



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2010

No. 26

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 26, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR 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, our God, You reward the just and hate injustice. You forgive those who repent their sins and stir compassion for those who suffer.

Once again, Lord, during Black History Month, You have brought to mind pitiful stories of slavery and the deep yearning of people to be free.

With the craft of mass communication and the skill of good teachers, You have brought to life again powerful stories of African American heroes, scholars, artists, and outstanding leaders throughout our Nation's history.

Much of this artistry, delightful spirit, strong determination, and hard work was inspired by religious faith in You and the promise of the Holy Bible. Their witness to undying hope and peaceful resolution changed this Nation forever.

Lord, we praise and thank You for the African American communities across this landscape who have shared our past, bless our present culture, and endow our future with profound hope, genuine laughter, memorable music, and so many other contributions to our common good.

May the African American people continue to be a blessing, Lord, upon this Nation, 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN AND BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

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

Mr. KUCINICH. The Washington Post reports that nearly \$1 billion a year in cash, suspected to include U.S. aid, opium trade receipts, or both, is moving from Afghanistan to Dubai, where friends and family of Afghanistan's President Karzai have multimillion dollar villas. Dubai real estate deals and a number of crooked enterprises connected to the Karzai family have

created crony capitalism in a country awash in U.S. cash and U.S. blood.

Nearly 1,000 U.S. soldiers have died, and for what? Hundreds of billions spent, and for what? To make Afghanistan safe for crooks, drug dealers, and crony capitalism?

Next Thursday I will bring a privileged resolution to this House so that Congress can claim our constitutional right to end this war and to bring our troops home. Please support the resolution.

HEALTH CARE SUMMIT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President missed an important opportunity to restart the national debate on health care reform. Americans who tuned into this health care summit were disappointed that they were left with the same Big Government health care takeover.

The American people are facing waves of Groundhog Day, as they have already rejected this type of government health care takeover.

There are substantive alternatives to consider. Republicans have offered 70 different health care bills to the Washington liberal majority. With 14.8 million Americans out looking for work, Congress should not be taking over a health care system that will destroy jobs, which the National Federation of Independent Business says will kill 1.6 million more jobs.

It's time to come to consensus on responsible health care elements that both parties agree on, and then move on to focus on job creation policies.

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

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.

H935

Best wishes for the continued success of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities of South Carolina.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I rise to celebrate the lives of two African Americans from Erie, Pennsylvania.

Born in 1886, Harry T. Burleigh was a world-famous musician. Burleigh was the first African American composer acclaimed for his concert music, and he wrote more than 200 American art songs.

After his death in 1949, Harry Burleigh was largely forgotten until Rev. Charles Kennedy of Erie revived his memory. Rev. Kennedy, a minister and a musician, was a distinguished community leader and president of the Harry T. Burleigh Society. He championed the legacy of Burleigh's incredible talent. Sadly, Rev. Kennedy passed away this November.

Harry Burleigh and Charles Kennedy made unforgettable contributions to the African American community and all of American society. For Black History Month and every month, we honor their memories.

LET'S GET PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the number of new unemployment benefit claims jumped last week to 496,000 Americans. More people out of work, more people looking for those promised jobs.

Meanwhile, a year later, we're bogged down debating the administration's \$1 trillion government-run health care bill, a government-created problem that most Americans flatly reject.

Our priorities should be getting people back to work. Get government off the back of small businesses, the real creator of jobs.

But the talk around town is to raise taxes. John Marshall said, "An unlimited power to tax involves the power to destroy. There is a limit beyond which no institution and no person can bear taxation."

Tax hikes for more Federal boondoggles won't create any jobs. Leave money in the hands of the people who earned it, the American public.

Meanwhile, 15 million Americans are unemployed.

And that's just the way it is.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, Americans have long demanded reliable consumer protections for goods and services.

Much as snake oil cures, flammable children's sleepwear, and lead toys were once commonly found in the marketplace, predatory lending, hidden fees, and skyrocketing interest rates are shamefully common today, with little oversight on behalf of the consumer.

This failure has had devastating consequences for our Nation, and was one of the principal drivers of the financial crisis that resulted in a deep depression.

A strong, independent Consumer Financial Protection Agency would have the ability to rein in the worst practices of the big credit card companies, banks, and other large financial institutions, placing the consumer on a level playing field. It would also help responsible institutions like community banks and credit unions by requiring their competitors in the unregulated shadow banking world to play by the same consumer rules.

I call on the Senate to follow the House's lead in including a strong consumer rights agency in financial reform.

