



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2009

No. 169

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 16, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GERALD E. CONNOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord of the ages and ever-present to faithful believers, You are our source of life and our strength.

The character of a people is easily fashioned by the typology of their land, the households of their families, and their history. Yet through all the changes of time and space, You, Lord, may step in and make an even greater difference in the lives of individuals and in the life of a nation.

Be with our beloved country and its government leaders today and throughout this coming week. May true goodness and lasting peace radiate from Your people and give You glory now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LYNCH 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 9, 2009.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 9, 2009 at 4:26 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 210.

With best wishes I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 9, 2009.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following mes-

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on November 9, 2009, at 1:40 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 806.
That the Senate passed S. 1860.

Appointments:

Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 10, 2009.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 10, 2009, at 9:29 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 955.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1516.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1713.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2004.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2215.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2760.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2972.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3119.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3386.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3547.

That the Senate passed S. 1825.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

□ 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.

H12973

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing conservative about the war in Afghanistan. The Center for Defense Information said a few months ago that we had spent over \$400 billion on the war and war-related costs there. Now, the Pentagon says it will cost about \$1 billion for each 1,000 additional troops we send to Afghanistan. One Republican Member from California told me recently that we could buy off every warlord in Afghanistan for \$1 billion.

Fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by all this spending. Conservatives who oppose big government and huge deficit spending at home should not support it in foreign countries just because it is being done by our biggest bureaucracy, the Defense Department.

We have now spent \$1.5 trillion that we did not have—that we had to borrow—in Iraq and Afghanistan. Eight years is long enough. In fact, it is too long. Let's bring our troops home and start putting Americans first once again.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE**

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

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

**W. HAZEN HILLYARD POST OFFICE
BUILDING**

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3767) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the "W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3767

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

SECTION 1. W. HAZEN HILLYARD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170

North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, shall be known and designated as the "W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building".

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I present H.R. 3767 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the "W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building."

H.R. 3767 was introduced by my friend and colleague Representative ROB BISHOP of Utah on October 8, 2009, and it was favorably reported out of the House Oversight Committee by voice vote on October 29, 2009. In addition, this legislation enjoys the support of the entire Utah House delegation.

A native of the city of Smithfield, Utah, Mr. W. Hazen Hillyard was born on June 6, 1893, and dedicated his life and career to serving his beloved Smithfield community. Mr. Hillyard began his career in public service as a member of the Smithfield City Council from 1930 to 1933, during which time he sponsored a variety of community projects designed to enhance and revamp the city.

Notably, Mr. Hillyard's tenure on the Smithfield City Council, on which he also served from 1964 to 1968, included his meticulous research effort to verify, upgrade, and catalog the records of the Smithfield City Cemetery. In addition, Mr. Hillyard's lifelong service to his Smithfield community included his active membership in the local Kiwanis Club, a Smithfield service organization, which elected Mr. Hillyard as its president in 1937. Moreover, Mr. Hillyard also served as chairman of the City Library Board, chairman of the Smithfield Historical Heritage Society, and vice chairman of the Cache Valley Council of the Boy Scouts of America for several years. The latter organization presented Mr. Hillyard with its Silver Beaver Award in recognition of his long-time service to the scouting program.

In 1934, Mr. Hillyard began a new career in public service when he was appointed to serve as postmaster of Smithfield. Notably, at the beginning of Mr. Hillyard's tenure, the city of Smithfield did not provide home delivery, and as a result, residents had to call the post office in order to receive their mail. While Mr. Hillyard thoroughly enjoyed his interaction with residents as they stopped by the general delivery window for mail services, he also recognized the need for enhanced postal facilities and services as the population of Smithfield grew over the years. Accordingly, Mr. Hillyard played an instrumental role in obtaining a new and larger post office facility for Smithfield in 1957, and in 1963, he led a successful effort to implement home delivery of the mail to all houses in Smithfield.

During his service as Smithfield's postmaster, Mr. Hillyard was an active member of the Utah chapter of the National Postmasters Association and was eventually elected to serve as president of the Utah chapter in 1952. That same year and in furtherance of his role, Mr. Hillyard visited every single post office in the State of Utah.

In recognition of Mr. Hillyard's service to the Smithfield community, the Smithfield Lion's Club presented Mr. Hillyard with its Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award in 1974.

Regrettably, Mr. Hillyard passed away on April 22, 1992, at the age of 99. However, while he is no longer with us, Mr. Hillyard's life and legacy of public service will live on through his various accomplishments on behalf of his beloved Smithfield community.

Mr. Speaker, let us take this opportunity to honor Mr. W. Hazen Hillyard through the passage of this legislation to designate the Smithfield post office facility in his honor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3767.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3767, which designates the United States Post Office at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the "W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building."

Mr. Hazen Hillyard of Smithfield, Utah, was born in 1893 and grew up on his family's farm. Always active in his community, he served on the Smithfield City Council twice from 1930 to 1933 and again from 1964 to 1968, being reelected after staying out of office 31 years.

While on the council, he worked tirelessly to upgrade the catalog of the records of Smithfield's city cemetery. He was also instrumental in a number of projects to beautify his hometown.

A member of many civic organizations, Mr. Hillyard served on the Smithfield Historical Heritage Society, was president of the local Kiwanis Club, vice chairman of the Cache Valley Council of the Boy Scouts of America, and was awarded the Silver Beaver

Award in recognition of his long service to scouting programs. Mr. Hillyard was also active in the Lion's Club of Smithfield and was awarded their Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award in 1974.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has mentioned, Mr. Hillyard was appointed postmaster of Smithfield's post office in 1934, and at that time there was no home delivery for citizens of that town. He was so active, as my colleague has mentioned, that he was elected president of the Postmasters Association in 1952. And under his leadership and direction, the Smithfield post office grew in size and was able to start home delivery and other services.

Throughout his life, Mr. Hillyard was a central figure in Smithfield, dedicating his life to the advancement of that city. He did live a long life and passed away in 1992 at the age of 99.

As my colleague has mentioned, this is a very worthwhile and appropriate piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3767.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

I would ask all our Members to join with Representative ROB BISHOP of Utah in supporting this very deserving resolution to name this post office on behalf of W. Hazen Hillyard.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3767.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1415

EXTENDING AUTHORITY FOR RELOCATION EXPENSES

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1825) to extend the authority for relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1825

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

SECTION 1. RELOCATION EXPENSES TEST PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5739 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3);

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “or extended” after “approved”; and

(B) by inserting “or extension” after “of the program”;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c)(1) An agency authorized to conduct a test program under subsection (a) shall annually submit a report on the results of the program to date to the Administrator.

“(2) Not later than 3 months after completion of a test program, the agency conducting the program shall submit a final report on the results of the program to the Administrator and the appropriate committees of Congress.”;

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “10” and inserting “12”; and

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e)(1) The Administrator may not approve any test program for an initial period of more than 4 years.

“(2)(A) Upon the request of the agency administering a test program, the Administrator may extend the program.

“(B) An extension under subparagraph (A) may not exceed 4 years.

“(C) The Administrator may exercise more than 1 extension under subparagraph (A) with respect to any test program.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on December 18, 2009.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present Senate bill 1825 for consideration. This legislation will grant the General Services Administration the permanent authority to approve Federal agency requests to operate programs that test alternative methods of compensating employees for relocation and travel expenses.

Senate 1825 was introduced on October 21, 2009, by Senator Joe LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, and it was favorably reported by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on November 4, 2009. In addition, the legislation passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent on November 9, 2009.

Mr. Speaker, the General Services Administration was granted the authority to approve Federal agency travel and relocation expenses test programs via the Travel Transportation Reform Act of 1998. Through the test programs facilitated by the act, Federal agencies have been able to test new and innovative methods of reim-

bursing relocation and travel expenses in order to enhance cost savings for the Federal Government. Notably, the current authority granted to the General Services Administration is scheduled to expire in December of 2009.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1825 will therefore ensure that agencies will continue to have the flexibility to use the compensation methods with respect to relocation and travel costs that work best for them and that are in the best interests of the Federal Government. In addition, I would like to note that according to the Congressional Budget Office, the net impact of S. 1825 on the Federal budget would not be significant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. LIEBERMAN and S. 1825.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1825, which would make permanent the authority of the U.S. General Services Administration to approve Federal agencies' requests to operate programs to test alternative methods of compensating employees for relocation and travel expenses. This bill passed the Senate on November 9 by unanimous consent. GSA's current authority to authorize a program would have otherwise expired in December of this year.

By acting now we are allowing successful test programs to continue to operate and are giving GSA authority to approve more of them. Many of these relocation expense test programs have been successful in not only making government run more efficiently but also in achieving cost savings. Other provisions of this bill would expand the number of test programs that can run at the same time from 10 to 12 and allow them to operate for a maximum of 8 years. Based on information from GSA and the agencies involved, CBO estimates that there would be no cost to the Federal Government if this bill is passed.

Unfortunately, these relocation and travel expense programs have been subject to major scandals over the past few years, and each and every agency should watch these expenses very closely; and, hopefully, these test programs will lead to a closer and more honest accounting of this type of money for the Federal Government and for our taxpayers.

At a time when the Federal deficit is soaring, it is important that we continue successful programs that make the government more efficient and hopefully save money.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1825.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his kind words. Again I ask all the Members from both sides of the

aisle to join with Senator LIEBERMAN in supporting Senate 1825.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1825.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA D. MCGINTY-JUHL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3539) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3539

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

SECTION 1. PATRICIA D. MCGINTY-JUHL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 3539 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building."

H.R. 3539 was introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative Albio Sires, on September 8, 2009, and favorably reported out of the House Oversight Committee by unanimous consent on October 29, 2009. In addition, this legislation enjoys the support of the entire New Jersey House delegation.

A native of the town of Harrison, New Jersey, Patricia McGinty-Juhl dedicated the majority of her life to public service as an employee of the United States Postal Service for over 33 years.

Ms. McGinty-Juhl began her distinguished career with the postal service in 1973 as a distribution clerk at the New York International and Bulk Mail Center located in Jersey City, New Jersey. During her more than three decades of service, Ms. McGinty-Juhl also served in a variety of personnel and benefits positions with the Postal Service Human Resources Division, as well as in the Government Relations Department at postal headquarters as a congressional liaison.

Most recently, in recognition of her tremendous talent and admirable dedication to her coworkers, Ms. McGinty-Juhl served as western area manager of human resources from April of 2001 until her unexpected passing on October 16, 2006.

In remembrance of Ms. McGinty-Juhl's life and career, United States Postmaster General Jack Potter offered the following tribute upon the untimely passing of this dedicated postal employee: "Patti will be greatly missed, both as a manager and as a warm and giving person. She made a difference for the postal service and for our employees."

Mr. Speaker, let us take this opportunity to honor Ms. Patricia McGinty-Juhl for her 33 years of public service by designating the Harrison Avenue postal facility in Harrison, New Jersey, in her honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3539.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3539, which designates the United States postal facility located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building."

Patricia McGinty-Juhl, a native of Harrison, New Jersey, had an impressive and distinguished career with the United States Postal Service for 33 years as a manager and executive. While working in the human resources office, she was instrumental in overseeing affirmative action issues on behalf of employees as the district women's program coordinator. As a result of her work, she was offered a position at the U.S. Postal Service headquarters in Washington as the national women's program manager.

Once in Washington, Ms. McGinty-Juhl continued to impress those who worked with her. As a result of her work ethic and leadership skills, she was offered the position of government relations liaison to congressional offices. The Postmaster General, Jack Potter, often spoke of Ms. McGinty-Juhl as an outstanding manager and a warm and giving person.

Ms. McGinty-Juhl passed away at her home in 2006.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3539 and recognizing Ms. McGinty-Juhl's dedication to the betterment of the United States Postal Service.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to join with Representative ALBIO SIRES from New Jersey in honoring Ms. Patricia McGinty-Juhl to the passage of H.R. 3539.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3539 which would designate the U.S. Postal Service building located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office."

Born and raised in Harrison, New Jersey, Mrs. McGinty-Juhl had a long and distinguished career with the Postal Service that spanned over 33 years. Her professional accomplishments serving New Jersey included clerking at the New York International Bulk Mail Center in Jersey City, a variety of Personnel and Benefits positions within Human Resources, and the District Women's Program Coordinator working on affirmative action activities on behalf of all employees. Later she became the National Women's Program Manager at USPS National Headquarters as National Women's Program Manager.

In recognition of her enormous talent and ability to work with people, Mrs. McGinty-Juhl was offered a position in Government Relations serving as the Government Relations Liaison to Congressional offices. She later moved over to the Human Resource Department at Postal Service Headquarters as the Program Manager, Research and Communications, where she worked with national leaders on postal issues.

She ended her career as Western Area Manager of Human Resources where she served until her death on October 16, 2006. Speaking on behalf of postal employees everywhere, Postmaster General Jack Potter gave the following tribute to Mrs. McGinty-Juhl: "Patti will be greatly missed, both as a manager and as a warm and giving person. She made a difference for the Postal Service and for our employees."

I am pleased to celebrate this dedicated civil servant through this legislation. I cannot think of a better way to honor Mrs. McGinty-Juhl's legacy than by designating a U.S. Postal Office in her name—a place in which she devoted her life's work.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3539.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FDR DOCUMENTS ACT

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1506) to provide that claims of the United States to certain documents relating to Franklin Delano Roosevelt shall be treated as waived and relinquished in certain circumstances.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1506

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

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS RELATING TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any person or entity makes a gift of any property described in subsection (b) to the National Archives and Records Administration, then any claim of the United States to such property shall be treated as having been waived and relinquished on the day before the date of such gift.

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—Property is described in this subsection if such property—

(1) is a part of the collection of documents, papers, and memorabilia relating to Franklin Delano Roosevelt or any member of his family or staff; and

(2) was in the possession of Grace Tully and retained by her at the time of her death.

(c) DATE OF GIFT.—The date of a gift referred to in subsection (a) is any date specified by the donor so long as such date is subsequent to the physical delivery of the property described in subsection (b) to the National Archives and Records Administration.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present H.R. 1506 for consideration. This legislation will facilitate the donation of the Grace Tully archive to the National Archives and Records Administration. H.R. 1506 was introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York, on March 12, 2009, and favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee by voice vote on October 29, 2009. In addition, the Senate companion bill to H.R. 1506, Senate bill 692, introduced by Senator CHARLES SCHUMER of

New York, was passed by the United States Senate on October 14, 2009, by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Grace Tully served as the personal secretary of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt from June of 1941 to April of 1945. In her capacity as personal secretary to the President, Ms. Tully preserved an assortment of personal papers and other historical items related to President Roosevelt that have come to form a historically significant collection.

While the private owner of the Grace Tully collection would like to donate the materials to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Presidential Library, the National Archives and Records Administration, which administers the Roosevelt Library, has asserted a claim to a portion of the collection. Notably, the claim asserted by the National Archives impacts whether the private owner may claim a tax deduction for the donation.

In order to facilitate the donation of the Grace Tully archive, H.R. 1506 waives the government's claim to the records and will thereby allow the collection to be gifted to the Roosevelt Library.

Mr. Speaker, the Grace Tully archive represents an important part of American history. Through the passage of H.R. 1506, we will ensure that this collection will be properly preserved and made publicly available through the Roosevelt Library. I would also like to note that this legislation enjoys the support of the National Archives.

As noted by former Acting Archivist Adrienne Thomas in a letter sent to the Oversight Committee last month: "I write to express my strong support for the ongoing legislative effort to facilitate the donation to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library of the Tully archive through House bill H.R. 1506 and its Senate companion, Senate 692."

Ms. Thomas went on to say that "it is very important to the National Archives and Records Administration, and for future historians that might want to study these papers, for the Tully archive to be kept intact and made fully accessible to the American people in a public government archive."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1506.

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

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1506 would waive certain claims of the United States to specific documents relating to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The papers, known as the Tully Collection, are said to be an important and valuable collection of materials relating to President Roosevelt's time in office. Grace Tully served as part of Franklin Roosevelt's secretarial staff for several decades, and in 1941 became his personal sec-

retary. After her death her collection of personal papers passed on through her niece into the hands of private collectors and finally to the current owners, Sun Times Media, who bought the collection for \$8 million in 2001.

In 2004 the National Archives asserted a claim to a portion of the documents. Sun Times Media wishes to donate the entire collection to President Roosevelt's Presidential Library in Hyde Park, New York. Due to the Archives' formal claim, however, Sun Times Media is prevented from receiving a tax deduction on the donation. This bill aims to alleviate the legal claims of the United States and the Archives, thereby clearing the way for the donation and the deduction.

I understand this bill is a priority for certain Members of the New York delegation. I also understand the Archives has offered its support for this legislation in a letter to the committee. Nevertheless, I want to briefly highlight two points.

First, given the multiple ongoing instances of mismanagement at the Archives, we need to take a close look at all legislation relating to this agency. Second, the majority moved this bill without a hearing. We should have a better understanding of this legislation, particularly how it relinquishes the Federal Government's claim to certain documents while benefiting certain entities through tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can take a closer look at this bill as it moves through the legislative process.

I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. On behalf of the sponsor here, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, I encourage my friends from both sides of the aisle to join us in supporting H.R. 1506.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1506, which will allow for the National Archives to acquire the Grace Tully collection of documents and memorabilia pertaining to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The passage of this important legislation could not be timelier, and will allow the American people to have access to historical documents that provide unique insight into the life of one of our nation's greatest Presidents.

Grace Tully was one of the most important figures in President Roosevelt's life. She began her professional career working for Eleanor Roosevelt, and worked for FDR from his time as Governor of New York through his death in 1945. From 1941, Grace Tully served as the President's personal secretary and she frequently traveled with the President. Her collection of documents and personal correspondence from this time span one of the most challenging eras in our nation's history and provide unique insight into the thinking of our nation's longest serving President.

The collection includes a draft copy of President Roosevelt's speech to the 1936 Democratic Convention in which he famously said that "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny." Much of the collection gives a behind the scenes look at how the President fulfilled his promise to that convention. It includes personal correspondence that

discussed the creation of Social Security and other programs that were integral to the New Deal. The collection also includes draft copy of the President's 1941 address to a joint session of Congress. The handwritten notes on the draft discuss the attack on Pearl Harbor and the President's timeless statement that December 7, 1941 was a "date which will live in infamy."

Beyond major statements and addresses, Ms. Tully's collection helps shed light on the important relationship the President had with Winston Churchill. There is personal correspondence between Roosevelt and Churchill which discuss important topics leading up to the Yalta Conference in 1945. But there is also more lighthearted correspondence including scorecards of poker games between the two heads of state.

The passage of this legislation will allow for the public to have access to this valuable collection, which provides important insight into one of the most important and transitional eras in the country's history. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1506.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1314) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1314

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

SECTION 1. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present Senate bill 1314 for consideration. This legislation would designate the United States postal facility located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland as the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office. Hopefully, today we will finish an effort I've been involved with for the last two Congresses to accomplish this honor for Dr. King, but more important, for our community. This legislation passed last Congress, but the Senate somehow didn't get around to acting upon it, and we passed it again this Congress, September 22, by a 411-0 margin. The legislation enjoys the unanimous support of the entire Oregon House and Senate delegation.

