

company like DISH Network carry public broadcasting in high def. It really does go against free market principles. I do know that is going to continue to be worked on. We are looking forward to getting that issue resolved.

I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7½ minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for the inclusion of language from my bill on statewide public television. Passage of this legislation will remove the legal obstacles for satellite carriers to offer statewide public television in Wyoming and other States. I don't care whether it's in high def or not. I just want public television carried in Wyoming and other States, and that's been achieved. So thank you kindly.

I also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) who worked diligently to address the problem of local television market areas. Despite his good work, I rise today to express regret for the missed opportunity the passage of this bill represents.

The decision to put off for another 5 years any real reform to the system of designated market areas carries with it very negative consequences for the citizens of my State. Out of Wyoming's 23 counties, 16 do not have satellite access to Wyoming-based stations. Over half of all television households in Wyoming do not have access to local television.

For a rural State like Wyoming, satellite sometimes represents the only viable option to receiving television programming. The inability to receive local stations restricts access to local content and severely limits the reach of emergency notifications.

Emergency situations, like the butane tank truck that recently overturned on an icy highway during a blizzard, should serve as proof that the availability of local stations on satellite television is not just an entertainment issue. The DMA system may make sense for the densely populated areas in the East, but it has created an absurdity in the sparsely populated areas of the West. I am grateful for the inclusion of a study to find a better way to determine what the local market is.

But, Madam Speaker, people in Wyoming do not need a study to tell them that when their network TV station originates 400 miles away from a different State, they are not receiving the local content they need. For this reason, I cannot support passage of this bill despite its tremendous improvements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3570, the Sat-

ellite Home Viewer Update and Reauthorization Act of 2009. I strongly support this important piece of satellite television reauthorization legislation.

H.R. 3570 reauthorizes satellite operators' licenses to import distant network affiliate television signals to viewers who cannot receive a viewable signal from their local affiliate. This is important as it allows satellite and cable television providers to carry out-of-market television signals to households that cannot receive stations in their own local markets. This allows state public television networks to reach all their state's residents with important news and public affairs programming.

Alongside the chairman, I worked hard to get the phantom signal language included in the bill. I am proud of the final product and believe it is something about which all Americans can be proud.

Previously, due to flaws in existing law, broadcasters sometimes paid royalties to content producers even when programming was not actually delivered to subscribers. Royalties for the transmission of broadcast signals to cable systems were paid as if the entire cable system received the transmission, even if it was only received by some subscribers within the cable system. This has been known as the phantom signal problem. The cost of this flaw was passed down to consumers. With the passage of this reauthorization, including my phantom signal language, the American people will no longer be forced to pay for programming they have not received.

I join the chairman in urging my colleagues to support this bill. As a result of this legislation, constituents in my district will not be forced to pay for satellite and cable programming they have not received and, as a result, save money in this economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3570, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
Washington, DC, December 1, 2009.

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

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the

Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for production of documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, in connection with a criminal matter now pending in the same court.

After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. BEARD.

CONGRATULATING THE DETROIT CATHOLIC CENTRAL SHAMROCKS

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Michigan Division 1 State High School Football champions, the Detroit Catholic Central Shamrocks. On November 27, 2009, the Shamrocks defeated a fine Sterling Heights Stevenson team 31–21.

The victory earned head coach Tom Mach his 10th State championship in his 34 seasons leading the Shamrocks. The team's hard work, mental toughness, and burning desire epitomizes what it means to be a Shamrock molded by the Basilian Fathers and their mission to teach young men goodness, discipline, and knowledge. Truly this accomplishment is shared by the entire CC family.

Madam Speaker, meeting the challenge with an undefeated record of 14–0, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Detroit Catholic Central Shamrocks upon winning their Michigan State football championship and for proving they are indeed men of Mary, Alma Mater, who inspires us evermore.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

THE WRONG DECISION ON AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, first I want to commend President Obama for thinking long and hard about the course that he believes the United States should take in Afghanistan. That kind of deliberation is a welcome change from the previous administration. I also want to commend him for making it crystal clear that the United States of America condemns torture.

Unfortunately, on the issue of troop levels in Afghanistan, I believe the President has reached the wrong conclusion. Sending 30,000 more U.S. troops to Afghanistan will make it 30,000 times harder to extricate ourselves from this mess. If our fight is truly with al Qaeda, then we're in the wrong country. They have moved to Pakistan. Indeed, General Jones has told us that there are maybe less than 100 al Qaeda members in Afghanistan. With the troop increase announced by the President last night, we will have over 100,000 U.S. service men and women in Afghanistan. Do we really need 100,000 troops to go after less than a hundred al Qaeda?