FUNDING FOR NASA

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss NASA funding. The President's proposed budget would end the Constellation program and shift funds to private companies, effectively killing United States human space flight. This shift to private sector is not a taxpayer savings. The Federal Government has already spent \$9 billion on NASA's Constellation program.

The new budget proposes to spend an additional \$2.5 billion to kill the Constellation, and billions more will be spent on unproven private sector entities. So, we're wasting \$11.5 billion to ensure that America's 50-year reign as the global leader in human space flight is over.

The President's budget does not even cut NASA's funding. It simply shifts funds dedicated for actual human space flight to unproven commercial entities, forcing us to reinvent the wheel on human space flight. This is not sound fiscal policy. It's not good for America's future.

I urge my colleagues to join me to support efforts to restore Constellation funding.

JOBS

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago last week, the President signed the Recovery Act, a comprehensive bill that

reinvested in the American workforce, an event that my colleagues on the other side have rallied against since President Obama took office. The facts simply don't back them up.

In the first quarter of 2009, our economy was losing 726,000 jobs a month. And now, largely due to the Recovery Act, the number has been reduced to 35,000 last quarter. The fact is, the CBO states that the Recovery Act created 2.4 million jobs through the end of 2009.

The Recovery Act also provided \$120 billion in tax cuts for 95 percent of working families. That's 95 percent of working families, and that's a tax cut.

Going forward, we must continue to build off this momentum of the Recovery Act. That includes passing meaningful job-creation legislation that will help small businesses and reduce unemployment. It also includes continuing focus on infrastructure projects and promoting energy efficiency initiatives.

Finally, that means we must pass meaningful health care reform.

RECOGNIZING THIRTY YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE OF VICKIE L. BANDY

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Bible tells us for everything there is a season. Surely, that includes a time to work and a time to rest.

Since 1979 I've had the privilege and indeed the honor of working with a West Virginian who has had an extraordinary time of working with me for the people of southern West Virginia. Vickie L. Bandy was born in our hometown of Beckley, West Virginia, and came to Washington, our Nation's Capital, three decades ago. She began her long career serving the State she loves and its people at my front desk. This week she retires from her Hill career serving as my deputy chief of staff.

Vickie, as we say back home, was raised right by her parents. But the truest power her parents gave her was her active faith. Far from being left at the church steps on Sunday mornings, Vickie's faith never tires. She has carried that throughout her career working on my staff and working for the people of southern West Virginia.

Our mission, of course, is larger, filling the giant void that is left in Vickie's absence. And I'm sure that we will have a hard task to do in our office, but we will do it for the people of West Virginia and for Vickie's continuing legacy of working for those people.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2701, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1113

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1105, amendment number 1 printed in House Report 111-419 shall be considered as modified by striking the matter proposed to be inserted as section 506.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for further consideration of H.R. 2701, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. The rule modifies amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-419 by striking the matter proposed to be inserted as section 506.

Mr. Speaker, the Intelligence Authorization Act provides much-needed policy guidance for the 16 agencies that comprise the intelligence community. At the same time, this bill improves accountability and helps to prevent the often disastrous consequences that faulty intelligence and misinformation to Congress can have on national security. This bill is vitally important because it recognizes the fundamental reality that solid intelligence is our Nation's first line of defense against terrorists.

This Congress has not reauthorized the intelligence bill in 4 years. The funding in this bill provides our intelligence agencies with tools, resources, and authorities they need to keep us safe. For example, it increases funding for human intelligence collection and counterintelligence activities; it makes significant investments in cybersecurity safety while also improving language capabilities in the intelligence community. Furthermore, it fully authorizes the President's budget request for the intelligence community programs and operations.

The rule we are debating this morning is the second rule the House has considered. Yesterday we heard impassioned arguments from both sides of the aisle regarding an amendment from

Mr. McDERMOTT on actions of the intelligence officers in the field and their criminal liability. Today, we are moving ahead with the authorization bill without that language because it's important to keep this bill moving forward.