Senate bill 1314 was introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator RON WYDEN, last June, and passed the Senate this summer by unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform for their continued partnership in moving the legislation through the House and bringing us to this consideration. I am pleased to have worked with Senator WYDEN to move his identical Senate version of the bill back to the House, as our legislation was held under a procedural hold in the Senate.

Regardless, we have an opportunity now to be able to put a final note on this chapter to make this important link to a postal service in our community. It is appropriate as we think about the United States Postal Service that has been voted for five consecutive years as the most trusted government agency. For Americans, the Postal Service provides a consistent and positive connection between the government and the people. And it's, I think, appropriate that the genesis of this legislation was the result of a community-led effort that was inspired by two local letter carriers from my district.

Back in 2007 Mr. Jamie Partridge and Mr. Isham Harris collected employees' signatures supporting the naming, as well as letters of support from all the surrounding neighborhood associations. These individuals brought the community together to honor not just Dr. King, but also Oregon's somewhat rocky path to racial equality and social justice. While our State ratified the 14th amendment expanding citizenship and providing equal protection under the law back in 1868, our State, sadly, continued to deny African Americans the right to vote under the terms of the original state constitution.

This was an area of great struggle in our community. Oregon had a sad chapter where it had a virulent, power-

ful, Ku Klux Klan presence, electing elected officials and inspiring some really unfortunate State legislation. In part, inspired by this struggle, in 1914, the NAACP opened a chapter in Portland which continues to this day as the oldest continually chartered chapter of the NAACP west of the Mississippi. They were part of the leadership that finally amended the Oregon Constitution in 1927 to remove the clause denying African Americans the right to vote. For the next 30 years they were involved in efforts with leaders like Dr. Martin Luther King not just to end segregation and racial discrimination, but to promote equality. It was a struggle that we faced continuously in our community in the 1950s, such as battles over open housing.

We are well familiar, all of us, with the remarkable life and legacy of Dr. King, who provided a face and a voice to the civil rights movement, one of the greatest orators in the history of the United States who provided national leadership and local inspiration in our community. I am pleased to honor this legacy with the full support of the Oregon congressional delegation. This post office will serve as a daily reminder of Dr. King's legacy and of the struggle in Oregon and around the country to reach our objective of individual dreams being fulfilled free of artificial barriers such as skin color, religious affiliation, gender, and sexual orientation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1314 and achieve that goal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to first commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, for bringing this legislation to the floor today, and I rise to express my strong support for this bill designating the post office located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office." The leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., during the civil rights movement helped to make America the country it is today. Because of Dr. King's many accomplishments in the pursuit of justice and liberty, he clearly deserves this simple honor and recognition that we can bestow on him.

Dr. King began his career as a Baptist minister who was also the leading civil rights figure in this country during the 1950s and 1960s. Dr. King's lifelong crusade to end all forms of racial inequity and discrimination was instrumental in enlightening the country with regard to civil rights for all citizens. Dr. King led the Montgomery bus boycott in 1955, helped to found the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in 1957, and was instrumental in orchestrating the famous Birmingham protest.

Dr. King was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, which helped show the world that racial discrimination

could be ended through nonviolent means. He was also awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom and a Congressional Gold Medal. In recognition of his many accomplishments for our country, in 1983 Congress established a national holiday as a tribute to his memory. Later in Dr. King's life, he expanded his message of equality to apply to impoverished Americans of all races and cultures. Dr. King dedicated his life to ensuring the principles this country holds so dear, those of liberty and justice for all of our citizens.

Not quite 4 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was given the honor of being the grand marshal of the Martin Luther King parade in Knoxville, Tennessee. And I believe I have attended all but one of the many Martin Luther King celebrations at the Greater Warner Church in Knoxville. I'm also very proud of the fact that my father, who served for 6 years as mayor of Knoxville, led the peaceful integration of that city. And in 1962, Look magazine awarded Knoxville an All-America City Award, primarily because of the peaceful integration that we accomplished in our city.

I think this legislation is very fitting and appropriate, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Tennessee for his thoughtful words of support, for his concern and his adding historical perspective on how we're all in debt to Dr. King and how it has, in fact, inspired people north, east, west and south to be able to deal with the legacy of promoting a world hopefully free of discrimination. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House would join us in approving this measure to honor not just Dr. King, but, as I mentioned, focus on the struggle in our community to reach these ideals, one that continues to this day. The designation of the post office in honor of Dr. King will be an ongoing reminder of what we have to do ahead as well as the progress we've made.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1314.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- S. 1314, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 3539, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 3767, de novo.

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

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1314, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1314.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 889]
YEAS—373

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

Doyle	Latham	Reichert
Dreier	Latta	Reyes
Driehaus	Lee (CA)	Richardson
Duncan	Lee (NY)	Rodriguez
Edwards (MD)	Levin	Roe (TN)
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Ellison	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Ellsworth	Lipinski	Rooney
Emerson	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Loeback	Ross
Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)
Etheridge	Lucas	Royal-Allard
Fallin	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Farr	Lummis	Ruppersberger
Fattah	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)
Filner	E.	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Mack	Salazar
Fleming	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda
Forbes	Manzullo	T.
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Foster	Markey (MA)	Sarbanes
Fox	Marshall	Scalise
Frank (MA)	Massa	Schakowsky
Franks (AZ)	Matheson	Schauer
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Schiff
Fudge	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt
Gallely	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Garamendi	McCaul	Schwartz
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Scott (GA)
Gohmert	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McDermott	Serrano
Gordon (TN)	McHenry	Sessions
Granger	McIntyre	Sestak
Grayson	McMahon	Shadegg
Green, Al	McMorris	Shea-Porter
Green, Gene	Rodgers	Sherman
Griffith	McNerney	Shimkus
Guthrie	Meek (FL)	Shuler
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Shuster
Hall (TX)	Mica	Simpson
Halvorson	Michaud	Sires
Hare	Miller (FL)	Slaughter
Harper	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Heller	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hensarling	Miller, George	Snyder
Herger	Minnick	Souder
Herseth Sandlin	Mollohan	Space
Higgins	Moore (KS)	Speier
Hill	Moore (WI)	Spratt
Himes	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hinchey	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)	Sullivan
Hirono	Murtha	Sutton
Hodes	Myrick	Taylor
Holden	Nadler (NY)	Terry
Holt	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Nye	Thornberry
Inglis	Oberstar	Tiberi
Inslee	Obey	Tierney
Issa	Olson	Titus
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Tonko
Jenkins	Ortiz	Towns
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tsongas
Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen
Jones	Paul	Velázquez
Jordan (OH)	Paulsen	Vislosky
Kagen	Payne	Walden
Kanjorski	Pence	Walz
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kennedy	Perriello	Schultz
Kildee	Peters	Waters
Kind	Peterson	Watson
King (IA)	Petri	Watt
King (NY)	Pitts	Weiner
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Welch
Kirk	Polis (CO)	Westmoreland
Klein (FL)	Pomeroy	Whitfield
Kline (MN)	Posey	Wilson (OH)
Kosmas	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Kratovil	Price (NC)	Wittman
Kucinich	Putnam	Wolf
Lamborn	Quigley	Woolsey
Lance	Radanovich	Wu
Langevin	Rahall	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Young (AK)
Larson (CT)	Rehberg	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—61

Alexander	Brady (TX)	Capuano
Barrett (SC)	Braley (IA)	Costello
Berman	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Bonner	Cantor	Davis (AL)

Davis (CA) Kilpatrick (MI) Neal (MA)
 Deal (GA) Kilroy Pingree (ME)
 DeGette Kirkpatrick (AZ) Platts
 Delahunt Kissell Rohrabacher
 Gerlach LaTourette Roskam
 Giffords Lowey Rush
 Gingrey (GA) Luján Schock
 Graves Lynch Skelton
 Grijalva Maffei Smith (WA)
 Gutierrez Markey (CO) Stark
 Harman McGovern Tanner
 Hastings (WA) McKeon Teague
 Heinrich Meeks (NY) Tiahrt
 Hoekstra Mitchell Wamp
 Israel Moran (VA) Waxman
 Jackson-Lee (TX) Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim Wexler

□ 1858

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA D. MCGINTY-JUHL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3539, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3539.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 0, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 890]
 YEAS—367

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis (IL)
 Ackerman Ginny Davis (KY)
 Aderholt Buchanan Davis (TN)
 Adler (NJ) Burgess DeFazio
 Akin Burton (IN) DeLauro
 Altmire Butterfield Dent
 Andrews Buyer Diaz-Balart, L.
 Arcuri Calvert Diaz-Balart, M.
 Austria Camp Dicks
 Baca Campbell Dingell
 Bachmann Cao Doggett
 Bachus Capito Donnelly (IN)
 Baird Capps Doyle
 Baldwin Cardoza Dreier
 Barrow Carnahan Driehaus
 Bartlett Carney Duncan
 Barton (TX) Carson (IN) Edwards (MD)
 Bean Carter Edwards (TX)
 Becerra Cassidy Ehlers
 Berkley Castle Ellison
 Berry Castor (FL) Ellsworth
 Biggert Chaffetz Emerson
 Bilbray Chandler Engel
 Bilirakis Childers Eshoo
 Bishop (GA) Chu Etheridge
 Bishop (NY) Clarke Fallin
 Bishop (UT) Clay Farr
 Blackburn Cleaver Fattah
 Blumenaier Clyburn Finer
 Blunt Coble Flake
 Boccieri Coffman (CO) Fleming
 Boehmer Cohen Forbes
 Bono Mack Cole Fortenberry
 Boozman Conaway Foster
 Boren Connolly (VA) Foy
 Boswell Conyers Frank (MA)
 Boucher Cooper Franks (AZ)
 Boustany Courtney Frelinghuysen
 Boyd Crowley Fudge
 Brady (PA) Cuellar Gallegly
 Bright Culberson Garamendi
 Broun (GA) Cummings Garrett (NJ)
 Brown, Corrine Dahlkemper Gohmert

Gonzalez Marchant Ross
 Goodlatte Markey (MA) Rothman (NJ)
 Gordon (TN) Marshall Roybal-Allard
 Granger Massa Royce
 Grayson Matheson Ruppertsberger
 Green, Al Matsui Ryan (OH)
 Green, Gene McCarthy (CA) Ryan (WI)
 Griffith McCarthy (NY) Salazar
 Guthrie McClintock Sánchez, Linda
 Hall (TX) McCollum T.
 Halvorson McCotter Sanchez, Loretta
 Hare McDermott Sarbanes
 Harper McHenry Scalise
 Hastings (FL) McIntyre Schakowsky
 Heller McMahon Schauer
 Hensarling McMorris Schiff
 Herger Rodgers Schmidt
 Herseht Sandlin McNeerly Schrader
 Higgins Meek (FL) Schwartz
 Hill Melancon Scott (GA)
 Himes Mica Scott (VA)
 Hinchey Michaud Sensenbrenner
 Hinojosa Miller (FL) Serrano
 Hirono Miller (MI) Sessions
 Hodes Miller (NC) Sestak
 Holden Miller, Gary Shadegg
 Holt Miller, George Shea-Porter
 Honda Minnick Sherman
 Hoyer Mollohan Shimkus
 Hunter Moore (KS) Shuler
 Inglis Moore (WI) Shuster
 Inslee Moran (KS) Simpson
 Issa Murphy (CT) Sires
 Jackson (IL) Murphy (NY) Slaughter
 Jenkins Murtha Smith (NE)
 Johnson (GA) Myrick Smith (NJ)
 Johnson (IL) Nadler (NY) Smith (TX)
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Snyder
 Johnson, Sam Neugebauer Space
 Jones Nunes Spratt
 Jordan (OH) Nye Stearns
 Kagen Oberstar Stupak
 Kanjorski Obey Sullivan
 Kaptur Olson Sutton
 Kennedy Oliver Taylor
 Kildee Ortiz Terry
 Kind Owens Thompson (CA)
 King (IA) Pallone Thompson (MS)
 King (NY) Pascrell Thompson (PA)
 Kingston Pastor (AZ) Thornberry
 Kirk Paul Tiberi
 Klein (FL) Paulsen Tierney
 Kline (MN) Payne Titus
 Kosmas Pence Tonko
 Kratovil Perlmutter Towns
 Kucinich Perriello Tsongas
 Lamborn Peters Turner
 Lance Peterson Upton
 Langevin Petri Van Hollen
 Larsen (WA) Pitts Velázquez
 Larson (CT) Poe (TX) Visclosky
 Latham Polis (CO) Walden
 Latta Pomeroy Walz
 Lee (CA) Posey Wasserman
 Lee (NY) Price (GA) Schultz
 Levin Price (NC) Waters
 Lewis (CA) Putnam Watson
 Lewis (GA) Quigley Watt
 Linder Radanovich Weiner
 Lipinski Rahall Welch
 LoBiondo Rangel Westmoreland
 Rehberg Whitfield Whitfield
 Reichert Wilson (OH) Wilson (OH)
 Reyes Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Richardson Wittman Wittman
 Rodriguez Wolf Wolf
 Roe (TN) Woolsey Woolsey
 Rogers (AL) Wu Wu
 Rogers (KY) Yarmuth Yarmuth
 Rogers (MI) Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Ros-Lehtinen Young (FL) Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—67

Delahunt Kilroy
 Gerlach Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Giffords Kissell
 Gingrey (GA) LaTourette
 Graves Lowey
 Grijalva Luján
 Gutierrez Lynch
 Hall (NY) Maffei
 Harman Markey (CO)
 Hastings (WA) McCaul
 Heinrich McGovern
 Hoekstra McKeon
 Israel Meeks (NY)
 Jackson-Lee Mitchell
 (TX) Moran (VA)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Murphy, Patrick

Murphy, Tim Rush
 Neal (MA) Schock
 Pingree (ME) Skelton
 Platts Smith (WA)
 Rohrabacher Souder
 Rooney Speier
 Roskam Stark
 Tanner
 Teague
 Tiahrt
 Wamp
 Waxman
 Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1906

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 890, I was absent due to a telephone interview. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

W. HAZEN HILLYARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3767.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3767.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

MR. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 368, noes 0, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 891]
 AYES—368

Abercrombie Boccieri Cassidy
 Ackerman Bono Mack Castle
 Aderholt Boozman Castor (FL)
 Adler (NJ) Boren Chaffetz
 Akin Boswell Chandler
 Altmire Boucher Childers
 Andrews Boustany Chu
 Arcuri Boyd Clarke
 Austria Brady (PA) Clay
 Baca Bright Cleaver
 Bachmann Broun (GA) Clyburn
 Bachus Brown, Corrine Coble
 Baird Brown-Waite, Coffman (CO)
 Baldwin Ginny Cohen
 Barrow Buchanan Conaway
 Bartlett Burgess Connolly (VA)
 Barton (TX) Burton (IN) Conyers
 Bean Butterfield Cooper
 Becerra Buyer Costa
 Berkley Calvert Courtney
 Berry Camp Crowley
 Biggert Campbell Cuellar
 Bilbray Cao Culberson
 Bilirakis Capito Cummings
 Bishop (GA) Capps Dahlkemper
 Bishop (NY) Cardoza Davis (IL)
 Bishop (UT) Carnahan Davis (KY)
 Blackburn Carney Davis (TN)
 Blumenaier Carson (IN) DeFazio
 Blunt Carter DeLauro

Dent	Lance	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, M.	Larsen (WA)	Reich
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Richardson
Dingell	Latham	Rodriguez
Doggett	Latta	Roe (TN)
Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Doyle	Lee (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	Levin	Rogers (MI)
Driehaus	Lewis (CA)	Rooney
Duncan	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards (MD)	Linder	Ross
Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Rothman (NJ)
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Ellison	Loeback	Royce
Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
Emerson	Lucas	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)
Eshoo	Lummis	Salazar
Etheridge	Lungren, Daniel	Sanchez, Linda
Fallin	E.	T.
Farr	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta
Fattah	Maloney	Sarbanes
Filner	Manzullo	Scalise
Flake	Marchant	Schakowsky
Fleming	Markey (MA)	Schauer
Forbes	Marshall	Schiff
Fortenberry	Massa	Schmidt
Foster	Matheson	Schrader
Foxx	Matsui	Schwartz
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (GA)
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Frelinghuysen	McCaull	Scotenburg
Fudge	McClintock	Serrano
Gallely	McCollum	Sessions
Garamendi	McCotter	Sestak
Garrett (NJ)	McDermott	Shadegg
Gonzalez	McHenry	Shea-Porter
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Sherman
Gordon (TN)	McMahon	Shimkus
Granger	McMorris	Shuler
Grayson	Rodgers	Shuster
Green, Al	McNerney	Simpson
Green, Gene	Meek (FL)	Sires
Griffith	Melancon	Slaughter
Guthrie	Mica	Smith (NE)
Hall (NY)	Michaud	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Halvorson	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Hare	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Harper	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Space
Heller	Minnick	Speier
Hensarling	Mollohan	Spratt
Herger	Moore (KS)	Stearns
Herseth Sandlin	Moran (KS)	Stupak
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Sullivan
Hill	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Himes	Murtha	Taylor
Hinchey	Myrick	Terry
Hinojosa	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Hirono	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Hodes	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Holden	Nunes	Thornberry
Holt	Nye	Tiberi
Honda	Oberstar	Tierney
Hoyer	Obey	Titus
Hunter	Olson	Tonko
Inglis	Olver	Towns
Inslie	Ortiz	Tsongas
Issa	Owens	Turner
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Upton
Jenkins	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Walz
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Wasserman
Jones	Pence	Schultz
Jordan (OH)	Perlmutter	Waters
Kagen	Perriello	Watson
Kanjorski	Peters	Watt
Kaptur	Peterson	Weiner
Kennedy	Petri	Welch
Kildee	Pitts	Westmoreland
Kind	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
King (IA)	Polis (CO)	Wilson (OH)
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Posey	Wittman
Kirk	Price (GA)	Wolf
Klein (FL)	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kline (MN)	Putnam	Wu
Kosmas	Quigley	Yarmuth
Kratovil	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Kucinich	Rahall	Young (FL)
Lamborn	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—66

Alexander	Berman	Bonner
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)	Heinrich	Murphy, Patrick
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Murphy, Tim
Cantor	Israel	Neal (MA)
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Pingree (ME)
Cole	(TX)	Platts
Costello	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kilroy	Roskam
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Schock
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Skelton
DeGette	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Delahunt	Luján	Stark
Gerlach	Lynch	Tanner
Giffords	Maffei	Teague
Gingrey (GA)	Markey (CO)	Tiahrt
Gohmert	McGovern	Walden
Graves	McKeon	Wamp
Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Gutierrez	Mitchell	Wexler
Harman	Moore (WI)	
Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)	

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 889, 890, and 891, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 889, “yea” on rollcall No. 890; and “aye” on rollcall No. 891.