President Karzai is corrupt and incompetent. He cheated in the most recent election. By most estimates, 30 percent of his votes was rigged. I don't want any more American service men or women to risk their lives for his corrupt government; and I am a little bit stunned, quite frankly, by the quick and inexplicable pivot by the administration from rightly denouncing Karzai's behavior to now embracing him as our dear friend. I think our support for Karzai actually discredits us with the Afghan people. We have seen that it is exceedingly difficult to train Afghan troops, many of whom are not only illiterate, but unable to add or subtract.

The cost of this escalation will be enormous, both in terms of blood and treasure. We will need to borrow billions and billions of additional dollars to pay for this policy.

Madam Speaker, at a time of great economic crisis here in the United States, I would suggest that rather than nation-building in Afghanistan, we should do a little more nation-building here at home.

It is important to note that the so-called timeline outlined by the President last night envisions the beginning of drawing down our troops in July of 2011—the beginning, not the end. Does anybody really believe that we will not be deeply ensnared in Afghanistan well beyond 2011?

Madam Speaker, I do not and I never will suggest that we abandon the Afghan people. They have suffered greatly over the last several decades. We must continue to support meaningful economic development and political assistance.

But finally, Madam Speaker, there is another important issue here, and that is congressional involvement. I know the President last night cited the resolution to authorize force in 2001 as pro-

viding the authority that he needs. I would argue that it was not Congress' intent in 2001 to authorize decades of nation-building in Afghanistan. We voted to go after the people who committed the horrible atrocities on September 11. I would urge that before a single additional troop is sent, that the United States Congress have the chance to fully debate his proposal and have an up-or-down vote.

Under the Bush administration, what usually happened is that additional troops were deployed and then later, once they were already in theater, the administration would submit a supplemental request. That is backwards. We should debate and vote on this critical issue before we send additional troops.

□ 1800

And, Madam Speaker, this is a big deal. This is a major escalation and Congress has a major role to play. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to ask the tough questions and to continue to play our constitutional role.

CLIMATEGATE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, evidence has come to light of fraud and corruption in the global warming scientific community. Or, as it is now called, the climate change community.

These shady scientists have made claims of a global warming apocalypse and created fear in the world that we are all doomed because man is the enemy destroyer of planet Earth.

But now thousands of their emails were recently leaked to the public. These emails, written by scientists at the British University of East Anglia exposed fraud and corruption in their global warming claims. Now Climategate is being exposed. These snake oil salesmen have been caught in their lies to the world. These are the very scientists who formed the foundation for world global warming claims. American politicians, the United Nations, everyone claiming that the world is headed toward this global warming catastrophe based their views on this information.

In these emails, these scientists conspired to destroy their own email discussion of data that contradicts their global warming claims. They discussed discrediting members of the scientific community who disagree with them. They even wish some of these dissenting scientists were beaten. Now isn't that lovely when you have an opposition.

Phil Jones, the director of the climate research unit at the University of East Anglia in England wrote in his now-leaked emails of thwarting access to the data by those who doubt global warming. He talked about getting

around British Freedom of Information requests. He didn't want other scientists to get his data because they could expose flaws and faults in his global warming claims.

But the bread and butter of these global warming claims comes from what these scientists say is "consensus" within the scientific community. Now we learn there is not a consensus about global climate change. The emails show numerous actions taken to silence the dissenting voices and withhold the actual information being used to make their questionable claims.

The British university says they are going to release all of their data now, but the scientists have already admitted that they destroyed much of that data. Obviously, they destroyed the data that shows their theory on climate change is a ruse. It is a fraud on the world. That doesn't look like sound science to me. It sounds like they have cooked the books. It sounds like they have picked out an outcome and are trying to fix the data to make it say what they want it to say. It sounds like a political agenda.

World economies depend on these claims that have clearly been manipulated. The U.N. global warming summit in Copenhagen that starts next Monday, December 7, is using this tainted information. The United Nations wants to exert more control over world energy and emissions, and the sovereignty of nations using information that is apparently now faulty. It is tainted with scandal, and it is deceitful.

How can the American people trust any of these claims when they have clearly been manipulated? Well, the American public can be fooled no longer by these pseudo scientists. One may ask why would these scientists skew the facts? Well, it is obvious. Governments all over the world give climate change individuals in the climate change crowd millions of dollars of money to study climate change. And if manmade climate change is a falsehood, these scientists may fear that their money will dry up.

The jury is still out on the global warming theory and the climate change myth. Before Congress passes any legislation based on this theory regarding manmade climate change, we ought to have an open, honest debate from real scientists who didn't manipulate the evidence to get an outcome-based conclusion. Further, the EPA should halt all carbon emission regulations of the energy community until we learn the facts about climate change. Honesty is a prerequisite for conclusions about climate change legislation. And now we learn that climate change is not a well settled scientific fact at all, whether the mad scientists at the University of Anglia like that fact or not.

And that's just the way it is.