The President has issued guidelines on this subject, and it deserves to be considered by this body. However, we are 4 years overdue on reauthorization, and our intelligence community cannot wait any longer.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can continue the business of protecting America's families. No American should ever face harm because this body could not do its job, and this bill needs to move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation for my Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Atwater, and I yield myself such time as I may consume as we proceed with our customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, my friend has just gone through—as was the case yesterday when Mr. HASTINGS, the gentleman from Fort Lauderdale, was managing the rule on his side—the importance of dealing with our Nation's intelligence. And we obviously have, since this bill first came to the forefront last year, been dealing with a wide range of very, very serious challenges: the shooting at Fort Hood, which the Speaker pro tem understands very well took place in his home State of Texas; the great threat that existed on Christmas Day when Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab posed a threat, and thanks to the fact that his device did not go off, and, even more important than that, the fact that we were able to see these courageous passengers come forward and prevent this man from posing a threat to all of those on board; and then, of course, the arrests of those who posed a terrorist threat, Najibullah Zazi and David Headley. And then of course there are many other instances that have not been in the headlines.

But those three which I have just mentioned have developed since last summer when this bill first came forward.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening today is, unfortunately, a very disturbing trend. We have had some records set by this Congress and, frankly, since Speaker PELOSI has been leading this Congress and the last Congress.

Last year, we went through the entire—entire—calendar year, the first session of the 111th Congress, without a single open rule. Not a single open rule on even the appropriations bills. Never before in the now 221-year history of the Republic have we had that take place. We, in fact, in the last 3 years have saved the appropriations process,

in the first 2 years of Speaker PELOSI's leadership, we have had a grand total, Mr. Speaker, of one open rule. And now, today, we seem to be establishing another very disturbing and unfortunate record.

It seems to me that as we look at legislation in its first stage, which is where we are right now, in its first stage, we are now considering not the second rule, as my friend from Atwater has said in his opening remarks, but in fact the third rule because this legislation last July was reported out of the Rules Committee. We had a rule. On July 3, we had a statement that came forward from the administration that leveled a very, very harsh criticism of the bill itself.

Now, we've gone through a wide range of measures that have been very important and many that are less than important in the last 8 months, and yet we have not considered this very important intelligence bill. My friend from Atwater has just talked about how critically important it is; and if that were the case in the eyes of the majority, it would seem to me that last July we would have dealt with this bill, since it's been 4 years since we have had an intelligence authorization measure.

Now, the language which has just been stricken from this bill, it was one of 21 amendments, Mr. Speaker, included in the manager's amendment. And the message that comes through to me over and over and over again—and my friend from Atwater just referred to it as a vigorous debate on both sides as an attempt to continue to move the legislation forward—this language was taken out.

Well, the bottom line is it meant that the votes weren't there on either the Democratic or the Republican side to move ahead with the intelligence authorization bill. Why? Because one of the most outrageous amendments imaginable was incorporated in this measure, and that's the McDermott language.

Yesterday, Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. HOEKSTRA and I, and I know others during the debate throughout the bill, talked about this language. And I think that probably this was best put when the special election took place in Massachusetts and we saw our new colleague, SCOTT BROWN, elected to the United States Senate. And he gave an entertaining and rather lengthy victory speech that night. But the message that came through loud and clear was that when he got to Washington, he was going to do everything within his power to make sure that we expand our hard-earned taxpayer dollars ensuring that we defeat the terrorists and not defend them.

And the language that was included—not allowed for debate on the House floor, but actually included among the 20 other amendments all by Democrats in the manager's amendment—the manager's amendment is usually a relatively noncontroversial measure, Mr.

Speaker, that comes to the floor and there is often a very brief 10-minute debate and it sails through with bipartisan support—but the manager's amendment included this McDermott amendment. And it provided a circumstance which could have seriously jeopardized our men and women who are courageously engaging in intelligence gathering.

Now, when we talk about, as now-Senator BROWN mentioned, the rights of those individuals who have perpetrated terrorist acts against us and our interests around the world, the notion of using the word "phobia," which was actually included in the McDermott amendment, it would mean that an individual could be imprisoned and they could claim that for religious reasons it's absolutely essential that they have a knife with them at all times.

People can say, Well, that is silly. How can that possibly take place? I mean, one has to scratch their head thinking that that could happen. And yet there are individuals who've interpreted that language which was included in the manager's amendment, Mr. Speaker, as language that would have allowed a prisoner to say that for religious reasons it's absolutely essential that they have a knife in their possession, obviously posing a threat to everyone around them.

And so, again, it's difficult to comprehend that that could take place, but we know how ruthless these barbarians are who have been perpetrating acts against us and other freedom-loving peoples around the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, it to me is very disturbing that we are here dealing with what has been once again a major management problem which has taken place in this institution.