CONGRATULATING MORRIS AND GERTRUDE SOLOMON

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

Mr. TONKO. I would like to take a moment to honor a very special 75th anniversary celebrated by two of my constituents, Morris and Gertrude Solomon. Morris and Gertrude were married in New York City on November 16, 1934. Two years later, in 1936, they moved to Albany, where they have resided ever since.

Upon moving to Albany, Morris bought his own pharmacy, where he served mostly the children of immigrants, as Morris himself was an immigrant, and he earned the nickname Doc. His credit plan during World War II and difficult economic times was “pay me when you can.”

Gert stayed home raising Harold and Barry. Afterwards, she went to work for the State of New York, retiring in 1976, the same year that Moe sold the drugstore and retired. They have five children and five great grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, this year Gert and Moe both celebrated their 97th birthdays. May their 75th wedding anniversary be an occasion for all of us to reflect on their many extraordinary achievements, and an occasion to celebrate life, love, and a unique closeness between two incredibly strong and caring individuals. Their relationship with one another, their family, and their community is a model to emulate.

Congratulations to this wonderful couple.

□ 1915

DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, Diabetes Awareness Month is our effort to raise awareness of the disease, its prevention, and ways to manage its impact. There are 24 million Americans living with diabetes. That's about 8 percent of our population. There are 1.6 million cases diagnosed every year, and 57 million Americans are at risk with prediabetes.

As encouraged by the American Diabetes Association, we must promote the four-step method of sharing, acting, learning, and giving:

sharing our personal stories of diabetes;

acting to help end the rise of new cases;

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1912

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 889 and, 890, and “aye” on rollcall vote 891.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Monday, November 16, 2009. If I was present, I would have voted: “Yea” on rollcall 889, agreeing to S. 1314, A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630 Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the “Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office”.

“Yea” on rollcall 890, agreeing to H.R. 3539—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the “Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building”.

“Aye” on rollcall 891, agreeing to H.R. 3767—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the “W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building”.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, today I was absent due to an illness and missed rollcall votes 889, 890 and 891.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall 889, “yea” on rollcall 890 and “aye” on rollcall 891.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I was unavailable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” for S. 1314, “yea” for H.R. 3539, and “aye” for H.R. 3767 on final passage under suspension of the rules.

learning about the risks and ways to manage and control the disease; giving of our time and resources to advance diabetes research.

Let's all make an effort to learn about the dangers of diabetes and best prevention practices, let's celebrate, and indeed, let's bring a greater awareness to this terrible disease.

HONORING ATLANTIS STS-129 FLIGHT CREW

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, Godspeed to Michael Foreman. It seems like a short time ago we were offering Godspeed to John Glenn. Mr. Foreman is among six members of the space shuttle Atlantis STS-129 flight team which earlier today blasted off at 2:28, took off from NASA's Kennedy Space Center at Cape Canaveral to begin an 11-day mission making repairs to the international space station. The crew includes: Mission Specialist Michael Foreman, Commander Charles Hobough, Pilot Barry Wilmore and other Mission Specialists Randy Bresnik, Leland Melvin, and Robert Satcher, Jr.

As a mission specialist aboard this flight, Michael Foreman, from Wadsworth, Ohio, in my district, will participate in two of the mission's three space walks where he will install exterior equipment on the International space station. However, Mr. Foreman is no stranger to space travel. He has logged more than 380 hours in space and completed three previous space walks in other NASA missions.

For his commitment to America's leadership and space exploration, Michael Foreman is a hometown hero, and he brings great pride to the city of Wadsworth and the 16th District. Please join me in wishing him and all members of the Atlantis STS-129 crew the best of luck on this important mission and a safe return on November 27.

STILL INDECISIVE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, here we are after Veterans Day still indecisive. Our soldiers continue to fight in Afghanistan. Winter is setting in. The commander of our Afghan forces laid out the plan to defeat al Qaeda and their Taliban terrorist pals. General McChrystal says he needs more troops to defeat the terrorists. The response has been months of indecision, doubt and delays that have encouraged the enemy. Losing Afghanistan to radical terrorists hangs in the balance.

So what's the holdup? Vietnam taught us that wars can't be won with political posturing. We owe our troops a commitment to winning when we put them into the valley of the gun.

Churchill once said, "As long as we have faith in our own cause and an unconquerable will to win, victory will not be denied us." It is that dogged determination, the will to win that is essential to victory and freedom's cause.

The courage and capability of America's fighting men and women are unequalled anywhere in the world. The only thing capable of defeating our military is politics.

And that's just the way it is.

A TRIBUTE TO THE ARES ROCKET

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize yet another achievement by north Alabama's Marshall Space Flight Center. Last week, Time magazine named NASA's Ares rocket as the best invention of 2009. We have seen time and again that tireless work and flawless execution breeds brilliant results, and that is exactly what we have seen out of the short history of Ares.

A few weeks after an impressive and successful test-flight, Ares received this review from Time magazine, calling the project "the best and smartest thing built in 2009." The review of Ares said that the finest moments from our space program come when bureaucrats give the designers a clean sheet of drafting paper and let them dream. Our brilliant men and women in the American space program can do just that if they receive the funding they need to bring manned space flight to the outer reaches of our universe.

This recognition and the recent Ares flight further prove that the Constellation program is exactly what our country needs—a safe, innovative, affordable, sustainable human space flight exploration vehicle.

WARNINGS FROM THE CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, lately we have heard from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services about the Pelosi health care reform measure. Their 31-page actuarial report, released over the weekend, reads that the bill would increase costs over the next 10 years by \$289 billion.

This is not a partisan report. It comes from the people who run the Medicare and Medicaid systems in the country. They warn that the provisions of the bill could lead to doctors and hospitals turning away Medicare patients.

They warn that some 18 million Americans will choose to pay a much lower fine than buy expensive health insurance coverage, because when they

get sick and truly need insurance, they can buy it, since they won't be turned down for preexisting conditions.

They warn that a crush of new patients would shock the system.

They warn that the plan to cut more than \$500 billion from future Medicare spending would sharply reduce benefits for some seniors and could jeopardize access to care for millions of others.

CMS should not have to issue warnings about the impact of a major piece of legislation that promises to change our entire system of health care and make it worse.

NEWSWEEK WINS LAPDOG AWARD AGAIN

(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. Madam Speaker, for the second time in a row, Newsweek is the winner of the Media Fairness Caucus' highly uncoveted "Lapdog Award" for last week's most glaring example of media bias.

The poster to my left of Newsweek's cover story features former Vice President Al Gore with the caption, "The Thinking Man's Thinking Man." The previous Newsweek cover featured President Obama with the caption, "Yes He Can," a variation of his campaign slogan. Before that, it was Vice President JOE BIDEN, "A Vice President to be Reckoned With." And Newsweek's latest cover features Governor Sarah Palin and says she is, "Bad News." It is no wonder five out of six Americans say the national media are biased, according to a recent public opinion poll.

If you want the liberal slant, read Newsweek. If you want the facts and news, you might want to look elsewhere.

WHY, MR. PRESIDENT?

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise to protest the misguided decision by President Obama and his Attorney General to bring Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and four terrorist suspects from Guantanamo Bay to New York City.

What an insult to the memory of those who lost their lives. The very man who masterminded that attack now will get his fondest wish. When he was captured on the battlefield, he said, Let me go to New York, and let me have my attorney. He will have his attorney. He will be in New York, just a stone's throw from the site of death by he and his compatriots.

What reason could we possibly have to bring them to the United States? Why, Mr. President, why, when we have Guantanamo, when we have military tribunals that are not only capable but

specifically provided to take care of those who would kill Americans on the battlefield? For what reason are we doing this?

Why, Mr. President? Why, Mr. President? Why?

TRY THE TERRORISTS IN GUANTANAMO, NOT NEW YORK CITY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, to follow up on my friend from California, he is exactly right. There is no good reason for bringing the most dangerous terrorists and terrorist organizers to the most densely populated area in our country. Those of us who have logistically been involved in setting up trials know that every bailiff, every guard, every person involved in the justice system will be at risk, as will their families.

So we know that every President brings their own kinds of experience to the office. This President does not have justice experience. He doesn't have military experience. He doesn't have foreign affairs experience. He doesn't have domestic affairs experience. He doesn't have community organizing experience, and that will be invaluable in organizing the communities in New York to get them off the island after the terrorists move in during the trial.

COSTS SOAR IN PELOSI'S TAKEOVER BILL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the nonpartisan, independent experts at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, released their analysis of the Pelosi takeover. I would like to say it was shocking, but I already had my suspicions that the government takeover of health care was going to cost much more than claimed. The independent report this weekend exposes the truth and the real cost.

The report shows that the Pelosi takeover will increase health care costs by \$289 billion. This discredits all the assertions we have heard about how a 2,000-page bill, the \$1.3 trillion health care bill, will somehow lower costs. This health care takeover will violate this administration's promise to "bend the cost curve." It will add more than a dime to the deficit and kill jobs.

There are better alternatives that Congress should consider, like H.R. 3400, that will lower health care costs for families and small businesses while creating jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Mass murderers should be tried at

Guantanamo Bay, not in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

SENDING MORE TROOPS IS NOT THE ANSWER

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, Matthew Hoh, a former Marine captain, recently resigned his job as U.S. Government reconstruction official in Afghanistan. In his letter of resignation, he criticized the American strategy in Afghanistan. He said the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops is making the insurgency stronger because it makes the Afghan people see America as an occupying power, a power that must be opposed.

Now, before anybody accuses Captain Hoh of being a long-haired hippie peacenik, keep in mind that he fought with distinction in Iraq before serving in Afghanistan. He believes in the American military. He supports it with all his heart.

□ 1930

In fact, he says that "no nation has ever known a more dedicated military as the U.S. Armed Forces. The performance of our troops," he says, "is unmatched."

But he also, Madam Speaker, believes that no military force has ever been given such a complex mission as the U.S. military has received in Afghanistan.

Captain Hoh is right. Our troops have been given an impossible job, and now we are seeing the tragic results. Over 1,000 American troops have been wounded in battle in just the past 3 months. That accounts for one-fourth of all the casualties we've taken since the war began in October 2001.

Think about it. The war has been going on for 97 months in Afghanistan, and one-fourth of all the casualties have been suffered in just the last 3 months.

Things have gotten so bad, Madam Speaker, in fact, that the casualty rate in Afghanistan is now actually higher than the casualty rate for American troops at the height of the violence in Iraq. And the spike in the casualty rate occurred after the administration sent 21,000 more troops to Afghanistan in the hope that there is a military solution to the problem.

But relying on military power alone has not done the job, and escalating the war now by sending in tens of thousands more troops won't solve the problem either.

That's why I am calling on President Obama to change our mission in Af-

ghanistan. I have urged him to devote most of our efforts on humanitarian aid, diplomacy, and economic development. These are the elements of "SMART Security." They'll do a much better job of stabilizing Afghanistan than a heavy military footprint.

Without this change in strategy, our troops are likely to face worse, not better, situations. The enemy is learning how to use IEDs more efficiently. Lieutenant Thomas Metz, the director of the Pentagon's effort to reduce IED casualties, has acknowledged that sending more troops to Afghanistan will likely mean more IED deaths and injuries, which include spinal cord damage, traumatic brain injuries, and amputations.

So I urge the administration to move in a new and a different direction for the sake of our country and for the sake of America's troops and their families. And I urge every Member of the House to listen to the words of Matthew Hoh, who wrote the following to a State Department official:

"I trust you understand the sacrifices made by so many thousands of military families whose homes bear the fractures, upheavals, and scars of multiple deployments. Thousands of our men and women have returned home with wounds, some that will never heal. The dead return only in bodily form to be received by families who must be assured that their dead have sacrificed for a purpose worthy of futures lost."

Madam Speaker, the casualty rate in Afghanistan is unacceptable. Continuing the same policies that put our brave troops at risk is unthinkable. That's why it's time to put SMART Security to work in a place where military power alone just isn't the answer.

THE TRIAL OF KHALID SHEIKH MOHAMMED

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. Madam Speaker, the 9/11 terrorist Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and four of his terrorist buddies are getting a trip to New York City to be tried in Federal court for their crimes against America.

Some of the other terrorists, however, are being tried in military courts. So why are we trying Mohammed in Federal court in the United States? Why aren't we treating them all alike, treating them all the same? Is it different strokes for different folks? It appears to be so. So why are these five special individuals being treated this way and brought to the United States for trial?

Military tribunals throughout history have always been used to try captured enemies on the battlefield. They have different rules and standards for evidence and interrogation, and the military courts make allowances for these basic differences. And tribunals

won't use classified intelligence material in open court.

The military courts and the prosecutors in the military courts have been preparing for 18 months to try these five terrorists in military court. Now all of that's over, and all of that paperwork now is going to be turned over to Federal prosecutors who know nothing about the case, and they will start over with their investigation.

Now, the way I figure it, it's been 8 years since 9/11 occurred. How long is it going to be before these people are tried? No one knows, because the government is now not prepared and they'll have to start getting prepared.

Military tribunals have always been created in a time of war. War criminals and people on the battlefield who are captured are tried there. And now we're making some exception, and the reason is we don't know. We don't know the reason why they're being tried in New York and why some of them, well, they're going to get their military trials. Maybe those are lower-ranked terrorists. Who knows. Nobody's talking in the Justice Department.

It does make a difference where a person is tried, whether he's tried in a Federal court or a military court, which has the jurisdiction. Let there be no mistake about it: these military courts have the jurisdiction to try these war criminals, but they are giving up their jurisdiction to the Justice Department.

For example, in 1993 in the World Trade Center bombing, prosecutors were required to turn over evidence to defense attorneys that included a large amount of intelligence secret information. Those intelligence documents were never supposed to be provided to anyone outside of the attorneys for each side. But guess what happened, Madam Speaker. Copies of those were later found in al Qaeda caves overseas. So much for secrecy.

We used to have Osama bin Laden's cell phone number, and we used it to track his movements and hundreds of calls he made back in 1998. It helped us to uncover members of the terrorist network prior to 9/11.

But during the Federal trial of four al Qaeda terrorists who blew up two American embassies in East Africa, the extent of our methods of intelligence of tracking the terrorists through using their cell phone numbers were disclosed. And not only were they disclosed; the phone records were made public to the whole world. So guess what. Terrorists quit using their cell phones and shut them off. Now they communicate with each other using different methods. This was the result of trials that took place in Federal court. The rules of evidence are different.

Doesn't anybody know we are at war and the rules of war ought to apply? And when we capture these people on the battlefield, when we capture these people who are at war with America,

we ought to try them in military tribunals.

Our anti-terrorist operations depend on secrecy. It makes the job of the FBI and Homeland Security agents harder when the methods they use are publicized in open court. And it doesn't seem to me to make any sense why we would want to make all of the evidence that we have obtained against these five terrorists public record.

One more example: the 20th hijacker, Moussaoui, escaped the death penalty during his Federal trial, and here's the reason why: the court ruled the evidence of his participation in the 9/11 plot from his own computer was not admissible in a Federal courtroom. And without that evidence, the Feds had to settle for a life sentence. Thus he avoided the death penalty.

Much of the evidence against Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was gathered through interrogations, and now unless the interrogators read this individual his Miranda rights before water-boarding, it makes us wonder whether the evidence obtained against him lawfully under military rules will be admissible in Federal court.

Federal courts were never intended to deal with wartime situations; military courts have always been the reason. And now we're going to allow this individual to have center stage in New York City to be tried and maybe possibly convicted and become an international martyr on the international stage. It makes no sense. They ought to be sent back to Guantanamo.

And that's just the way it is.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2009.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 16, 2009, at 12:17 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1422.
Appointments:
United States-China Economic Security Review Commission.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

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

(Mr. GRIFFITH 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 gen-

tleman 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial by David Broder, Friday, November 13, and the title is "Half Done on Health Reform."

Madam Speaker, I'm reading from this editorial some points that I would like to share with the House tonight:

"At least a dozen health and budget experts have filled the Web and airwaves with warnings that the House bill simply postpones the cost controls needed to finance the vast expansion of insurance coverage and Medicare benefits envisaged by its sponsors.

"One of them speaks with special authority: David Walker, the former head of the Government Accountability Office, the auditing and investigating arm of Congress, told me in an interview on Wednesday that the lawmakers are 'punting on the tough choices rather than making sure they can deliver on the promises they're making.'

"In a speech delivered less than 48 hours after the House acted, Walker, now president of the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, laid out the tests that buttress his conclusion.

"Acknowledging that 'clearly we need radical reconstructive surgery to make our health care system effective, affordable, and sustainable', Walker cautioned that 'what we should not do is merely tack new programs onto a system that is fundamentally flawed and rapidly driving the national budget into ruin.'

I further read from the editorial: "A separate Lewin Group study of the Finance Committee bill from which Majority Leader HARRY REID is working on in the Senate shows it is almost as much of a fiscal failure as the House bill.

"Walker, a close observer and former employee of Congress, calls that assumption 'totally unrealistic.' In reading his analysis and the comments of the many others who have appraised the House handiwork, it becomes clear that unless something intervenes, Congress is headed toward repeating a familiar pattern. Just as it did under Republican control in the George W. Bush years when it passed but did not pay for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, it is about to hand out the goodies

and leave it to the next generation to pick up the bill.”

Madam Speaker, before closing, as I always do on the floor because my heart aches for those who have given their lives in Afghanistan and Iraq and those who have been wounded, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I ask God to please bless the House and Senate, that we would do what is right in the eyes of God. And I ask God to give strength, wisdom, and courage to the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for this country.

I close three times by asking God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 13, 2009]

HALF DONE ON HEALTH REFORM

(By David S. Broder)

While House Democrats spent the week congratulating themselves for squeezing out the midnight passage of their version of health-care reform, neutral observers were reminding them: You’ve left the job half done.

Having watched Hillary and Bill Clinton try and fail even to bring their version of health reform to a vote, I can certainly join in saluting Speaker Nancy Pelosi, her leadership team and the Obama White House for maneuvering the 1,990-page behemoth to harbor.

But, as many sympathetic voices have been telling them: Unless you find more realistic ways of paying for the promises included in the bill, you are simply setting up the public for more frustration—and yourselves for a political backlash.

At least a dozen health and budget experts have filled the Web and the airwaves with warnings that the House bill simply postpones the cost controls needed to finance the vast expansion of insurance coverage and Medicaid benefits envisaged by its sponsors.

One of them speaks with special authority: David Walker, the former head of the Government Accountability Office—the auditing and investigative arm of Congress—told me in an interview on Wednesday that the lawmakers are “punting on the tough choices, rather than making sure they can deliver on the promises they’re making.”

In a speech delivered less than 48 hours after the House acted, Walker, now president of the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, laid out the tests that buttress his conclusion.

