somehow at the conclusion of that debate there are still people who believe that moving these individuals to the United States is a good idea, then let's be fully transparent as to the ramifications, the risks, and the implications to local communities.

What we have seen so far is that the Obama administration is totally unwilling to engage in the first debate as to why and what the benefits are to closing Gitmo and moving those prisoners to the United States. Now they have moved directly to the second, without any consideration or any dialogue on the first, and now they are doing the second one in total secrecy.

It is time to change that process. I think it is time to go back to the beginning of this process and reconsider that first decision that says we are going to close Gitmo. Then I think what we will find out is this second discussion may not even be needed.

PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE TO EVERY
AMERICAN

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I want to just change the topic now to how to insure every American on health care.

A colleague of mine wrote an op-ed that was published in the Wall Street Journal recently that said there are different ways to ensure that every American has access to health insurance. People say, do Republicans have a plan? Of course we have plans. We have had plans for a number of years on ways to address the health crisis or

the problems that we face in health care and with health insurance in America today. We were very, very clear that there is a plan that can do that. We also identified what some of the problems may be.

If you take a look at why we have some of the issues, go to your local hospitals. Go to your local doctors. Ask them, when someone comes in with government health care, Medicare or Medicaid, how are you reimbursed for the expenses that you incur? And what they will typically tell you is, well, if someone comes in with a Medicaid card, for every dollar of expenses that we incur, we receive about 40 cents of reimbursement. If they come in as a Medicare patient, they will say, well, that is a little bit better. We get paid at about 60 cents for every dollar of expenses we incur.

You ask, why is the private sector being squeezed and why do you see the insurance rates in the private sector going up? It is because the government programs are terrible payers and the cost has to be borne by the private sector.

There are really five types of patients that will walk into a health care facility: those that are on Medicaid; those that are on Medicare; those that have private insurance; the fourth would be those that have no insurance, they are going to pay out of their pocket; and then the last would be uncompensated care, people that go into an emergency room or go into a doctor's office, they are sick, they are going to get the care, but they have no way to pay for the care that they are going to receive.

All of those, everything except the private insurance plans, they are all squeezing private insurance, and that is what is forcing private insurance plans to escalate their costs and their premiums very quickly. Think about what would happen if the government programs actually paid \$1 of reimbursement for \$1 of care given.

The other thing that we find is that our Tax Code incentivizes employer-provided health care, rewards health insurance companies by insulating them from accountability, and punishes those that lack employer-provided care. If individuals want to go out and buy health insurance for themselves, the Tax Code penalizes them, versus their neighbor who may be getting it from their employer. We need to fix this.

But the bottom line that we come to in terms of insurance and making sure that every American has access to insurance is to empower patients and to give them more choice. We are going to talk a little bit about the alternative plans that are out there in just a minute. But our focus is driving towards patient choice, patient affordability, providing the mechanisms in the Tax Code and through tax credits or subsidies to enable individuals to go out and access health care, rather than having the government-run health care.

It is a very, very different model between the two parties, one of which says we are going to empower individuals and give them access and they are going to keep the authority and the responsibility and the accountability and the opportunity to go out and buy their own health care, ensuring that they keep that power and that control.

We are not empowering anybody. That is a word that we use all too often here, that we are "empowering." No. Individuals already have that authority. The Constitution protects those kinds of individual rights and individual freedoms. They are not getting that from this Congress. They are getting that because that is what the Founding Fathers gave to them. Now what we want to do is create a framework so they are better able to use that power and have access to health care.

On this side of the aisle—and you saw it more recently with the passage of the Baucus bill out of committee over on the Senate side as well as in the bills that have come out in the House side—what do we see? What we see is, rather than individuals having the power, it is this body and Congress taking the power from individuals and taking it into this body and then giving it to Federal bureaucracies. And we know what happens when those decisions move from individuals to Washington.

As a matter of fact, there was an op-ed written in the Investor Business Daily, again written by Congressman SHADDEGG and myself, and the title of that op-ed, as they put it on, we did not, but it says "Lies, Earmarks and Corruption All in One Bill." You kind of take a look at it and say, that is a pretty harsh indictment of a piece of legislation moving its way through Congress. Let me tell you where John and I see some of the evidence of this.