The American people want us to focus on job creation, economic growth. We, of course yesterday, saw the 7-hour summit take place at the White House on the issue of health care. But of paramount importance is our security. It's the single most important thing that we deal with. And to have it mishandled in the way that it has that has led us at 9:25 Friday morning to be on the House floor with the third rule dealing with the Intelligence authorization bill is, I think, a sad commentary on where we are.

I have to say that this rule actually included several other provisions which should not have been included at this point, and I discussed this last night up in the Rules Committee when we met into the evening. And that is we understand—I mean, I was privileged to serve as chairman of the Rules Committee, and we understand that moving the agenda and ensuring the process of getting that agenda passed is very, very important. And yet, Mr. Speaker, what this rule did was it put into place a so-called martial law rule.

Mr. Speaker, martial law basically means that something can move immediately to the House floor, and it usu-

ally takes place—and I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, Mr. OBEY, here. He knows very well that martial law rule usually takes place at the end of a session when there are very, very pressing needs that need to be addressed.

□ 0930

When we are dealing with those issues we can see martial law imposed. I understand that and recognize that sometimes it's necessary. But, Mr. Speaker, we are in the second month of the second session of the 111th Congress, and yet we have imposed a so-called martial law rule here.

So the most important thing is, of course, dealing with the intelligence authorization bill. But underlying all of that are very, very serious management flaws which have taken place. So I just want to voice my concern, and I know we are going to have a number of my colleagues who are going to want to speak and address the issue of the intelligence authorization bill.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to my colleague from California that we must get this legislation done. I agreed with him. He agreed with me. This is very important legislation. It's critical to the country.

Then he said, well, there is no real rush because you are doing a martial law rule. I submit to you that we need to get this done. It's very important for the country, and we have taken a long time. And I would also submit that the majority of the Congress people speaking to us all, Republicans and Democrats, as I said in my opening statement, felt that that amendment wasn't appropriately included in the manager's amendment. We agreed. That's why we are here today striking it out.

I realize that the gentleman is saying, well, it should have never been in there to begin with, and that may be true, but the reality is we are fixing and correcting that error today. That is why we are here, and I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that, interestingly enough, the measure that we are addressing here is not being considered under a martial law rule. The martial law provision in this rule was to deal with any other issue that would have come to the floor either yesterday or today. The idea of including that in the rule—

Mr. CARDOZA. The gentleman is correct, and there are other measures, like the jobs bill, which is critically important, critically important to our home State.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely.

Mr. CARDOZA. Like my district, it has got 20 percent unemployment. So there are other pressing matters that we have to get to, and that's exactly the kind of point that I was making.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that obviously job creation and economic growth is a very, very important priority, but the notion of saying that all of a sudden this has to be done under martial law, which basically undermines the legislative process, is not only not necessary, but we are all focusing on job creation. We want to do what we can. We all have very strong feelings as to what should be done on this and we are concerned about this dramatic expansion of government.

Let me at this point, Mr. Speaker, yield 4 minutes to the very thoughtful, diligent, and hardworking gentleman from Clarendon, Texas, the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Mr. THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since a number of our colleagues were watching the events or participating in the events at the White House yesterday, like the gentleman from California, I think it's important to review briefly the history of this legislation.

The Intelligence Committee referred or reported out H.R. 2701 out of committee on June 26, 2009, by a party line vote of 12–9. The Rules Committee first reported a rule out for its consideration on July 8, 2009, and from July 8, 2009, until February 24, 2010, it just sat there, no action.

Meanwhile, there were at least eight attempted terrorist attacks or plots for which arrests were made against our homeland. Meanwhile, events changed in Afghanistan, Yemen, Somalia, Iran. All around the world things were changing, but we couldn't find time on the floor to deal with the Intelligence authorization bill. We had important things to do. We had post offices to name.

But then on February 24, 2010, the Rules Committee reported the second rule out, which included the McDermott language as part of a manager's amendment that was 31 total amendments combined into one. That McDermott language would create a new crime and penalties only for our intelligence professionals if they did things like deny terrorists a proper amount of sleep or if they did something that would violate a terrorist's religious beliefs however the terrorist chose to define those religious beliefs. There was no standard of reasonableness there at all.

So throughout the day yesterday, as most people were watching events in the White House, we argued against that provision; yet it was defended on the other side of the aisle throughout

the day. Some people said, Oh, it just restates current law. Mr. MCDERMOTT answered that himself in a 1-minute last night. He said, My amendment would have expanded on the President's Executive order to define what constitutes cruel, inhuman, and degrading interrogation, and it will create criminal penalties for those who use those kinds of interrogations.