Acknowledging that “clearly, we need radical reconstructive surgery to make our health-care system effective, affordable and sustainable,” Walker cautioned that “what we should not do is merely tack new programs onto a system that is fundamentally flawed”—and rapidly driving the national budget into ruin.

He proposes a four-part test of fiscal responsibility for any health reform plan: “First, the reform should pay for itself over 10 years. Second, it should not add to deficits beyond 10 years. Third, it should significantly reduce the tens of trillions of dollars in unfunded health promises that we already have. Fourth, it should bend down—not up—the total health-care cost curve as a percentage of” gross domestic product.

An analysis by the Lewin Group shows that the Energy and Commerce Committee

bill that was the basic blueprint for the House measure comes close to meeting the first of those tests and fails the other three, according to Walker, “by a wide margin.”

A separate Lewin Group study of the Finance Committee bill from which Majority Leader Harry Reid is working on the Senate legislation shows it is almost as much of a fiscal failure. It fails the fourth test, falls short on the third, and passes the first two only by assuming that future Congresses will force reductions in reimbursements to doctors and hospitals that lawmakers in the past have refused to impose.

Walker, a close observer and former employee of Congress, calls that assumption “totally unrealistic.”

In reading his analysis—and the comments of the many others who have appraised the House’s handiwork—it becomes clear that unless something intervenes, Congress is headed toward repeating a familiar pattern. Just as it did under Republican control in the George W. Bush years, when it passed but did not pay for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, it is about to hand out the goodies and leave it to the next generation to pick up the bill.

The Senate could still reduce the damage. If it began to move away from the fee-for-service payment system that rewards doctors and hospitals on the quantity of procedures they perform, rather than on the results of the treatment, that would help. If it reduced the biggest single loophole in the revenue system—the tax-exempt status of employer-provided health benefits—that would help a lot.

Otherwise, while congratulating one another for an overdue piece of social legislation, lawmakers could end up condemning our children to a far worse financial future than they deserve.

A TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT CHARLES MAGGART

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. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to pay the long overdue respects of a grateful Nation to First Lieutenant Charles L. Maggart from Marion, Indiana, who fell serving his country in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II.

Charles Maggart was born in November of 1919 and attended Marion High School in Indiana, where he was an honor student as well as a football and basketball star. In fact, his outstanding athletic ability earned him scholarship offers in 1938 from both Indiana University and the University of New Mexico. Charles chose the University of New Mexico. However, with the clouds of war looming over Europe, Charles returned to Indiana to attend Marion College, today Indiana Wesleyan University, where he took flying lessons.

In April of 1941, Charles applied for and was accepted into the Army Air Force. Upon completing basic flight training at Parks Air College in St. Louis and Randolph Air Field in San Antonio, Texas, Charles was assigned to Ellington Field in Houston, Texas, for advanced flight training.

On December 12, 1941, just 5 days after the bombing of Pearl Harbor,

Charles Maggart, until then a sergeant major of cadets, earned his pilot’s wings and his lieutenant’s bars. He also married his wife, then First Lieutenant Yolanda Federico. The next day he departed for Morrison Field, Florida, for assignment to the 49th Pursuit Group, Ninth Pursuit Squadron; but he was fairly quickly reassigned from fighters to bombers, ending up with the 405th Bombardment Squadron, 38th Bomb Group, Fifth Air Force 38th flying out of Australia.

□ 1945

The group shipped out from California for Australia in April of 1942. On December 5, 1942, Lieutenant Charles Maggart’s war came to an end. Flying a B-25 bomber known as the “Happy Legend,” Lieutenant Maggart and his six-man crew set off to bomb Lae, a critical point along the northeastern coast of Papua, New Guinea. Lieutenant Maggart and his crew were shot down by the Japanese over the Owen Stanley Mountains. In January of 1943, Lieutenant Maggart’s wife and family were informed by the War Department that he was missing in action.

Lieutenant Maggart’s mother, waiting patiently, had reservations about his fate. After repeated letters to the War Department, in 1947 she was told that the aircraft and crew were never recovered and were probably lost at sea. It wasn’t until 1949 that Lieutenant Maggart and his crew was officially declared killed in action. Although a team of Australians reportedly reached the crash site in 1943, the area was still overrun with Japanese units, and little could be done to document the remains of the aircraft and crew. Except for the determination of Charles’ brother, Phil Maggart, and the families of the other crewmembers of the “Happy Legend,” that might be the end of the story.

Phil Maggart last saw his brother Charles in October of 1941, and for more than six decades, Phil has tried to find his brother and to bring him home. Working through government bureaucrats and private contacts even when he was serving with the U.S. Air Force around the world, including a tour of duty flying search-and-rescue missions in Vietnam, Phil never gave up asking questions, and ultimately he found answers. Thanks to the persistence of Phil Maggart, Lieutenant Charles Maggart has finally come home. And tomorrow, Tuesday, November 17, 2009, Lieutenant Charles Maggart and his crew will be interred together at Arlington National Cemetery, a fitting place of honor for true American heroes.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that all of my colleagues join me in saluting Lieutenant Maggart and his valiant crew. God bless you, gentlemen, and thank you for your service to America.

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

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

100TH OCCASION OF THE THANKSGIVING DAY RACE IN CINCINNATI

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th occasion of the Thanksgiving Day Race in Cincinnati. According to Runner's World magazine, the Thanksgiving Day Race is the sixth-oldest in the Nation. This annual holiday tradition started in 1908 on a course that ran from Fort Thomas Kentucky's gym to the YMCA in downtown Cincinnati. Today the course continues to incorporate much of downtown Cincinnati and northern Kentucky, beginning and ending at Paul Brown Stadium.

The growth of this race has been impressive. The inaugural race in 1908 consisted of 19 participants. Last year there were more than 11,000. To date, over 16,000 have registered for this year's Thanksgiving Day race, and registration doesn't even close until the race morning. According to Running USA, Cincinnati's Thanksgiving Day 10K race is one of our nation's 10 largest. Each year highly skilled athletes run alongside casual runners and seniors run alongside children. For many families the race is an important part of their holiday festivities. While the race is certainly popular, it would not be successful without the sponsorship and support of the local community. Hundreds of folks volunteer along the course aiding the runners. Local businesses and community organizations provide monetary support whose proceeds benefit many local charities, including the Ronald McDonald House and Girls on the Run.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in celebrating the 100th Occasion of the Thanksgiving Day race in Cincinnati and wish this proud Cincinnati tradition continued success.

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.)

SUFFERING OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE OF CUBA

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, the international press, including almost all the press in the United States, continues

to ignore the suffering of the oppressed people of Cuba. Yes, there are exceptions, such as the National Review's Jay Nordlinger, the premier defender of human rights in the American press, or The Miami Herald's Juan Tamayo or Wilfredo Cancio, and occasionally there are other dignified exceptions. But the almost totality of the U.S. press systematically ignores what goes on in Cuba.

Despite 50 years of tyranny there, despite Cuba being 90 miles from our shores, despite hundreds of prisoners of conscience languishing in dungeons simply because of their peaceful advocacy for freedoms, including freedom of the press, which should not be denied to any people, and thousands of others imprisoned for crimes which are only illegal in the totalitarian fiefdom of a demented despot—crimes like “dangerousness” or “illegally attempting to leave the country”—the press continues to ignore the reality of Cuba. Their irresponsibility in doing so is absolutely indefensible.

Jewish friends have told me that they understand what I'm talking about when I refer to the concept of the nonperson. For countless generations, for 1,800 years, Jews were subject to exile, to pogroms, persecution, discrimination. And their suffering was ignored in countries throughout the world. They were nonpersons. When their suffering was not ignored it was often minimized or ridiculed. Jews know that the recovery of their homeland, the establishment of their state in 1948 was absolutely necessary. That was the only way to guarantee the end of the nonperson status, to guarantee an end to pogroms, to discrimination, to persecution.

Cubans have been stateless nonpersons for over 51 years. Their suffering is systematically ignored. Their unity of purpose is continuously questioned or ridiculed. Even the torture of their heroes, of the heroic political prisoners, is ignored. Martha Beatriz Roque, a respected economist, leading Cuban dissident and former political prisoner who was only released from prison so that she would not die due to her many illnesses in prison and embarrass Castro, she is close to death in Havana due to complications arising from a hunger strike that she's engaged in.

Dozens of other brave dissidents are also on hunger strikes in the home of one of Cuba's other extremely respected pro-democracy leaders, Vladimiro Roca. Cubans, unlike the Jews, have not yet recovered their state. They will. But they haven't yet.

I ask the press, Madam Speaker, the media to please cease treating Cuba's pro-democracy activists as though they didn't exist. Stop treating Martha Beatriz Roque as a nonperson. Why do you continue to absolutely ignore Cuba's brave prisoners of conscience? Why don't you at least write about the elderly prisoners of conscience in Cuba, such as Hector Maseda Gutierrez or

Arnaldo Ramos Lauzurique, or about the severely handicapped prisoners of conscience such as Miguel Galvan Gutierrez, or most especially about the gravely ill Cuban prisoners of conscience in the gulag such as Ariel Sigler or Normando Hernandez or Dr. Jose Luis Garcia Paneque, or Dr. Alfredo Pulido Lopez, or Pedro Arguelles Moran?

Members of the press, have you no conscience? Do not continue to treat the suffering oppressed people of Cuba and their heroes as nonpersons. Please, do your duty.

THE NEEDS OF AMERICAN WOMEN AND THE 111TH CONGRESS' RESPONSE TO THOSE NEEDS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend and to enter remarks into the RECORD on this topic.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus is proud to offer this special order tonight which will focus on the needs of American women and the response of the 111th Congress to those needs.

The Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC, is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. I am Representative MARCIA L. FUDGE from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we have been joined by our Chairwoman, the gentlelady from California, the Honorable BARBARA LEE. I now yield to our Chair.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And let me thank again the Representative from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her leadership and for continuing to voice the concerns of so many who may or may not have a voice in this House. And I want to thank you for tonight's Special Order on the needs of American women, because in this economic downturn, where women still only make about 66 cents to the dollar, women again are feeling the brunt of these very, very desperate times. And so thank you again for continuing to keep our Congressional Black Caucus focused on addressing issues that don't always receive the attention that they deserve. Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE.

So let me just talk very briefly about the issue of adolescent health and the challenges that many young women and girls face in accessing the tools and information they need to really just take care of themselves. For too

long now, our country has led with an abstinence-only policy when it comes to sex education for our young people. Unfortunately, for women, and women of color, and our young girls, that policy has led to an increase in teen pregnancies and in the rate of sexually transmitted infections.

Today, the rate of unintended teen pregnancies in the United States is much higher than most other developed nations. Each year, almost 750,000 women between the ages of 15 and 19 get pregnant. That's 750,000 women. And the vast majority of these pregnancies occur among women of color. The sad reality is that before they turn 20, 53 percent of young Latinas and 51 percent of young African American women will become pregnant at least once. The comparable rate among non-Hispanic white young women is 19 percent. That is just outrageous.

It doesn't end there, though. Each year there are about 19 million new cases of sexually transmitted infections, and almost half of them occur in young people ages 15 to 24. The CDC recently found that young sexually active teenage girls are especially at risk as nearly one in four is living with a common sexually transmitted infection. Among sexually active African American teenage girls, nearly one in two is living a sexually transmitted infection. When it comes to HIV and AIDS, the story gets a heck of a lot worse. African American women are nearly 15 times more likely to have HIV than white women, while Latinas are four times more likely to have HIV than white women. AIDS is also the leading cause of death among African American women between the ages of 24 and 34.

So, clearly, we're not doing our part to provide women and our young people with the tools that they need to protect themselves. That's why I've introduced H.R. 1551, the Responsible Education About Life Act. I call it let's get real, my REAL Act. This bill will create the first Federal funding stream dedicated to teaching our young people about comprehensive sex education. The statistics I just mentioned really warrant this type of a bill to be passed and signed into law. Our young people need to know how to protect themselves.

Yes, we need abstinence, and we need to teach our young people abstinence. But abstinence by itself does not work. We need an abstinence-plus approach that teaches about contraceptive use and condoms to prevent unplanned pregnancies and to reduce the spread of sexually transmitted infections. And so, once again, we have to look at some of the policies of the past and see exactly how devastating they have been in terms of the impact on our young women.

And I certainly say the abstinence-only policy, based on the statistics I just read you tonight, deserves to be dismantled and abandoned, and we need to allow states to use Federal

funding, if they so desire, and if the states think that this is the strategy they want to use, and that is, allow Federal money to be distributed to the states to teach comprehensive sex education to our young people so that they can grow up, go to school, do whatever they want to do without worry of unintended pregnancies or HIV and AIDS or sexually transmitted infections.

So thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for allowing me to speak this evening on this very tough issue. Sometimes we try to sweep these issues under the rug. But I think when it comes to our young women, our young girls, we have to be for real, and we have to talk about what we can do to help them protect themselves. Thank you again.

□ 2000

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to our Chair how appreciative I am that she has allowed me to anchor this hour for most of this year, and even though I may in fact be biased, I know that we have the most dedicated and hardworking Chair of any caucus in this House. So I thank you, and I thank you for being with me just about every week. I couldn't do it without you.

Madam Speaker, as well I have been joined by my good friend and colleague from the great State of New York, the gentlelady from New York, Yvette Clarke.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I would like to start this evening off in my address by thanking my esteemed colleague, the congresswoman from Ohio, MARCIA FUDGE, for giving me a moment to comment on women in small business. As the co-Chair of the Women's Caucus Task Force on Women and Education, Congresswoman FUDGE has constantly demonstrated her leadership on these crucial issues, and you are to be commended.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you.

Ms. CLARKE. I am especially pleased to be speaking on these issues with you here this evening because of the timeliness of this conversation. Women entrepreneurs have come a long way in recent decades, but more must be done to support them, especially in this dire economic environment.

As the sole member of the Congressional Black Caucus on the Small Business Committee in the House—or the Senate, for that matter—I am constantly monitoring developments that affect women-owned small businesses, especially those in underserved areas. The impact of small businesses cannot be stated enough. We know the statistics, but it is worth going over it again.

Small businesses are the key to the health of the U.S. economy. They represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms; they employ about half of all private sector employees; pay nearly 45 percent of the U.S. private payroll; and are responsible for more than half of the non-farming private GDP.

Women-owned businesses are an important factor in this economic story.

Recent studies show that there are close to 8 million individual women-owned small firms with a \$3 trillion impact on our close to \$14 trillion economy employing close to 23 million people. These are great numbers, but I for one believe that more must be done. Not only do I believe it, but the facts bear it out.

A recent study was released by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York entitled "Gender and the Availability of Credit to Privately Held Firms." This report relied on data on privately held businesses drawn from the Federal Reserve's Surveys of Small Businesses Finances covering the period of 1987 through 2003. Authors of the report concluded that when compared to male-owned firms, women-owned firms are significantly smaller as measured by sales, assets, and employment; younger, as measured by age of the firm; more likely to be in retail, trade, or business services, and less likely to be in construction, secondary manufacturing, and wholesale trade industries; and are more inclined to have fewer and shorter banking relationships. Women owners are significantly younger and less experienced and tend to have less formal education than their male counterparts.

The report further found that women firms are significantly more likely to be credit-constrained because they are more likely to be discouraged from applying for credit, though not more likely to be denied credit when they do apply.

This report reflects the fact that women-owned businesses have made great strides in recent years but that challenges to growth, business model diversification, technical capabilities, and ability to access capital remain.

The bottom line is that women entrepreneurs need more support. I have long been an advocate for women-owned businesses, and it is vital that we improve existing programs and explore the need for new ones to narrow this achievement gap.

Most recently, I have been hard at work exploring possible solutions for women entrepreneurs. Last month, I introduced H.R. 3771, the Veteran, Minority, and Women-Owned Construction Business Mentorship and Grant Assistance Act of 2009. This legislation would establish grant programs for women-owned small business construction companies to help create the internal business systems that are essential for success. Funds would also be made available to local groups and schools to bolster technical assistance to these firms. This bill would create opportunities in the highly competitive construction sector at a time when there has been a stark decline in construction activity due to the housing downturn. This legislation is really about capacity building for small firms so they can better compete for the many stimulus opportunities that are still being developed and deployed.

Most of the total \$787 billion in stimulus funds have yet to go out. Further,

most of the remaining funds are targeted to shovel-ready construction projects—projects that our women-owned businesses should and must participate in.

I'd like to take this opportunity to applaud the women builders in this country. So often, the image of the construction industry is a burly man in a hard hat. Well, I've got news for you, gentlemen. Women builders face great obstacles and challenges, and in my experience, meet and exceed them consistently in a highly competitive environment. Our Nation's extraordinary women builders will benefit from this legislation, and I'd like to thank my colleagues, including Congresswoman FUDGE, for supporting this bill. We have, as of today, 23 cosponsors for the legislation. The growing support for this legislation is proof that Washington is waking up to the prominent role that small businesses, including our women-owned businesses, must play in our recovery.

Finally, I have been tirelessly working to find ways to improve access to capital for women-owned businesses. It is no secret that our largest depository institutions are not lending as much as they could but are instead using the excess capital they have to provide capital buffers for their own balance sheet health, retarding any rebounds that could be fueled by small business lending.

I applaud President Obama for announcing that his administration will be seeking low-cost loans to smaller banks and community development financial institutions, known as CDFIs, as a means to address the small business lending gap. I am especially supportive of CDFIs as a means of getting credit to our smaller women-owned firms in underserved and economically distressed areas. For every dollar of CDFI investment, \$15 of non-Federal dollars are leveraged to provide lending to deserving borrowers.

I will be studying how to improve programs like CDFIs to leverage government investment to help people help themselves.

Let us make no mistake, the last great frontier for women entrepreneurs—especially in our communities—will be consistent ability for them to access credit. I will fight tirelessly alongside my colleagues to make this a reality.

As I said earlier, these are but a few of the challenges faced by women-owned businesses. I am always paying attention to the issues affecting our women entrepreneurs and I will for as long as I am a Member of Congress. Much work is left to be done, but with the great leadership of people like Congresswoman FUDGE; the Chair of our CBC, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE; and our Speaker, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, I know we will get to where we need to be and beyond.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank my friend for coming this evening and

thank her for her support of businesses and for her work on the Small Business Committee.

Thank you again. I hope that you will join me another time.

Ms. CLARKE. I look forward to it.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, the CBC is composed of 42 members, including 4 committee Chairs, 15 subcommittee Chairs, and the majority whip. Our members promote the public welfare through legislation designed to meet the needs of millions of neglected citizens. CBC members are tireless advocates who work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress. We stand firm as the voice of the people and provide dedicated, focused service to our constituents.

Madam Speaker, we are proud to anchor this hour to discuss Congress' responsiveness to an important constituency group, American women. Let's first understand the current role of women in the legislative process.