People talk about this legislation and they say, well, it reduces the deficit by \$70 billion or \$80 billion over the first 10 years. And you look at it and say, yes, as my colleague before said, it is time for us to address the deficit. You say, yes, we are excited about that.

But then you peel back the layers and you say, but how does it do that? We have got this massive expansion of health care to more Americans and these types of things. How do we do that and save money? As you peel back the layers, it says, yes, the taxes start day one when this bill goes into effect, but the benefits or the expansion of health care really doesn't start until year 3 or 4. So we have got 10 years of taxes and only 7 years or 6 years of health care.

Well, what happens when we have 10 years of health care and 10 years of taxes? Same old thing. We are back to massive new deficits. Is that a lie? I don't know. But it sure looks like Enron-style accounting. People in the private sector have gone to jail for similar types of accounting.

They also indicate that they are going to pay for this with \$404 billion of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. If there are those types of savings available in Medicare and Medicaid, let's do those right now. The reality is those types of savings aren't identified in Medicare and Medicaid. They never have been. As a matter of fact, the other body now is considering a doctor fix. They are not going to put it into this health care bill. Why? Because it is an increase of \$250 billion of reimbursements to doctors. It is called the doc fix.

So rather than finding savings in Medicare and Medicaid, what they are identifying is massive new expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid; \$133 billion in cuts to Medicare Advantage.

Earmarks. There are State earmarks. Think about it. There are people from different States in this auditorium and on the floor of the House. There are new massive mandates in here for Medicaid, expansion of Medicaid.

You say, well, let's apply those equally across all 50 States. The mandates go across all 50 States. In 46 of those States, the States have to pick up their share of the costs of these new mandates. In Michigan, it would normally mean we would pick up 40 percent of the cost of these new mandates. But, for some reason, four States are exempted. The Federal Government will pick up 100 percent of the expanded Medicaid costs. Michigan is one of those States. I say to the other 46 States, thank you, in this case, for subsidizing Michigan health care.

There is another feature in here, another earmark, where there are going to be new taxes for individuals who have golden health insurance plans. What is the earmark? You would think this new tax would apply equally to all 50 States. Wrong. Seventeen States are exempted and only phase into this program over a period of time. You say thank you to the other 33 States, because you are now subsidizing, in this case, 17 States who will not have new taxes imposed on them.

Those Senators, those Members of the House, maybe were more effective in negotiating and saying, I will only vote for this health care if you exempt us from the Medicaid, the new Medicaid fees, or if you exempt our State from the new taxes.

It hardly seems fair. It hardly seems to have much to do with the delivery of quality and quantity of health care. It seems to reflect more on who has power and who does not have power in the process of designing this new legislation.

There is a better way. As I have gone through and as some of my colleagues have gone through and said, you know, let's take a look at health care. At one of my first town meetings, someone said, PETE, I know you came out of the business world. Now, you came out of Herman Miller and you came out of a marketing background, but you were working for a Fortune 500 company,

and because you worked in product development, you spent a lot of time working with engineers. Take a look at our health care system from an engineer's standpoint.

What an engineer would do is they would look at this thing systemically. They would identify where the problems were in the system, what parts of the system were broken and what parts of the system actually worked. Then they would focus in like a laser on fixing the parts of the system that were broken and leave the rest of the system working. That is kind of where we are with health care.

Eighty-five percent of Americans have health care. Surveys indicate that most of these folks are satisfied with the health care that they are getting, but they are also compassionate and saying we ought to take a look at fixing the parts of the system that right now are barriers to other Americans getting health care.

So the question is, why not focus on those? I have introduced and sponsored a series of bills that say, let's take a look at these seven targeted fixes for health care reform. They address the issues of cost, so that we have more competition. We have the tax credits and the cost subsidies, so every American will have the resources to go out and buy insurance. And they will also have an opportunity to have more choice, and there will be more competition, so that prices should come down.