Since 1917, when Representative Jeannette Rankin of Montana became the first woman to serve in Congress, a total of 260 women have served as U.S. Representatives or Senators. Currently, more women now serve in Congress than at any time in the Nation's history. In this year's Congress, there are 17 women serving in the United States Senate and 74 women serving in the United States House of Representatives. Of those Congresswomen currently serving in Congress, 14 are members of the CBC.

Since the first Congresswoman of color, Representative Patsy Mink of Hawaii, won election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964, a total of 39 women of color have served in the U.S. Congress. Roughly three quarters—or 30—of these women were elected after 1990, and a total of 38 have served in the House of Representatives, where Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois is the only woman of color to serve in the U.S. Senate, from 1993 to 1999. The first African American woman to serve in Congress was Shirley Chisholm of New York who won election in 1968. Twenty-five African American women have followed her.

There are some States who have never elected a woman to Congress. They are Delaware, Iowa, Mississippi, and Vermont. I look forward to having women from those States join us at some point, Madam Speaker.

There are a historic number of women currently serving in Congress, including the first woman Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, who was elected Speaker in 2007. The 111th Congress understands that our Nation's laws must include and respond to all of our citizens, including women.

Women in the Workforce. We addressed that when we looked at Lilly Ledbetter. Congress began this year addressing gender-based pay discrimination. In January, Congress swiftly and decisively passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Just days later, Presi-

dent Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act into law and restored an employee's right to challenge unlawful pay discrimination.

The Paycheck Fairness Act passed by the House on January 9 takes further steps to ensure that gender-based pay discrimination does not occur in the first place by closing the loopholes that have allowed employers to avoid responsibility for discriminatory pay. A comprehensive update to the 46-year-old Equal Pay Act, The Paycheck Fairness Act puts gender-based discrimination sanctions on equal footing with other forms of wage discrimination, such as race, disability, or age. It creates a new grant program to help strengthen the salary negotiation skills of girls and women. And it creates strong incentives for employers to equally compensate workers while strengthening correlating Federal enforcement efforts.

In 1963, President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law. Progress has been slow during the 46 years since passage of the act. After four decades, American women continue to be unfairly compensated for their work. According to the National Organization for Women, when the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, women working full time and year round earned an average of 59 cents for every dollar earned by men; in 2007, women made 78 cents for every dollar earned by men; today, the gap has narrowed by less than a half a cent a year.

The impact of income disparity extends far beyond the individual woman. As such, equal pay is not just a woman's issue, it is a family issue.

□ 2015

The current wage gap hurts everyone. It lowers family income for essentials such as groceries, doctor's visits, and child care. When women earn more, families benefit. Closing the wage gap is an integral part of strengthening American families and providing hope for a better future.

I stand in support of equal pay for all. I look forward to the day when all women receive equal pay for equal work.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act recognized the need to get our people back to work, and that includes women. During the current recession, from December 2007 until September 2009, roughly 2 million women lost their jobs, according to employers across this Nation. As of September, women represented 49.9 percent of all workers, excluding those in the Armed Forces and farmworkers.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act contains powerful provisions to retrain workers. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act has made nearly \$4 billion in new funding available through the Department of Labor for job training programs. Just under \$3 billion of this funding has already gone out to States through formula grants under the Workforce Investment Act.

Speaking with Lori Atkins, the deputy director of workforce training in Cuyahoga County where I live, I learned the county will receive \$14 million for training. The money will help dislocated adult and youth workers, including America's women. Another \$750 million will be allocated through competitive grants to train people in green jobs and health care and other high-demand sectors. While women are underrepresented in many of these high-demand sectors, we can be retrained to compete for these jobs.

I am proud of community organizations that retrain women in nontraditional industries. Hard Hatted Women is one such organization. The nonprofit, located in Cleveland, Ohio, is launching a new program called Tradeswomen TOOLS. This program will link women to opportunities in high-wage, nontraditional fields using the expertise of women working on diversity initiatives in these fields. The goal is to link unemployed women with employment opportunities within the building trades in heavy highway construction, the energy and utility sector, the green building sector, and advanced manufacturing. Tradeswomen TOOLS provides orientation to nontraditional careers, industry specific workshops and presentations, individualized career counseling, one stop center for referrals, and math and physical fitness for the trades. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and organizations like Hard Hatted Women provide women the resources to get back to work.

Now I would like to talk a bit about women and education challenges. Madam Speaker, we must ensure that our girls graduate from high school in order to financially provide for themselves. According to the National Women's Law Center, an estimated 25 percent of female students do not graduate with a high school diploma in 4 years. Girls of color are particularly affected by this trend. Across the Nation, in 2004, 37 percent of Hispanics, 40 percent of black, and 50 percent of American Indian or Alaskan Native female students failed to graduate in 4 years.

While there are many factors that contribute to students dropping out of school, some are unique to girls. Those factors are: first, pregnancy and parenting responsibilities. According to a survey conducted by the Gates Foundation, 33 percent of female dropouts reported that becoming a parent played a major role in their decision to leave school. Specifically, students cited the lack of affordable day care for their children. While some high schools provide subsidized care for student parents, many do not. The school itself then becomes a determinant in whether the student remains in school.

In many schools where a certain number of absences result in students forfeiting a class, teen mothers need child-related absences not counted toward their total number of absences, and most could benefit from counseling

in time management, parenting skills, and referrals to services for their children.

Poor attendance rates influenced by a high occurrence of sexual harassment by peers and educators is another reason why young women drop out of school. During the same Gates Foundation survey, 83 percent of girls were victims of sexual harassment in school. Suffering abuse at the hands of peers, teachers, and other school administrators, these girls reported that the abuse caused them not to want to attend school to avoid the teacher responsible for the harassment, to stop participating in the classroom, and to be distracted from their studies.

Unfortunately, when we fail to create a safe space in our schools, we undermine the success of all students, especially girls, their future families, and our Nation. According to the study "When Girls Don't Graduate, We All Fail: A Call to Improve High School Graduation Rates for Girls," female dropouts earn significantly lower wages than male dropouts, are at a greater risk of unemployment, and are more likely to rely on public support programs. Female high school dropouts earn only about 63 cents for every \$1 earned by male high school dropouts. Measured against the Federal poverty line, women without high school diplomas earn an average salary about 7 percent below the family poverty line for a family of three, \$15,520 versus \$16,600. Women with high school diplomas earn an average salary about 32 percent above the Federal poverty line, or \$21,936 to \$16,600.

Female dropouts struggle with worse health conditions and less access to health coverage to address their needs than girls who graduate from high school.

Women under the Affordable Health Care of America Act are among those who stand to gain the most from health insurance reform. Madam Speaker, we pay more, we get less, and some of the ways we are treated by insurance companies is just criminal.

Recently, I met Mrs. Jodie Miller of Maryland, a mother who conceived triplets through in vitro fertilization. Mrs. and Mr. Miller were later denied health coverage because their insurance company declared that they had preexisting conditions. She was denied because of her infertility. The insurance company denied Mr. Miller coverage due to what they deemed "spousal infertility." America's Affordable Health Care Act will outlaw such discrimination based on preexisting conditions.

The Affordable Health Care for America Act would revolutionize health care for women, ending the discrimination we face under our current system. More than 14 million American women who have purchased health insurance in the private market last year paid up to 48 percent more in premium costs than men. Insurance companies routinely practice what they call gender

rating, and that permits them to charge men and women different premiums for the very same coverage. The Affordable Health Care for America Act would make gender rating illegal. Never again will insurance companies be able to deny women coverage for C-sections because we are pregnant or because we are victims of domestic violence. Never again, Madam Speaker, will insurance companies be able to deny us coverage just for being women.

The House's health reform proposal would make health care affordable for all of America's women and protect us from high and potentially unimaginable out-of-pocket health care costs. We must and will improve health care for not only women, but for all Americans.

I want to talk about women of color and disproportionately being targeted for high-cost mortgages.

According to a report for the National Council of Negro Women researched by the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, African American and Latino women continue to receive disparate treatment in the mortgage lending process. The report, "Assessing the Double Burden: Examining Racial and Gender Disparities in Mortgage Lending," demonstrates that minorities continue to be much more likely to receive high-cost home mortgage loans than their white counterparts. In many instances, disparities by race widened as income levels increased, indicating that discrimination remains a reality in home mortgage lending, as reports by the Federal Reserve and others have documented.

The foreclosure epidemic is, in part, rooted in the targeting of communities of color for high-cost loans. The report finds that minorities were first to experience disproportionately high rates of foreclosure. As the foreclosure crisis continued to spread to suburban areas, the study suggests that middle- and upper-income minorities will continue to experience a disproportionate impact, which is especially pronounced for African American women.

Dr. Avis Jones-DeWeever of the National Council of Negro Women commented that, "Given the importance of homeownership to families and entire communities, it becomes clear that we simply cannot rest until every person, regardless of race or gender, is treated fairly at every stage of the mortgage lending process."

The report examined data collected under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act for the year 2007, which is the latest year for which data is publicly available, for 100 of the largest metropolitan areas in the country. Among the findings, middle- and upper-income African American females were at least twice as likely to receive high-cost loans as middle- and upper-income white females in more than 84 percent of the metropolitan areas examined.

Low- and moderate-income African American females were at least twice as likely to receive high-cost loans as

low- and moderate-income white females in 70 percent of the metropolitan areas examined.

Middle- and upper-income Hispanic females were at least twice as likely to receive high-cost loans as middle- and upper-income white females in almost 62 percent of the metropolitan areas examined, and low- and moderate-income Hispanic females were at least twice as likely as low- and moderate-income white females to receive high-cost loans in 32 percent of the metropolitan areas examined.

The foreclosure crisis has definitely affected my congressional district. The Center for Responsible Lending projected that more than 5,500 foreclosures will occur in my district in 2009, and more than 18,500 foreclosures will occur over the next 4 years.

The Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act is to respond to the foreclosure crisis. In May, the House of Representatives passed the Predatory Mortgage Lending Practices Reduction Act of 2009. If the act passes the Senate, it will strengthen restrictions on compensation paid to mortgage lenders and brokers.

Today, some lenders deceptively pay brokers extra fees for loans if they write loans at a higher interest rate, even when lower rates are available to borrowers. The rates are unreasonable, and borrowers are often subsequently forced into foreclosure. Such arrangements are an indefensible conflict of interest and must be stopped.

A key element of the act prohibits lenders from underwriting unreasonable loans and prohibits practices that increase the risk of foreclosure.

The act supports lenders making 30-year, fixed rate, fully documented loans rather than the record number of unstable loans marketed today. It also provides greater protections for renters of foreclosed properties, like requiring a mandatory 90-day notice to vacate instead of the arbitrary practices currently being used.

The Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act is crucial in curbing the predatory practices of the past. Mortgage lending reform is a vital piece of the congressional effort to prevent future financial disasters. Congress cannot, and will not, ignore the fact that lax regulation of this industry has left far too many consumers unprotected. I urge the Senate to pass this measure soon.

In response to the predatory practices of some mortgage brokers and agents, I introduced the Predatory Mortgage Lending Practices Reduction Act of 2009, H.R. 2108. The act is designed to assure consumers that mortgage brokers or agents are thoroughly trained and accountable for predatory practices. It does this by altering the law in three ways.

□ 2030

First, the act requires that brokers and agents issuing subprime loans undertake a rigorous certification pro-

gram. Second, the legislation streamlines the process for filing complaints against unethical brokers and agents. And, finally, the act creates civil penalties for violations of Federal predatory lending laws.

Madam Speaker, there are honest and decent mortgage brokers and agents in this industry. Then there are a relatively few number of unscrupulous individuals who earn their commission through deception. The Predatory Mortgage Lending Practices Reduction Act of 2009 would help protect consumers from the latter class of lenders by ensuring that all related personnel are properly trained and held accountable.

Madam Speaker, further, I, on a regular basis, host housing clinics within my district. I do this in order to educate women about predatory lending, about housing scams and their rights under foreclosure.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I would quote from Susan B. Anthony who said it was "we the people," not we the white male citizens, nor yet we the male citizens, but we the whole people who formed the union; men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less. By responding to the needs of all Americans, Congress will address the needs of all women as well.

REMEMBERING THE EVENTS OF NOVEMBER 5, 2009, AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, tonight we rise during this leadership hour to remember the events of November 5, 2009, one of the largest attacks that was perpetrated at our U.S. military installation at Fort Hood, Texas, just north of my district, a very solemn occasion. Thirteen people were killed, over 30 people wounded, and an unborn child was killed that day. I went to the memorial service, thirteen pairs of combat boots put together with a rifle and a helmet on top, and the pictures of the victims who were killed in cold blood that day by a deranged gunman who, unfortunately, served in the United States military.

In my view, simply put, it was an act of treason. Look, in a time of war, soldiers are killed. But when I visited Fort Hood for the memorial service, they said, Congressman, we never dreamed that they would be killed in our home. This is our home. This man killed his fellow comrades at our home. Very disturbing. And the words that he said as he pointblank shot them one by one, as 100 rounds went off from his semi-automatic pistol, 100 rounds into a crowd of defenseless soldiers and a few civilians, were "Allahu Akbar, God is great." That's one of the most dis-

turbing reports that we got from that tragic day.

Well, I submit that that is not our God. That's not the God of our Founding Fathers. As the President said so eloquently at the memorial service, no religion condones the killing of innocent people. No religion condones that kind of violence. And he went on to say that he will face his punishment here on Earth and in the next world. The President is right.

We went to Veterans Day services the following day and went all across our districts paying tribute to the great veterans, the men and women who have served this country with honor and distinction, to thank them for their service; but the whole day, one could not help but to stop and think about what had just occurred at Fort Hood, these tragic, tragic events. Mr. Hasan will pay for this tragic event. He will be brought to justice. And it is my sincere hope, as the President said, that he will be taken to the next world.

And I want to, at the beginning, pay tribute to the 13, the 13 who were killed in cold blood that day, who died while serving their country admirably and nobly: Private Francheska Velez, 21, of Chicago, Illinois; Lieutenant Colonel Juanita Warman, 55, from Maryland; Major Libardo Caraveo, 52, of Woodbridge, Virginia; Captain John Gaffney of San Diego, California; Captain Russell Seager, 41, of Racine, Wisconsin; Staff Sergeant Justin DeCrow, 32, of Plymouth, Indiana; Sergeant Amy Krueger, 29, of Kiel, Wisconsin; Specialist Jason Hunt, 22, of Tillman, Oklahoma; Specialist Frederick Greene, 29, of Mountain City, Tennessee; Private 1st Class Aaron Nemelka, 19, of West Jordan, Utah; Private 1st Class, Michael Pearson, 22, of Bolingbroke, Illinois; Specialist Kham Xiong, of Saint Paul, Minnesota, just 23 years old; and, finally, Mr. Michael Cahill, 62, of Cameron, Texas, where he was a civilian employee.

Fort Hood has a special connotation for many of us in Texas. It's the largest military installation in the world. The fact that it was attacked, the fact that these soldiers were killed at home, in my view, is the greatest act of treason and the greatest tragedy of November 5.

But there were heroes that day. There were many heroes that day. Sergeant Kim Munley, the civilian cop employed by the base, described by fellow officers as a tough cookie, pretty much fearless, born and bred to be a police officer, and a very good shot. She was nicknamed "Mighty Mouse" because of her size long before the Fort Hood shooting. Three minutes after Mr. Hasan began shooting, Munley tracked him down outside of the predeployment facility and unloaded on him at close range. Munley was hit in both legs and a wrist during the gun battle, but stayed on her feet bravely

and kept firing at the charging gunman. Hasan was eventually apprehended by Sergeant Mark Todd, Sergeant Mark Todd of the Killeen Police Department, who arrived shortly after the scene, and finally brought this man who perpetrated this great act of treason on his fellow officers, his fellow soldiers, to bring him to justice.

I want to talk briefly about my good friend, Congressman JOHN CARTER. He represents Fort Hood. He introduced a bill of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor. And this bill will grant combatant status to those wounded and those families who lost loved ones. It will also allow military personnel to receive the Purple Heart. Civilians will receive the Secretary of Defense Medal of Freedom, and beneficiaries of all military personnel who lost their lives in this horrendous attack will receive the maximum life insurance benefit available. Just today it was announced by the Department of Defense that they will receive the full maximum amount of \$100,000.

But let us focus on this man, Mr. Hasan, the gunman. When I was at Fort Hood for the ceremony and viewing the 18 combat boots with the rifles and the helmets on top, I looked at the wounded soldiers. I talked to them, who were actually shot by this man, as they saluted their comrades, their friends, at that memorial service, and I said, what did he say as he shot you in cold blood and killed 13 others? "Allahu Akbar, God is great."

When that news was reported to me and when I got that information firsthand by our soldiers serving in uniform, the hair went up on the back of my spine, the back of my head. I knew at that point that we weren't dealing with an ordinary person, obviously a deranged man. Yet this man was on a mission, on a mission that he believed was from his God, a jihadist mission. It is a common terminology in the jihad world to say "Allahu Akbar" before you shoot and kill others. I think he fully expected to die that day. He gave away his material possessions. He was seen wearing Pakistani garb at the 7-11 that morning. He was preparing himself. He was premeditating the death of others and preparing himself for his own death.

This man was born of Jordanian immigrants. He was shot many times. He has survived. It is my sincere hope that we can get inside this man's head to answer the question, What was your intent, what was your motivation? Because there have been so many flags raised about this case. It was reported that he said his allegiance was not to the Constitution of the United States but rather to the Koran. He received poor performance reviews at Walter Reed because he was conflicted in the mission. He didn't believe in the mission. He didn't believe in the war on terror. He didn't believe in what we were doing in Iraq and Afghanistan.

ABC News reported just this evening that Hasan tried to get his bosses to

prosecute some of his patients as war criminals, soldiers serving in the United States Army, to get them prosecuted as war criminals because they were killing his fellow Muslims. He regularly described the war on terrorism as a war against Islam. This is a man serving in the United States military counseling as a psychiatrist for PTSD soldiers coming out of that theater, a man who was transferred to the largest military installation, United States military installation, in the world.

And while studying for a master's degree in public health in 2007, Hasan used a presentation for environmental health class to argue that Muslims were being targeted by U.S. anti-terror campaigns. A former classmate said he was very vocal about the war, very upfront about being a Muslim first and an American second. He was always concerned that Muslims in the military were being persecuted, a self-proclaimed soldier of Allah on his own business cards. A man who wore traditional Pakistani garb, a man who attended the mosque in Falls Church, Virginia, with the imam who also preached to two of the hijackers from 9/11, a man convicted of providing material support to al Qaeda and conspiring to assassinate President Bush.

Then we found out that the Joint Terrorism Task Force got information that Mr. Hasan, 6 months ago, was contacting this imam in Yemen. We don't know what those communications were. But why in the world would a major in the United States military, at one of the greatest bases in the world, be talking to an al Qaeda recruiter in Yemen? And yet this information was not shared with Fort Hood.

That is why we are asking for hearings. But this President has said, No, Congress, you will not have hearings on this matter. We need to deal with this issue. Well, I'm not going to stand back and watch this matter being swept under the rug and not allow the American people access to the truth. And the last time I checked, under the Constitution, the Congress is a separate branch of government and the Congress has the power under the Constitution to exercise that oversight authority, and Congress should do that. Congress needs to have hearings in this case.

And we will continue the drumbeat until the truth comes out on this man, Mr. Hasan, and who he was talking to before this happened, and his friend, the imam, who the day of the shootings congratulated him for what he did, congratulated him for killing 13 American soldiers.

□ 2045

With that, I would love to yield to my good friend from Indiana, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, let me say thank you for taking this Special Order tonight.

You know, this should never have happened. There are 13 Americans that

are dead, their families are suffering tonight, and it need not have happened. This man issued so many warning signs, it wasn't even funny. And, for some reason, his superiors did not investigate this man, call him on the carpet and find out why he was talking about these acts of violence and anti-American sentiments, and because they didn't, and they decided to unload him and send him down to Fort Hood, all those people are suffering—the families—and those people are dead that you alluded to just a few minutes ago.

This is not just an issue about this man committing these terrible atrocities, this terrorist attack. This is about making sure that the people in positions of leadership in the military and in other areas of our government are made aware when people start talking like he did and advocating terrorist attacks on the United States of America.

Now I understand that people are very concerned about the religious attitude that people have and trampling on their rights as far as their religious beliefs are concerned. But when you're talking about a war on terror—terrorist attacks where they kill almost 3,000 people at the World Trade Center, they blew up embassies over in Africa, they attacked the USS Cole and killed a bunch of Navy personnel—when we know they do that, and that's their goal, to destroy America, these fanatics, then, by golly, when we have somebody in the military or anyplace else in government that's talking like that, they need to be investigated and they need to be removed from a position where they can perpetrate those terrorist attacks.

And this is a tragedy not just because those young people gave their lives down there unnecessarily because of this terrorist, but because the superiors of his did not do their duty in responding to this man and reporting on what he was talking about prior to this thing taking place. If they had stood up and said, This guy's a threat to his fellow soldiers, we might have been able to avoid this.

And so I'd just like to say to my colleague once again, I'm very happy that you have taken this Special Order. I hope you will add me, along with our colleague from Texas, to this bill. I'd like to be a cosponsor. And I just say to any of the military personnel and leadership over at the Pentagon or the people at any of our military bases, if you hear anybody talking like this man did, advocating a terrorist attack on America, then, by golly, tell the people of this country about it and tell your superiors and get them out of there.

Not only should they be removed from the service; they should be watched so they don't perpetrate a terrorist attack once they're removed from the service. But they certainly should not be in a position of leadership in any branch of the service in any part of this country.

We're in a war against terrorism, and we need to make sure that we are vigilant. Thomas Jefferson said, The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. And we need to be that way right now, because this is not something that's just going to go away because we don't want it to happen. We are in a war against people that want to destroy America, want to destroy our way of life and force upon the rest of the world their religious fanatic beliefs. And we can't allow that to happen and go unchallenged.

We have an awful lot of people in all religions that would cringe at thinking that that person was in their church or in their synagogue or in their mosque and shared some of their beliefs, because it casts a pall over every one of them. It makes every one of them feel like they share in this terrible tragedy that took place, this act of terrorism. And it's unfortunate because there are a lot of people that believe in the Muslim faith that are just horrified that this happened and because of the way that they're looked upon in this country.

And so if we're talking tonight not just about people in the military, but if we're talking to people in mosques around this country, who love this country, they should tell the authorities if there's somebody that's acting like that—that threatens the security of this country and threatens the possibility of a terrorist attack in any part of our society.

With that, let me just say to my colleague once again, thank you very much for taking this Special Order. I really appreciate it. I'm sure people across this country share your views. And I yield back.

Mr. McCAUL. I thank the gentleman from Indiana and your great comments. And you're a true patriot to this country. I mean that very heart-felt.

We've gotten so wrapped up in this political correctness, we're prohibited from calling this the war on terror. That's been taken out of the vernacular. And you wonder how a man like this could be transferred and then promoted. And with all the flags and contacts with al Qaeda recruiters, how did this happen? Why wasn't that information shared? Why, when these flags went up, weren't we able to act upon it?

We know for years that al Qaeda has been targeting bases both in the United States and abroad. It's a homeland security threat, it's a national security threat abroad. They tried to do that with Fort Dix, and we stopped it with good intelligence. They tried to do it with other military installations in the United States.

So when this evidence got out there, the real question I think we in the Congress need to ask is: Why didn't his superiors know about this? Or, when his colleagues heard the ranting and raving by him, having a business card saying he is a soldier of Allah, saying that his loyalty is first and foremost to the Koran, not the Constitution.

And the gentleman from Indiana is right. I worked in the Justice Department, a Federal prosecutor at the Joint Terrorism Task Forces. The National Intelligence Estimate says the most effective weapon we have is a moderate Muslim—the Muslim who will come forward and help us in the mosque to say there is an individual out here that we believe to be a threat to the security of the United States. Obviously, this man was. But, for whatever reason, nothing was done about it, and 13 soldiers are dead and 30 more are wounded.

We in the Congress have a role, an oversight role to get to the answers, to fix the problem, to make sure it didn't happen. The whole point after 9/11 was to make sure that we shared intelligence and information to better protect the American people. And I see no greater homeland security issue than protecting our bases right here in the United States.

As I said at the outset, when I visited the soldiers at Fort Hood for the memorial service, they say, Congressman, we see this in Iraq and Afghanistan, but we don't expect that to happen at home. Not in our home. Not on our base. This was not supposed to happen. And the question is: Is this man—did he infiltrate or was he a "lone wolf" acting on his own without any outside influence?

We don't know the answer to those questions. We have been told that from the very day after this occurred that he was a lone wolf acting on his own. There's a term "rush to judgment." In my view, I think that was a rush to judgment, the idea that he was acting as a lone wolf before we got all the evidence in front of us.

All we are asking in the Congress is that we review the matter. I have great hope that the majority will work with us in a bipartisan way to provide that oversight that this body, this distinguished body, by the Constitution has the authority to: To get to the real answers for the American people as to whether this man had radicalized on his own, which he clearly did—he radicalized—or whether he is being facilitated by people on the outside, and whether al Qaeda had something to do with this. Because they got a playbook, and they go back to the playbook.

They had the World Trade Center bomber. They went back to the World Trade Center. They tried to hit the Capitol. That's their playbook. They will, in my view, try to hit the Capitol again. Chemical explosives. Ramzi Yousef, when he was arrested in Islamabad, a very chilling story. He had multiple baby dolls that he had stuffed with chemical explosives. He was going to take those baby dolls onto airplanes, known as the Bojinka Plot, and blow up 12 commercial airliners simultaneously. They go back to that playbook. We've seen chemical explosives come up over and over again.

Military installations are in their playbook. And we need to take the pro-

tection of our military installations both here in the United States and abroad very, very seriously. And when a man like this gets in and gets promoted and perpetrates what he did, one of the greatest acts of violence on a military base since Pearl Harbor, then we need the answers to these questions.

There are so many flags in this case. Not only this individual, but what was he doing with Pakistan. What influence did Pakistan have on this individual. The American people need to know the truth. We need to know it not as a "gotcha" exercise, but as a way to look forward and say, How can we better protect the American people from individuals like this and our soldiers from people like this? How can we better protect bases here in the United States?

We know he contacted many radical Web sites, posted very radical thoughts on these Web sites. It's time for us to stand up and have hearings on this matter and answer these fundamental questions.

Tonight, to the families of the victims, our heart goes out. We hear the cries. As we saw the 13 combat boots, the rifle, and the helmet portrayed in that picture, it was one of the saddest days and darkest chapters, I think, in American history. As we go forward, I believe we need to get the answers to these many, many questions that are out there.

Probably the hardest thing we have to do as Members of Congress is to comfort families who have lost their loved ones. I will never forget that day at Fort Hood at the memorial service, talking to the survivors, particularly some of the spouses who lost their husbands that day, to the mothers, fathers, and brothers and sisters; talking to the wounded victims who were shot by this man.

As we comfort these families, as we have with soldiers coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan and those who died, it is one of the most difficult things as Members of Congress, one of the most solemn responsibilities that we have. We know that words cannot give them back what they lost. We grieve their loss in the Congress. We stand by the families of the victims. With that, let me say God bless them.

I know we have another colleague from Texas who I know is here. When he is ready to speak, I'd like to yield to my good friend from Texas. Then I will reclaim my time and yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just hope that all of our colleagues who are in their offices tonight or may be watching this Special Order on television will join with you and the other sponsor of the bill from Texas, our colleague, and push as hard as possible for hearings here in the Congress of the United States.

We have in this body subpoena authority. The only thing that can't be brought before a committee is something that's top secret, classified, and

if that is not the case, then we have the authority to subpoena documents and evidence to bring this issue before the Congress, a number of committees here.

I think it's important that people like you and all of our colleagues ask the White House to relent and let us have these hearings, which I think are extremely important, because the American people want to know about this, because everybody is concerned about the terrorist threat that we face in this country.

So the President can't claim executive privilege. If he does that, then of course they can block us from having a hearing. But even if he does that, they have to prove that there's a reason for executive privilege. And we have subpoena power here in the Congress of the United States. And so the committee chairmen, chairmen of these various committees, if it isn't something that's top secret or highly classified, they can subpoena this information and bring it before the Congress.

I hope that you and the rest of our colleagues will do everything possible—I know you will—everything possible to make sure the American people know everything that happened and everything that led up to this tragedy.

Once again, thank you very, very much for taking this Special Order.

□ 2100

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Again, reclaiming my time, I think I speak for most Americans, we do not want to see this thing swept under the rug. We don't want to see the rush to judgment that it was the act of one man—and perhaps it was—but the American people need to know the truth, and they need to know who he was talking to. And when the reporting came out that he was talking to the top al Qaeda recruiter in Yemen by emails and that there were communications in Pakistan, that raises big flags in this case. We cannot ignore that.

It is our constitutional duty to ask the tough questions to get to the bottom of this case so that the American people, through their representatives, can find out what really happened that tragic day on November 5. And if we don't do that, and if the majority does not want to do that and bows to the President and his request, I think we are being derelict in our responsibilities.

Again, this is a man who places allegiance more to the Koran than the Constitution, in his own words. "Son of Allah" on his business cards, dressed in the Pakistan garb, classic of the suicide bomber techniques to will your possessions away, wear the dress the morning of. I think he fully expected not to survive the incident. He did. And the best evidence we have is inside his head.

Of course the first thing he did was ask for an attorney, and he is not

speaking. That is the same thing Khalid Sheikh Mohammed asked for. When he first got arrested, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed asked for two things: I want a lawyer, and I want to be taken to New York City. And unfortunately, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed got his wish that day because Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is going to be brought to New York now under the President's new guidelines.

I think getting to the bigger picture of all this, as we've taken "war on terror" out of the vernacular, we are moving back to this Clinton era where these terrorists are treated not as enemies of war but as criminal defendants. We are in a war, like it or not. We are in a war. We need to treat these people who mean to do us harm as enemies of war. The military tribunals are the best way to prosecute. We are going to bring Mr. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed into the United States to the very city where 3,000 people were killed at his hands.

I was a Federal prosecutor. The Southern District of New York is one of the finest U.S. Attorney's offices and is probably best equipped to handle that prosecution, but the Federal rules of evidence are very different from the military tribunals. It's going to withhold evidence from trial. It will not protect classified information. It will turn to a showcase. And as in the case of Moussaoui, whose computer records were ruled inadmissible, he got life imprisonment. Ramsey Yousef, the perpetrator of the '93 World Trade Center got life imprisonment. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed deserves the death penalty. It was an act of war.

Now, I don't know if the administration is saying, you know, basically that the war on terror is over, it's over so let's just go ahead and bring these people in and treat them like criminal defendants, but I think they are making a serious mistake, not only compromising the prosecutions of these terrorists but bringing them into a city that has been a target for quite some time. It's only going to heighten the state of alertness in New York City and become a mecca for jihadists around the world to come to New York to see the spectacle of a show trial. They ought to be tried in Guantanamo. Guantanamo never should have been closed or the order should never have been sent out to close it, and a military tribunal is best equipped to prosecute these individuals.

Just let me say in closing, we've been dealing with the health care legislation. It is very important for the Nation, but we were struck by a heavy blow last week, November 5, at Fort Hood. We never expected it to be one of our own. We never expected an act of treason on that level, killing 13 soldiers and wounding 30 others, firing off 100 rounds, yelling out "Allahu Akbar," talking to known al Qaeda operatives in Yemen and possibly Pakistan. There are too many questions in this case, too many red flags, and the

American people deserve the answer. We in the Congress—and I know my good friend from Indiana stands with me—we're not going to sit back and follow the orders of this President to stand down and not exercise our constitutional responsibility.

There is a separation of branches of government under the Constitution for a good reason. The executive branch can't sweep things under the rug. The American people, through their representatives, need to find out what really happened. The American people deserve the truth in this case. They deserve hearings, a full investigation and the truth to come out.

I commend our great fighting men and women. I have had so many constituents who have gone through Fort Hood on their missions to Iraq and Afghanistan. They were serving very bravely and nobly in a very, very important struggle between radical Islam and freedom, between the jihadists and democracy. We will eventually win that struggle. We pray for the victims' families, and we pray that God holds their loved ones in the palms of his hands.

GIVING TERRORISTS A TRIAL BY JURY IN NEW YORK CITY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to follow up on what my colleague from Texas was talking about, as the ranking member on the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Terrorism. And actually, I'm the ranking Republican member on the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee under the Judiciary, so we have some overlapping space there.

I know my friends, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), in their hearts are very much concerned about the safety and the well-being of this country. This is some serious stuff that's going on here when the President of the United States says that we need to bring at least some of the most feared terrorists in the world into the most densely populated area in America.

Now, having been a judge and a chief justice, having had to work out logistics for major trials that had a lot of publicity, nothing, nothing like this trial will be—I understand perhaps some of the ramifications that our fine President, with his experience in community organizing, may not quite understand. You can't bring terrorists—and the reason I say "terrorists" instead of "alleged terrorists" is because they've admitted it. You can't bring them to the most densely populated area in our country and not expect there to be terror to follow. I mean, I've tried felony cases, death penalty

cases, and I know there are other friends here in Congress that have also. Death threats arise in those types of cases. I had them. I didn't worry about them when it was me. I worried about them when it was my family, and that happens.

If you think about the consequences logistically of bringing admitted terrorists to the most densely populated area in America, New York City, where they've already struck at least twice. They tried to blow up the World Trade Center. It didn't work the first time. They did some damage, but nothing like the second time, and we're going to bring them right back. We know, thank God, that most Muslims are not jihadists like you find here with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

But when you read the six-page pleading that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the guy that they want to bring to New York for trial, said in his own pleading—and as I understand it, he did his own interpretation to English. He would make statements, and he would back them up by a reference and a quote in English from the Koran. He says, "We ask to be near to God"—this Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who our President is inviting to come to New York City. "We fight you and destroy you and terrorize you." Khalid Sheikh Mohammed said this in his pleading. And it wasn't just for him. It was on behalf of the other four defendants in this case.

But he says, "The jihad in God's cause is a great duty in our religion. We have news for you. The news is you will be greatly defeated in Afghanistan and Iraq, and America will fall politically, militarily, and economically. Your end is near, and your fall will be just as the fall of the towers on the blessed 9/11 day. We will raise from the ruins, God willing. We will leave this imprisonment with our noses raised high in dignity as the lion emerges from his den. We shall pass over the blades of the sword into the gates of heaven. We ask from God to accept our contributions to the great attack, the great attack on America, and to place our 19 martyred brethren among the highest peaks in paradise." Now, this is the guy we want to bring to New York.

Now, having logistically set up major cases for trial, I can tell you that you have jailers who are going to be responsible for these people in jail 24 hours a day. Those shifts change constantly. You will have to be very attentive not only to every single jailer, but to every single jailer's family, because these forces will look for weak links in the jailer and the jailer's family.

You will have bailiffs in the courts who will also be responsible for their safekeeping and security. The bailiffs and their families will have to be viewed as potential weak links to be utilized by the terrorists.

You'll have to think about the clerks who may be marshaling evidence. They and their families will have to worry about being targets.

You will have to think about potential jurors. Even though the names supposedly would be kept secret, you have to worry about them and their families.

And the judge, his name will not be kept secret. The judge and his family will be open targets the rest of their lives.

This is scary stuff from a President who knows how to community organize better than any President we've had, but I don't believe he knows the organizational efforts and the weaknesses that will be brought out.

I would yield to my friend from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I just want to say that I hope Americans are thinking through the various ramifications. I think you just made an excellent point. We are talking about trials of terrorists in civilian courts in the biggest city, or one of the biggest cities in the Nation.

You just made a brilliant point. What about the guards and their families, the court clerks and their families, the bailiffs and their families, and on and on and on, all of whom now will be exposed to perhaps pressure, kidnapping, threats.

But what about, how long will this take? Are these trials that can be concluded in weeks? No, I don't think so. You are a judge. Do you think these trials can be concluded in months? Or perhaps, as our colleague Mr. HOEKSTRA pointed out on Face the Nation yesterday, these are trials which, if the defense exploits them, as defense attorneys do in courts in America, could go on for months or years, ripping open the wounds of the people whose family members died in those attacks. Why? Why in God's name are we giving terrorists the protection of trials in American criminal justice courts? It is insane. It absolutely makes no sense.

I believe that we are exposing the people of New York, the people involved in these courts and the people involved in their security all for no reason whatsoever, and it won't just go on for a few days or a few weeks or a few months.

□ 2115

I would like to direct the attention of the listening audience to the points that were made in today's media. This is going to be a field day for al Qaeda to learn how America and the American system of intelligence gathers information, and they'll be able to drag it out in open public court rather than in a military tribunal.

Somebody explain to me—I wish somebody could explain to me—why terrorists deserve the protections of the U.S. Constitution as if they had broken civil laws while they're operating inside this country. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was not in the United States when he planned this. This was not a simple murder. This was a terrorist attack by enemy combat-

ants. We may not want to call it war. We may not want to call it a war on terror. We may not want to accept the fact that there are people who hate us, as the quote the gentleman from Texas just read demonstrates; but it's reality. And we ought to be dealing with it as a terrorist threat in the tribunals set up for terrorist threats and for war crimes and crimes committed in the process of combat.

There was no mistaking, absolutely no mistaking, what al Qaeda wanted to accomplish by these attacks, and they were not done for mere criminal purposes. They were done to terrorize a Nation. And we have lost sight of that, and I think this administration has lost sight of it. I think this Attorney General is making a grave, grave mistake. And the damage we have seen in the past when our intelligence community is injured because this kind of information is made public and we are no longer able to operate as an intelligence community protecting a Nation against foreign enemies should act, I think, is a risk which we should never be undertaking under these circumstances.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know his years on the bench as a trial judge watching criminal trials makes it painfully clear that that's a procedure designed to protect defendants accused by the Nation of crimes under the laws and statutes of this Nation. That's not what we are dealing with here, and I thank the gentleman for making that point.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate Mr. SHADEGG making the point he does about why would we bring them to trial here in the United States, especially in New York City.