In terms of access, we are also going there, because we are saying we do need to do something. It is inherently unfair that individuals who have a pre-existing condition find it difficult, if not impossible, to access health care in America. Let's make sure that we put in place a process in our insurance system that allows people that have pre-existing conditions to make sure that they are covered and that they also have the opportunity to have the confidence that if they get a different illness or they get a different health care problem, that they are covered and they can be covered for their pre-existing condition and other things that may happen to them.

Then we put in a bill that deals with tort reform. All of these bills could be implemented immediately, and in 3 years we would find out how much impact we have had. As a matter of fact, these things could be implemented right now. We would have 3 years of experience in improving our current health care system, and in 3 years we could say, how much have these programs and these bills improved health insurance and health quality and quantity in America? If they are working, we could say, okay, maybe we have to tweak them, we have to modify them a little bit.

But why the 3-year window? Remember that under the President's plan, the health care programs don't kick in for 3 years.

□ 1245

And at the rate that we're going, you wonder why 3 years. It also happens to

be, means they'll kick in after the next election, so Americans who will lose their health insurance or will have to change their health insurance, they won't be hit with that reality until after the next Presidential election. Interesting timing.

But when we get to health care, there's a way to improve health care that says we're going to enable individuals, individual American citizens, to keep the power that they have to direct their health care, the choices that they have versus a plan that says we're going to have that choice and that opportunity and that freedom taken away from individuals and moved to the government and government bureaucracy where we see all the kinds of shenanigans that are going on in the current Senate bill and going on in the current House bills.

There is an alternative: Freedom versus massive government programs. And there are alternatives that go out and say, in a very targeted way, here's how we can address the issues and improve the access, the quality and the price of health care for every American and do it today, rather than waiting 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this gets to be a much more open process than what we have today, a much more open process than what we have had up until this point. It appears that some are driven and they've bought into the idea that government needs to run health care. That is fundamentally wrong because if we move in that direction, it means we will grow government and we will take freedom away from Americans. That is the wrong way to address this problem.

Let's bring Republicans and Democrats together, and let's focus on providing individuals the tools that they need to be able to go out and get the quality and the quantity of health care that they need and that they want.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MAFFEI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. MCCAUL (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of receiving St. Mary's Law School distinguished alumni award.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. WOOLSEY for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on October 22, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 621. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

H.R. 2892. Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 26, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4237. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Group Risk Plan of Insurance Regulations; and the Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC19) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4238. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — TRICARE; Reimbursement of Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs) [DoD-2008-HA-0007] (RIN: 0720-AB21) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4239. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Final Rule Regarding Limited Amendment of the Temporary Liquidity Guarantee Program To Extend the Transaction Account Guarantee Program With Modified Fee Structure (RIN: 3064-AD37) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4240. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Boards of Directors: Eligibility and Elections (RIN: 2590-AA03) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4241. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Post-Employment Restriction for Senior Examiners (RIN: 2590-AA19) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4242. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Operating Fees (RIN: 3133-AD60) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4243. A letter from the Chief, PRAB, Office of Research & Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP): Nondiscretionary Provisions of Public Law 108-265, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 [FNS-2007-0008] (RIN: 0584-AD74) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4244. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4245. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 090206144-9697-02] (RIN: 0648-XQ95) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4246. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR30) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4247. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR20) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4248. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100090344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR40) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4249. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR40) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4250. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fraser River Sockeye and Pink Salmon Fisheries; Notification of Inseason Orders; Correction [Docket No.: 0907301169-91204-01] (RIN: 0648-AY02) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4251. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Bottomfish and Seamount Groundfish Fisheries; Fishery Closure (RIN: 0648-XN78) received August 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4252. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 0809251266-81485-02] (RIN: 0648-XR11) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4253. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR33) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4254. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-time Category [Docket No.: 010319075-1217-02] (RIN: 0648-XP75) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4255. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 29 [Docket No.: 090206149-91081-03] (RIN: 0648-AX39) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4256. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Pelagic Fisheries; Squid Jig Fisheries [Docket No.: 080206127-91246-03] (RIN: 0648-AS71) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4257. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XR43) received September 30, 2009, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4258. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter regarding the efforts to create a "National Strategy for Child Exploitation and Interdiction", pursuant to Public Law 110-401; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4259. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vessel and Facility Response Plans for Oil: 2003 Removal Equipment Requirements and Alternative Technology Revisions [Docket No.: USCG-2001-8661] (RIN: 1625-AA26) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4260. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Final Rule; Safety and Security Zones: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant, Plymouth, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0311] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4261. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director Directive #5 Tier I Mixed Service Costs received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4262. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance on 2009 Required Minimum Distributions [Notice 2009-82] received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4263. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2009-47) received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4264. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interim Final Rules for Sections 101 through 103 of the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act of 2008 (RIN: 0938-AP37) received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4265. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Payments to Beneficiaries Residing in Vietnam and Cambodia and Other Conforming Changes [Docket No.: SSA-2008-0047] (RIN: 0960-AG62) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4266. A letter from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's fourth quarterly report for fiscal year 2009 from the Office of Security and Privacy, pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 803; to the Committee on 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. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2868. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend,

modify, and recodify the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance security and protect against acts of terrorism against chemical facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-205, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1612. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service; with amendments (Rept. 111-312, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to enhance the security of the public water systems of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. 111-313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

The Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1612 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2868 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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. MAFFEI (for himself, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of Clean Energy Business Zones and for tax incentives for the construction of, and employment at, energy-efficient buildings and clean energy facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a waiver of minimum required distribution rules applicable to pension plans for 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 90 days the first-time homebuyer credit for taxpayers who have entered into a binding contract before the termination of such credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. MICA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LIN-

DER, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MACK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 3922. A bill to ensure that companies operating in the United States that receive United States Government funds are not conducting business in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, 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. POLIS:

H.R. 3923. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H. Res. 862. A resolution congratulating the staff, students, and faculty at the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy for winning the 2009 Star Innovator in the Intel Schools of Distinction competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIMES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. HODES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KILROY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 863. A resolution recognizing the scourge of pneumonia, urging the United States and the world to mobilize cooperation and prioritize resources to fight pneumonia and save children's lives, and recognizing November 2 as World Pneumonia Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H. Res. 864. A resolution congratulating President Obama for winning of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H. Res. 865. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt a target of 350 parts per million of atmospheric carbon dioxide by which to evaluate domestic and international climate change policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 866. A resolution expressing support for designation of a National Veterans History Project Week to encourage public participation in a nationwide project that collects and preserves the stories of the men and women who served our nation in times of war and conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 867. A resolution calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" in multilateral fora; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYES, Ms. SPIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HARE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOREN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Res. 868. A resolution honoring and recognizing the service and achievements of current and former female members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. DENT (for himself, Mr. DRIEIER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. FOX, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr.

SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Res. 869. A resolution directing the Chief Administrative Officer to install cameras in the hearing room of the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 450: Mr. CARTER and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 571: Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 644: Mrs. CAPPS and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 775: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 929: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 1132: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. HALVORSON.
 H.R. 1207: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1250: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1352: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 1362: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. Chu.
 H.R. 1831: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1974: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1990: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 2024: Mr. SPACE.
 H.R. 2102: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2275: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2279: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2377: Mr. KRATOVIL.
 H.R. 2382: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 2406: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2413: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HARE, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 2452: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 2534: Mr. SNYDER.
 H.R. 2547: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 2548: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 2642: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
 H.R. 2756: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 2807: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 3024: Mr. WAMP and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3044: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3245: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 3286: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3355: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3467: Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 3519: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3524: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 3669: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3677: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3702: Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 3711: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3715: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3731: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 3734: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3799: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 3827: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3906: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCALISE.

H. Res. 22: Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 333: Mr. FILNER and Mr. OLVER.

H. Res. 704: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 729: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 736: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 747: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 749: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 763: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 780: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. TEAGUE.

H. Res. 787: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 798: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WU, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LINDER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 839: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WU, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 848: Mr. HOLDEN.