There are a lot of people that have never picked up the Constitution. We've got a little pocket Constitution here. But in article I it talks about the legislative powers. Over in section 8 it says that "Congress shall have power to" and you go down to "constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court." So President Bush made a mistake when he tried to create tribunals by the executive branch without getting Congress involved, and the Supreme Court rightfully struck that down and said you can't do that because article I, section 8 says this is something that Congress must do.

So then Congress did that. We had the Military Commissions Act of 2006, and this is the bill that's been slightly amended here this year, but it still says that, in section 948c, persons subject to military commissions: any alien unprivileged enemy belligerent is subject to trial by military commission as set forth in this chapter.

I am in the process of drafting this legislation right now that we will file this week that will say they must be tried in military commissions so we don't have an inexperienced President that doesn't realize the consequences of his actions.

Mr. MCCAUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to my friend Mr. MCCAUL.

Mr. MCCAUL. Are we not in a war on terror, in your view?

Mr. GOHMERT. Pardon?

Mr. MCCAUL. Are we not in a war on terror?

Mr. GOHMERT. Some people don't want to call it that and it may be unilateral at this point, but there is a war using terror going on and we either fight it, or we will be overwhelmed by it. So we should be in it, yes.

Mr. MCCAUL. My point is that that language has been taken out of the vernacular by this administration for whatever reason. We have our points as to why, but this is not being viewed as a war. What happened by the decision to bring in the mastermind of 9/11 to the very city where 3,000 Americans were murdered basically was a signal by this administration that the war on terror is over, that we are no longer going to treat terrorists as enemies of war; but, rather, we're going to go back to the Clinton administration years where we're going to treat them as criminal defendants, like Ramzi Yousef, the 1993 World Trade Center bomber, a criminal defendant. Not an act of war, but he is a criminal defendant.

By the way, Ramzi Yousef did not get the death penalty. And he went to talk to his Uncle Khalid Shiekh Mohammed about flying airplanes into buildings, and look what happened. Moussaoui did not get the death penalty because a lot of evidence was held to be inadmissible in a Federal court.

If they are true enemies of war, the best venue to try them is, as we did in World War II, by military tribunals. And the rules of evidence, as you know, Judge, I was a Federal prosecutor in the Justice Department, Southern District of New York, U.S. Attorney, one of the finest in the country. But the fact is you bring them on American soil, give them all rights under the Constitution, as my good friend from Arizona stated, why does Khalid Shiekh Mohammed get constitutional rights?

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, that is a very important point. Why does he get American citizens' rights? He has not been to America. He masterminded this. He was captured overseas in a foreign country. He's in Guantanamo right now, and the Constitution gives us in Congress the right to set up a military tribunal commission system, which we did.

But I want to come back and I'm going to keep injecting quotes from Khalid Shiekh Mohammed's own pleading himself. This is the guy who our President and Eric Holder, the Attorney General, want to bring to the most densely populated area in America. On page 4 he said, "In God's book he ordered us to fight you everywhere we find you, even if you were inside the holiest of all holy cities, the Mosque in Mecca and the holy city of Mecca even during sacred months." He said, "In

God's book," verse 9, Al-Tawbah, "then fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them and seize them and besiege them and lie in wait for them in each and every ambush." This is the guy they want to yield American citizens' rights to who will not be able to—

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentleman would yield, what was the first thing that Khalid Shiekh Mohammed said when he was apprehended in Islamabad? It was two things.

Mr. GOHMERT. Take me to New York.

Mr. MCCAUL. One, I want an attorney, and, number two, Take me to New York. And you know what? President Obama and this administration gave him his wish.

I just want to end my comments by saying you and I have tried cases. This is going to be a circus, a show trial of the maximum. The motions to transfer venue, the motions to suppress the evidence, none of the information we got from Khalid Shiekh Mohammed using water-boarding, which has protected American lives, which, by the way, this administration wants to investigate and put those CIA and intelligence people in jail. The discovery alone, as the gentleman from Arizona stated, will keep this thing alive for years to come, will involve classified information that will not be properly protected as it would in the military court.

Finally, on the security issue, I think the gentleman from Texas is right: this will become a Mecca for the terrorists, not only to al Qaeda but homegrown, radicalized homegrown, whether Mr. Moussaoui is homegrown, radicalized, or not, people like him will come to New York to blow buildings up and to prey on the jury perhaps or the judges.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield, I think it's fascinating that we all stand here, all three of us, with backgrounds in prosecution. The gentleman was a Federal prosecutor. I was in the Arizona Attorney General's Office for many years and involved in the prosecutions of a number of cases. You sat on the bench. All three of us come here instinctively tonight because we are so repulsed by the notion that American criminal courts intended to provide a plethora of rights to Americans accused of crimes inside this country are being afforded to someone who is clearly a terrorist, who clearly plotted from outside this country, who clearly plotted acts of war, and who said, as the gentleman just pointed out, as soon as he was apprehended outside the country, I want an attorney and I want to go to New York. And this administration is going to give him both of those wishes? That's an outrage.

I want to explore the point that my colleague Mr. GOHMERT made earlier. This is supposed to be a Nation of laws. Laws that anticipate that crimes committed by war criminals, enemy combatants, terrorists seeking to attack this Nation and all it stands for, they weren't seeking to attack a random

group of people on an airplane or in a building. They wanted to attack this Nation. The law says how that should be dealt with. It's supposed to be dealt with when those terrorists, those war criminals are apprehended, as Khalid Shiekh Mohammed was. They are supposed to be tried in tribunals. You just read us the law.

How does Mr. Holder, how does President Obama get around the law? And do not the people of America have the right to demand that the law be followed and that these individuals be charged and tried in tribunals held by the military because they are war criminals? They are not civilians and they are not U.S. citizens and they are not afforded the protections of the criminal courts of the United States.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentleman would yield, this was clearly evident early in this administration under their global justice policy that no longer would apprehended terrorists captured on the battlefield be treated as enemies of war.

Mr. SHADEGG. So we're going to read them their Miranda rights? We're going to provide lawyers to them out on the battlefield?

Mr. MCCAUL. Precisely. And what came out in a shocking story that has not been told enough, in my view, was that FBI agents were there at the detention facilities reading them the Miranda rights. This is where this administration has shifted towards treating them as criminal defendants in Afghanistan, with full rights of the U.S. Constitution in Afghanistan. And I believe it is a sad day for America when we bring this mastermind of 9/11 to the very city where he killed 3,000 Americans.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time briefly, the gentleman from Arizona asked how do they get around the law. Under section 948h of the Military Commissions Act of 2006, it says the "military commissions under this chapter may be convened by the Secretary of Defense or by any officer or official of the United States designated by the Secretary for that purpose." So the Secretary of the Defense serves at the pleasure of the President. And that "may" word allows them not to convene, which brings them to court.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes.

Mr. SHADEGG. So the Secretary of Defense may choose, pressured by the President, not to convene a tribunal. How then does that give the President of the United States the right to bring them to the United States and to try them in a criminal court? Because they did not violate a civilian law of the United States. I submit they committed acts of war. Does he have the power to overrule the law and bring them here and say they are something they are not, say they are not terrorists when their conduct constituted an act of terror? Or is he simply then obligated to hold them if they don't conduct a military tribunal?

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman raises a very good question. The problem has been apparently that the Attorney General and the President don't want to charge them with what they've actually done, committed an act of war against this Nation. They want to charge them with a criminal violation and bring that to court. And if they do not charge them with the act of war that brought about the deaths of thousands of Americans, innocent Americans of all walks of life, if they don't want to charge them with the most heinous act of war against this country in our history, and charge them simply with a criminal violation, then they can bring them into the civilians courts.

Mr. SHADEGG. Let will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Does that then raise the issue of whether their refusal to charge them with the conduct they, in fact, engaged in, which I would argue was clearly an act of war, clearly an act of terrorism against the Nation, if the officials charged with the duty of charging them with that conduct, acts of war against the United States, acts of terrorism against the United States, the Secretary of the Army, the Attorney General, or the President of the United States, are they not then derelict in their duty and are they not then subject to being either punished by the Congress or removed from office for failing to do their duty to charge Khalid Shiekh Mohammed with the conduct he engaged in, which was an act of war against the United States?

□ 2130

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, that's another good question. But as far as a—I think there is a breach of a fiduciary duty when you're more concerned about your image among foreign countries than you are with the safety of individuals in New York City, it would seem to be a breach of the fiduciary duty to protect Americans.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield, I'll let him make his point.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, let me inject one more comment by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, because I'm going to keep on injecting his own words from his own pleading. We do not—this is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed—we do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons, not yet; nevertheless, we fight you with the Almighty God. So if our act of jihad and our fighting with you cause fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is Him that has thrown fear into your hearts which resulted in your infidelity, paganism and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs. That's for Christians. He also says, in God's book, He ordered us to fight you everywhere we find you. Oh I've already read that one. But he quotes from the Koran and says, soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbeliever for that they join companies with Allah for which he

has sent no authority. Their place will be in the fire, and the evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

This is the guy we're going to bring to New York City. I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCAUL. And you're going to bring him into New York. And Osama Bin Laden, in the late 1990s, declared war against the United States. He actually declared war against the United States.

Mr. SHADEGG. And if the gentleman would yield, and he took credit for this act, and said it was a part of that war against the United States. How in God's name could Khalid Sheikh Mohammed not be at least charged and tried with an act of terrorism against the United States which, under current law, if we are in fact a Nation of laws, must be tried in a military tribunal? This country, the American people, get it. They see that in the name of political correctness we are placing an imprimatur on these acts that they were not acts of war, and that is not what the American people believe. We will rue the day, we will as a Nation, rue the day that we treat our enemies as criminals and not as enemy combatants who commit war against us.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, there is a key issue my friend raises. We treat them as criminals instead of as war terrorists and war criminals, because this won't just put New Yorkers at risk. It will not. It will put our soldiers at risk.

Mr. SHADEGG. Absolutely.

Mr. GOHMERT. I mean, having tried so many criminal cases, I can tell you, you know, the best thing they do is roll in, they've got photographers, they've got people with the rubber gloves, they take—the latex gloves—they take DNA evidence, they take fingerprints, they do all of this forensic analysis of the scene as my friends both know because they've used that evidence. Our soldiers cannot afford to bring out a forensic wagon in the middle of a battlefield to check for DNA, to check for fingerprints, to establish a chain of custody. And both of my friends know, if you don't have the chain of custody on a piece of evidence, it's not coming in. It's one of the reasons you don't charge war criminals as criminals in a civilian court because our soldiers should not be put in harm's way trying to gather that kind of forensic evidence.

Mr. SHADEGG. Every father and every mother and every sister and every brother of a soldier of this Nation needs to be scared because this undercuts our troops. This damages their morale. This undercuts their ability to do their job. This is a betrayal of America's fighting women and America's fighting men, and we need to stand up and we need to speak out and we need to say it's wrong. And it's not just unsafe for the people of New York. It's not just unsafe for the people of Illinois. It's not just unsafe for the people of Texas or Arizona. It is unsafe for every soldier we have engaged in combat. It is a betrayal of them in the name of political correctness.

Mr. McCAUL. Political correctness. And when has the Constitution of the United States been applied to enemies who are captured on the battlefield outside of the United States? I don't think that's ever been done. I'm not sure if that has ever been done.

Mr. SHADEGG. I would doubt it has ever happened.

Mr. McCAUL. And this administration again wants to take the vernacular war on terror, they want to just erase the last, you know, 4, 8 years. No, it was never a war. These are just criminal cases that need to be prosecuted and we need to treat them that way.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think the gentleman brings up a great point of history, and I want to add to it. Do you know that in World War II, enemy combatants caught in the United States, and there were some who came into the United States, came ashore or came to our coasts in submarines, then came ashore, could not, under international law, be held in American civilian prisons. The reason for that is they are not, as of that point in time, they're not criminals, and they have not been convicted, and therefore cannot be punished as prisoners in American jails or prisons are being punished.

And so we had to create camps where you could hold prisoners of war. As it turned out, we didn't adjudicate most of them. We released them upon the end of combat. In this case we are actually doing the opposite. We are not just saying that they're not enemy combatants engaged in acts of war and treating them separately and treating them as our colleague from Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, points out, through military tribunals. We're mixing them into the American criminal justice system, a system designed to preserve and protect the rights of the American people. It's insane. And the consequences will mean that, by extension, we have to go into the battlefield with evidence testing and with defense counsels and, as my colleague from Texas pointed out, the notion that we have to read them their rights. This is lunacy and a betrayal of our military.

Mr. McCAUL. As the gentleman knows if he will yield, a criminal defense lawyer in a civilian court is going to use discovery at every opportunity to embarrass the United States of America and to blame America first for the acts of a terrorist, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. And what concerns me the most is that they're going to make a mockery of our criminal justice system here in the United States and use it as a propaganda weapon in what I still refer to as this war on terror. This was one of the biggest mistakes this President has made. The decision to close Guantanamo Bay—I saw Khalid Sheikh Mohammed down in Guantanamo; it was one of the most chilling things I've ever seen, as he prayed, bowed over his prayer rug, to Mecca. We haven't broken his spirit.

And this administration again just granted him his wish. He gets his lawyer now, and he gets to come to New York City, just like his nephew, Ramsay Yusef did, who, by the way, did not get the death penalty. And as I close, as I move on, I sincerely hope that—this was a huge mistake—but I sincerely hope that this man is given the ultimate punishment so he can—not only here on earth but move on to the next world.

Mr. GOHMERT. And the gentleman makes a great point also, that he is not remorseful at all and, in fact, here he has been in prison, and this is filed this year, that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed says, and this is from his pleading that he himself prepared, so our religion is a religion of fear and terror to the enemies of God, the Jews, the Christians and pagans. With God willing, we are terrorists to the bone. So many thanks to God. He went on to say, and he quotes the Arab poet that stated, we will terrorize you as long as we live, with swords, fire and airplanes.

It's unbelievable that you would bring a guy like this into the United States of America, put our soldiers at risk for the future, forcing them to try to gather forensic evidence. While people are shooting at them they're going to have to be worried about fingerprints and DNA evidence and gee, did they have witnesses, getting witnesses' names and addresses, locations so they can come back and perhaps bring them to court in New York some day to testify. We just don't do this. We can't afford to do this when people are at war.

Our President, this administration may not realize we're at war, but there are people at war with us, and we fail to respond at our own risk. This is scary stuff. And we have the Military Commission Act of 2006. We're working on language that will make it a requirement so that it is not an option for the President. I mentioned article 1, section 8 that gives power to Congress to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court. As a constitutional law professor mentioned this weekend to me as I was visiting with him about this issue. He said, you know, the Supreme Court is really the only court in the country that has a right to exist under the Constitution. Every other court, tribunal, commission, only has their existence at the will of Congress.

And article 3 and section 1 makes that clear: The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. Going over, and it says, even the Supreme Court, it talks about all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and those in which the State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In the other cases before mentioned the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law, in fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

We have an obligation in this Congress to rein in a President that is putting New York City, our soldiers, our military at risk, and we fail to do so at the risk of those we are elected to serve and protect from all enemies, foreign and domestic. I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. I think it's important to note that from the outset there have been some in this body who have tried to stop this moment from occurring. I introduced legislation as soon as I heard that the President intended to bring detainees from Guantanamo Bay to the United States and to close Guantanamo Bay. I introduced legislation back last February to prohibit the President from bringing a single person who had ever been detained at Guantanamo Bay here to the United States. Mine was one of many bills introduced by Republican Members of Congress to try to stop this very point.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would yield, that was a good bill he filed as well, and I appreciate the efforts in doing that.

Mr. SHADEGG. Our minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, introduced a bill identical or very similar to mine. There have been other pieces of legislation. I just want to make it clear that I think that this is a grave error on so many fronts it's hard to explain. And it's worth maybe trying to lay out some of those points for anybody who'd just listen. Number one, I think the gentleman made a good point of this earlier. If you bring terrorists to the United States, there is, first and foremost, the danger that by merely being physically present in the United States, they will acquire rights that they do not have in Guantanamo Bay, that they do not have in Iraq, or that they did not have in Afghanistan.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I will add that no prisoner of war, no enemy combatant has ever had in the whole history of the world and of mankind.

Mr. SHADEGG. And why are we changing it? For some sense of political correctness, because we doubt ourselves, because we doubt that we were attacked, because we doubt the sincerity of the insane comments you've just read from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed about his intention to kill us, about his bragging, I believe, of beheading Daniel Pearl himself?

Those are shocking things. But that's just like the first of many reasons why this is a terrible policy. The gentleman did, I think, an excellent job earlier, that maybe the average American doesn't think about. But think of the risk that you are imposing upon not just the sworn police officers who will transport the combatants brought here, and the jailers that will jail them and the judges that will preside and the clerks that will be in the room or the bailiffs, but think of every single one of their family members, not just their children, their wives; what about their brothers, their sisters, their cousins,

their aunts, all of whom now become targets of terrorism, because if I were a terrorist outside of United States and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was going on trial in New York, I'd say, why don't I find the judge's cousin? Why don't I find the judge's sister? Why don't I find the bailiff's brother? And I'll capture them and hold them for ransom until Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is released.

We are placing literally, a countless number of Americans, guards, bailiffs, clerks, judges, jury members, and all their families at risk to afford to avowed terrorists who say the insane hatred things that you just read? We are putting all of them at risk to afford to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed the rights that our Constitution reserves to Americans accused of, Americans simply accused of criminal acts in America? These were not criminal acts in America. This was an act of war.

□ 2145

As our colleague from Texas pointed out earlier, he made no mistake. When Osama bin Laden declared war against the United States, it was not, "I plan to go rob the United States." It was not, "I plan to go kidnap Americans in the United States and hold them for ransom." It was, "I am declaring war against the United States." And here we sit compliant in this process because we want to be politically correct; we want to be perceived as fair.

What did we establish that was unfair about Guantanamo? Soldiers there have been given copies of the Koran. They've been given prayer mats. They are allowed time of prayer. We have spent \$50 million or more in building and improving that facility.

This is the first time in the course of the history of this Nation that we have doubted ourselves so much as to say we can't deal with enemy combatants who launch a war against us as we have dealt with them throughout history; throughout World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam. The tradition, the standards, the equity, the justice of the American military tribunal process has been established. And now, for the sake of political correctness, because somebody is unhappy, maybe somebody who is not a friend of the United States, maybe somebody who is not an ally of the United States, maybe somebody who wants to destroy this Nation, says, "We don't like your system," so we are going to put them into the American criminal justice system? It makes no sense.

If he had been born here, if he had been a domestic terrorist who had begun his activities here, maybe that could be debated, but that is not the case. Not born here, not a U.S. citizen, not here when the crimes were committed, plotted from overseas as an act of war under the command of Osama bin Laden—a man who had already declared war on the United States—and both of them part of an entity, al

Qaeda, an entity that, as an institution, declared war against the United States

We have to stand our ground. This is the time, America, to say enough is enough. We are not going to expose America's citizens—all of those judges, all of those clerks, all of those bailiffs, all of those jailers, all of those police officers who have to transport somebody. And it's easy for them to say, "We are tough." I saw the mayor of New York say, "We are tough. We can do it."

Well, Mayor, how are you going to feel when it is your daughter that is kidnapped at school by a terrorist? How are you going to feel when it is some clerk, some innocent clerk of the court whose daughter or son is kidnapped or the judge's wife or the jailer's little brother or little sister?

This is political correctness run amok.

Mr. GOHMERT. Nothing illustrates my friend's point better than Khalid Sheikh Mohammed's own words on page 6 of his own pleadings where he says, "We fight you and destroy you and terrorize you." He goes on to say, "So we ask from God to accept our contributions to the great attack, the great attack on America." Those are not words of a conspiracy to commit a crime. Those are admissions of participation and an act of war.

I want to direct attention to New York City where I am sure the leaders like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed that are still loose are already planning. Think about the logistics in New York City. Well, you could provide a safe environment like we have in Guantanamo if you closed all of the tunnels, if you closed all of the bridges, if you closed the area around the court and the area around where these terrorists, these enemy combatants, are being held. You close that area off. Failure to do any of those opens the easy possibility of one car or several cars being filled with explosives and driving near an area and blowing up.

Now, you also have to stop the subways that are running underneath all of these areas. There is no easy way. There is just no way to safeguard the people of New York City.

And my friend brings up the kidnapping of family members of participants in the case, but then there is the also the problem of those who are threatened to be kidnapped.

Now, when you have a big trial, normally it's not uncommon to have bomb threats called in. How many bomb threats do you think will be called in during the course of this trial?

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I guess in order to figure out how long you'd have to close the subways and how long you'd have to close the bridges and how many bomb threats will be called in during the course of the trial, you'd have to begin by saying, well, how long will the trial last? And that is a pretty interesting question.

In America, if we have a true criminal trial in a multiple murder case, those can last weeks, months, years. I don't know what the longest criminal trial in American history is, but I guarantee you, it is a lot more than a month or two. And then when you add appeals, I presume Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, as Eric Holder envisions and as Barack Obama envisions, is going to get to have appeals. Maybe he'll get to have interlocutory appeals of rulings by the judge which could deny him his now, I guess, constitutionally guaranteed rights, the rights we cherish as citizens of the United States which we've now decided to extend to an avowed terrorist.

I want to suggest that our colleague from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) was correct yesterday morning on Face the Nation when he pointed out that this could turn into a legal circus that goes on for not days, not weeks, not months, but years when you count Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and all of the others that I guess Eric Holder wants to bring here one after another and try in the courts of the United States as if they were criminals.

I am plagued by a question as I stand here. I cannot cite to you—and I challenge someone to let us know—what it is about the criminal—about the military tribunal process that is not adequate. Did Attorney General Holder announce that there was some flaw in the military tribunal process that could not be remedied? Did the American Civil Liberties Union, have they come forward and said there is a flaw in the tribunal process, because I didn't hear it. It was good enough for prisoners of war during World War I. It was good enough for prisoners of war during World War II. It was good enough, I presume, for prisoners of war in Korea and Vietnam. How is it now that it's not good enough? Why are we doing this?

Does the gentleman know?

Mr. GOHMERT. All I can think of is you have an administration that is willing to bow both personally and as a Nation before other nations, bowing our security, our safety in ways that have never been done before.

Mr. SHADEGG. Are those nations changing their military tribunal processes?

Mr. GOHMERT. There is no one who has ever granted an American citizen the kind of rights that are being afforded—and I am sure my friend has been to Guantanamo, as I have, and, in fact, as you get down there, they utilize brilliant legal minds in conjunction with wonderful engineering minds to create a terrific courtroom setting with security. There is a bulletproof glass between the gallery and where the trial will take place. There are areas where people can consult, defendants can consult with their attorneys and that are completely secure. They don't have to worry about privacy issues or being bugged because of the austerity of those facilities. It is very

well thought out. It is very difficult to get there. You couldn't get an attack into that area. You couldn't have a terrorist activity take place that would threaten that facility, it was so well thought out.

Oh, and by the way, with regard to Guantanamo, my friend raised this. The prayer rugs, the arrows pointing which way to Mecca, the Korans that are provided in safekeeping—and as we know it was not a guard that tried to flush a Koran. That was not the case. But I asked our own Sam Johnson, who is in this body, who was a POW in Hanoi, if anybody provided him prayer books or prayer rugs or gave him a chance to pray.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think he liked the Bible, if I know Sam Johnson.

Mr. GOHMERT. Sam said there were no Bibles provided, but they did give them the chance to drop to their knees. They would put a rod across the floor where, when they were beat in the back and dropped to their knees, their knees would hit on the rod and then they were forced to stay with their knees on that rod. And he said, It may not sound like much, but over a period of hours, it becomes so excruciatingly painful that it's just unbearable and you hope and pray you will pass out. That is what has been afforded to Americans before. And we have seen what happened to Daniel Pearl.

They say, well, gee, they may treat ours more harshly if we don't bring them to a criminal trial in New York. How much more harshly do you treat somebody than cutting their heads off while they are gurgling and trying to beg for help? I don't think that is a problem.

We need to treat these people as the war criminals that they are, that they have admitted to be; otherwise, we put our Nation at great risk.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think the gentleman says it right. I appreciate the opportunity to be here on the floor and chat with him.

I happen to be from Arizona. I happen to be from the home State of JOHN MCCAIN. I happen to believe that there is, in fact, a duty to treat war criminals within the bounds of international law. I believe that they should not be beaten, they should not be tortured. I believe they should be afforded those standards that are accorded to those accused of war crimes through history. I personally believe they can be held without trial as long as the war goes on, and I believe this war is going on.

We, as a Nation, can be in denial as long as we want. We can cleanse from our vernacular every term that the administration finds offensive. Janet Napolitano can say we are no longer going to call it a war on terror. We are no longer going to deal with radical Islam or Islamists or jihadists. We are going to pretend that all goes away. In my life experience, you cannot pretend and, by pretending, change reality.

There are those who hate us. There are those around the world who hate

us. There are those like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, whose works you just read, who despise us and who desire to kill us. If we do not deal with them fairly, but also according to law, then we've betrayed the tradition of this Nation.

Never ever, in the history of this Nation, have we taken war criminals, people who have committed acts of terrorism under the auspices of an organization—here, al Qaeda—led by a leader—here, Osama bin Laden—that has declared war formally and in writing against the United States and said somebody acting on behalf of that organization, having as an organization declared war against the United States, having engaged then in acts of war, shall be tried in American criminal courts designed to deal with criminals who commit common crimes against other citizens of this Nation. This is a betrayal of our soldiers, and it puts our Nation and puts our soldiers at grave risk.

I believe Attorney General Holder will rue the day they made this decision and rue the day when someone is captured or killed in New York or held hostage as a result of this irresponsible conduct. And even if that doesn't happen, it, alone, is a betrayal of the system we have followed since the founding of this Nation where those accused of war crimes are tried in military tribunals.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend's wonderful points.

We understand the President just recently, because of the lack of understanding of our military history and the Nation's history, is perhaps apparently the first President ever to fail to understand and believe that President Truman did the right thing in dropping the two bombs that they did.

And so if you are an apologist for America, you believe that consistently we have done the wrong things, you have never been really proud of America before, you don't know that the Japanese had committed to dig in and had planned to withstand an assault even to the death of every single Japanese person on the island of Japan.

□ 2200

If you don't know these facts, if you don't know the fact that perhaps millions of lives were saved by dropping those two bombs because it brought the war to an end rather than forcing the Japanese, as their leaders intended to do, to die to the last person to repel an invasion, then you would be an apologist, if you simply don't know the facts. But this puts us further at risk. We just simply cannot bow to this.

The answer will be when the American people respond and let the White House know and let the Department of Justice know. Burn up the phone lines. Let them know by constant calls. I'm not sure I would email this White House since they have shown what they do with the list. But at least burn up the phone lines letting them know that

the Commander in Chief needs to act as a Commander in Chief, and not an apologist in chief and that we should not put our soldiers at further risk by requiring them to gather forensic evidence, that we should not put the people of New York at further risk, and to leave them at Guantanamo to be tried there.

People who understand about war understand that in the whole history of mankind, the precedent is if you as a group declare war on another nation and you or your fellow warriors are captured, then you are held until such time as your fellow group will cease the war, whether it takes years, a 100-year war, a 7-year war, whatever it takes until you convince your people to quit being at war with us, then we hold you until the war is over, and then bring you to trial. That's what the precedent normally is. Whether it's 4 years as World War II, whatever the length of time, we hold you until your people are no longer at war with us as a Nation.

In this case, if you want to rush them, bring them to trial, fine. Do it with a military commission set up under the Military Commissions Act of 2006. We are going to try to amend it so that the President has no choice, so that this President learns you do not have the choice to put New Yorkers at risk.

It breaks my heart to think about the families of those victims of 9/11 and what they will be subjected to. As a judge, I saw the faces of family members who struggled with the aspect of going through and reliving the trauma of the terrible crime that was committed against them. I saw those faces. I heard their great suffering. I'm afraid it's not going to be nearly what that will be collectively of a city the size of New York as they have to relive 9/11 on the island. They have to relive the possibility of further terrorist attacks.

Certainly terrorist attacks will be threatened during the course of the trial. And, of course, you would expect the defense attorneys to wait until Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and these other terrorists have actually put their feet on American soil so they will be granted all the rights of an American citizen such as they were trying to kill as many of as they could. You wait until their feet are on American soil, and then you file your motion to change venue, then you file your motion for discovery, then you file your motions to examine experts and drag those things out as long as you can.

I ended up being asked to take over a civil trial in Texas that several judges had worked on prior to me. It was outside my district. But every judge had been recused for one reason or another. It had gone on for 11 years. I was asked to take it over, and it had been a logistical nightmare. And I was deemed to have done an amazing job in wrapping the case up in 2 years when both parties said when I got into it that they wouldn't bring a case to trial for perhaps 5 years.

But even working as quickly as I did and being as forceful as I was as the judge, not taking any extensions, not granting any type of continuances, forcing everything as quickly as could be done, and yet legally, it still took 2 years to wrap that thing up. And that was considered amazing.

With what is at stake here, the City of New York should suffer no more. No more. I went to New York shortly after 9/11. I saw the suffering. We should not do that to New Yorkers again. My goodness, they have suffered enough.

Having spent 4 years in the Army, being familiar with the military justice system, it isn't a slam dunk for anybody under the UCMJ. There are rights afforded individuals who are tried under the UCMJ. But that is the appropriate place to try people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed who says "We are terrorists to the bone. So many thanks to God." We can also be thankful to God that all Muslims, in fact, the vast majority, do not feel as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

This man does not need to set foot on American soil. We need to have a President that starts acting like a Commander in Chief, not an apologist in chief, so that we can keep America as safe as we have been for the last 8 years and not as the terror will be reintroduced by the reintroduction of these masterminds in America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I realize my time is now expired, and I would conclude.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GIFFORDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. SKELTON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a codel.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and November 17 on account of presiding over the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's Fall Plenary Session.

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:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFITH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, November 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, November 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, November 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, November 18.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, November 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today, November 17 and 18.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following title were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 806. An act to provide for the establishment, administration, and funding of Federal Executive Boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1860. An act to permit each current member of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to serve for 3 terms; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on November 5, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3548. To amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the temporary availability of certain additional emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 17, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4644. A letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Rough Rice, Brown Rice for Processing, and Milled Rice (RIN: 0580-AA94) received October 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4645. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0047; FV-08-702-FR] (RIN: 0581-AC82) received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4646. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Regulatory Period [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0012; FV09-959-1 FIR] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4647. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of Size Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0002; FV09-905-1 FIR] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4648. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Almonds Grown in California; Revision of Outgoing Quality Control Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0045; FV08-981-2 FIR] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4649. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Research and Promotion Program; Designation of Cotton-Producing States; Secretary's Decision and Referendum Order on Proposed Amendments to the Cotton Research and Promotion Order [Doc. #: AMS-CN-09-0032; CN-08-003] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4650. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0037; FV09-927-1 FR] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4651. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rates [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0013; FV09-916/917-2 IFR] received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4652. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and in Umatilla County, OR; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0040; FV09-924-1 FR] received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4653. A letter from the Department Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Plastic Surgery Devices; Classification of Wound Dressing With Poly (Diallyl Dimethyl Ammonium Chloride) Additive [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0333] received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4654. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator/Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Fospropofol into Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-327F] received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4655. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Services Surveys: BE-150, Quarterly Survey of Cross-Border Credit, Debit, and Charge Card Transactions [Docket No.: 0807311000-9272-02] (RIN: 0691-AA67) received November 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4656. A letter from the Senior Advisor, OFAC, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Economic Sanctions Enforcement Guidelines received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4657. 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; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS34) received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4658. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Presumption of Service Connection for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (RIN: 2009-AN05) received November 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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:

[Omitted from the Record on November 7, 2009]

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3618. A bill to provide for implementation of the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-331 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3360. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to establish requirements to ensure the security and safety of passengers and crew on cruise vessels, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted November 16, 2009]

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 86. A bill to eliminate an unused lighthouse reservation, provide management consistency by bringing the rocks and small islands along the coast of Orange County, California, and meet the original Congressional intent of preserving Orange County's rocks and small islands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 118. A bill to authorize the addition of 100 acres to Morristown National Historical Park, with an amendment (Rept. 111-335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2781. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2888. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin

Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild or recreation rivers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 841. Resolution expressing support for designation of November 29, 2009, as "Drive Safer Sunday" (Rept. 111-338). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

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

[Omitted from the Record of November 7, 2009]

The Committee on Science and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3618 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

The Committee on Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3791 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of November 7, 2009]

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 3791. A bill to amend sections 33 and 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and for other purposes, with an amendment, Rept. 111-333, Pt. 1; referred to the committee on Homeland Security for a period ending not later than November 7, 2009, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(i), rule X.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on November 13, 2009]

H.R. 2989. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than December 11, 2009.

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. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 4068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the penalty for failure to disclose reportable transactions based on resulting tax benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARE (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow S corporations the deduction for charitable contributions of inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 4070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for the production of biodiesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4071. A bill to require insurers of motor vehicles to provide coverage of bodily injuries in insurance policies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mrs. HALVORSON):

H.R. 4072. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that provide a national industry-recognized and portable credential; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona):

H.R. 4073. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the payments to certain veterans for certain travel expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the temporary increase in unemployment tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 4075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 4076. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of Chlorsulfuron (2-Chloro-N-[(4-methoxy-6-methyl-1, 3, 5-triazin-2-yl)aminocarbonyl]benzenesulfonamide) and metsulfuron methyl (Methyl 2[[[(4-methoxy-6-methyl-1, 3, 5-triazin-2-yl)arnino]carbonyl]amino]sulfonyl] benzoate) and inert ingredients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4077. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to make it an unfair or deceptive practice for any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to charge a fee for or accept payment from a passenger on a flight segment for the first piece of checked baggage; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 4078. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national model disclosure form to assist consumers in purchasing long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 4079. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to temporarily remove the requirement for employers to increase wages for veterans enrolled in on-the-job training programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 4080. A bill to establish a criminal justice reinvestment grant program to help States and local jurisdictions reduce spending on corrections, control growth in the prison and jail populations, and increase public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4081. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Willamette Falls National Heritage Area in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 4082. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to pay affected participants under a pension plan referred to in the USEC Privatization Act for benefit increases not received; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. MASSA):

H. Res. 904. A resolution honoring women who have served and women who are currently serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom as members of the Armed Forces and recognizing their increasing and invaluable role to the success of current military operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 905. A resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of the retirement of Justice Louis D. Brandeis from the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 906. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to encourage continued investment to complete the development of an HIV/AIDS vaccine for the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H. Res. 907. A resolution recognizing the Grand Concourse on its 100th anniversary as the preeminent thoroughfare in the borough of the Bronx and an important nexus of commerce and culture for the City of New York; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 24: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 156: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 197: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

H.R. 211: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 268: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 272: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 275: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 417: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 422: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 571: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 644: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. WU.

H.R. 690: Mr. SPACE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 718: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 745: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 836: Mr. BOREN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 847: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 886: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STARK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of

- Georgia, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 930: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 932: Mr. TONKO and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 982: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. McKEON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1032: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1086: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1126: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1132: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. TURNER, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1159: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1175: Mr. MASSA and Mr. NYE.
H.R. 1189: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1204: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1230: Mr. CLAY and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 1242: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1250: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1278: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1326: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1351: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1389: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1443: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1454: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1517: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1523: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1526: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1549: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1557: Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BARROW, Mr. NYE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1766: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1792: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1806: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1818: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1826: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1829: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1835: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1894: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1924: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1925: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1993: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2012: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 2122: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2138: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2149: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2156: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BAIRD, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2159: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2194: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 2267: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2377: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 2381: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2408: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2446: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2480: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 2528: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2542: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2578: Ms. TITUS and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 2624: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2625: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2648: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 2709: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 2835: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 2866: Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 2897: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 2906: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2941: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3019: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3020: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3039: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3053: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3116: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3202: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3217: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3218: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3245: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3286: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3307: Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3328: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3355: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3359: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3380: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3381: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3439: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3454: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 3480: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3493: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3508: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3545: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3554: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3560: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3578: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 3611: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3621: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3623: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3644: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3652: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3677: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3679: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3683: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3693: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3700: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3715: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3724: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 3728: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3749: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3765: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3766: Mr. WATT and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3790: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 3799: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 3800: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3821: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3822: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3837: Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3904: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3905: Mr. OLSON and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 3942: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3943: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SPACE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3966: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3991: Ms. CHU and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4000: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4003: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4021: Mr. TONKO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4022: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4034: Mr. MINNICK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4044: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4045: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. FARR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4048: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4051: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. TIBERI.
H. Con. Res. 67: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H. Res. 111: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. POMEROY.
H. Res. 150: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 166: Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 200: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 227: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 397: Mr. UPTON.
H. Res. 516: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 524: Mr. SNYDER.
H. Res. 611: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 727: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 803: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. MCMAHON.
H. Res. 851: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 861: Mr. CAO and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H. Res. 864: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HARE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YARMOUTH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WATT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCMAHON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WU, Mr.

BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BACA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GENE

GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 870: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 879: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 890: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McMAHON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 891: Mr. HERGER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BRIGHT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Res. 900: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MASSA.

H. Res. 901: Mr. STARK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.