People over there who said that it just restates current law were just mistaken. Somebody else said it reflects American values. I don't know when it became American value to treat terrorists better than we treat Americans in the criminal justice system. When it came time to vote, the majority found that they didn't have enough votes to pass the bill, and so they went back to Rules a third time on this bill. Now this rule strips out that provision that the majority spent the whole day yesterday defending.

Now, I heard what the gentleman from California said. I am not quite clear that I have understood why we have had this amazing turn of events, why the Rules Committee on Wednesday night would say this provision is so important it must be in the manager's amendment, but on Thursday night they say, no, we are going to have a rule that does nothing but strip it out. Maybe they didn't really know what the McDermott language did. Maybe they just voted the way the Speaker's office told them to vote.

As a matter of fact, there is a report in the Washington Times today that says a House Democratic aid told the Washington Times leadership supported the amendment and told the House Rules Committee to put it in the provisions. Maybe they were just persuaded by our eloquence on the floor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and decided that it needed to be removed. I don't know, but this provision is deplorable; it needs to be scrapped. But it's a symptom, I would suggest, of a deeper sickness that, in fact, some in this body, some in the administration, of how they view our intelligence professionals. Their reflex action is to blame the intelligence community first. We see it when special prosecutors are appointed to go after our intelligence professionals. We see it when classified interrogation memos are released, despite the protestations of five former CIA directors.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. THORNBERRY. We also see that "blame the intelligence professionals first" mentality when someone as distinguished as the Speaker of the House, under political pressure, just accuses them of lying all the time. That's the sort of mentality that gets a provision made in order that mixes up the good guys and the bad guys and goes after the good guys and puts a higher standard on them than any county sheriff or State trooper in the country would have.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. Terrorists are plotting and planning to attack us every single day. It doesn't do our intelligence professionals much good if we give them nice words and then enact new crimes against them. What counts is our actions, standing up for them and what they do to protect us, and I would suggest this bill needs to go a long way further in doing that. But that strain that goes through this House and some in the administration to attack them first must be stopped at all costs.

Mr. CARDOZA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my friend from Atwater has chosen to reserve his time, I am happy at this point to yield 4 minutes to another hardworking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence who brings his great experience, having served in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the gentleman from Brighton, Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Thank you to my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I think, was a very, very important symptom for us to all understand, and it's easy to get confused, by the way, in who the good guys are and who the bad guys are. When you take the fight on the war on terror from a proactive intelligence approach to a law enforcement approach, things get pretty murky in a hurry, and everything slows down, and information exchanges slow down.

What we have done, what they have tried to do in the middle of the night, is sneak in a provision that would actually, when you read the entire thing, treat terrorists with a special carve-out that not even white-collar criminals, organized crime members, extortionists as American citizens would get, that your interrogator could be brought up on charges for what you believed might be incidences that offend you. Unbelievable. But that's exactly what happens when you are confused about who the bad guys are.

This bill should be known for what it doesn't do. I mean, right now, they are getting ready to bring, through the administration policy and support of this Congress, hundreds of some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world to the United States. Do you know that about over a dozen times where these terrorists have been held overseas, including places like Great Britain, that terrorists have tried to break in to break them out? And guess what? Our policy is to bring them to the United States, give them a special carve-out, and treat them like American citizens at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.

You know, we had the opportunity to do disruptive activities to al Qaeda, and some speculate that between the Fort Hood shooting and the Christmas Day bomber, there were methods and activities that we as a Nation didn't engage in because we were confused about being proactive on intelligence

against terrorism or treating it like a law enforcement matter. There is a lot to be accountable in that decision, but it can happen when you get confused who the bad guys are.

We have never had a full vetting of what was known at one time as the Global Justice Initiative where you send FBI agents around the world, including to the battlefield, to Mirandize foreign-trained terrorists who have declared war on the United States. That can happen when you forget who the bad guys are. There is nothing in this bill that protects the very courageous CIA interrogators for following Department of Justice guidelines in the interrogation and the development of information that will have saved lives in the United States.

And, by the way, it was brought to our attention that the same interrogators who gave us about 70 percent of what we know about the logistics and operations of al Qaeda are subject to criminal investigations. You know why that happens? Because it's easy to do when you are confused about who the good guys are and who the bad guys are.

Yesterday was that symptom, Mr. Speaker, that when you make that decision, there are serious consequences. Now, folks want to say, oh, that's just politics you are trying to interject.

This is serious business. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed will come to New York. Some estimate it as high as \$200 million just for the security. That city said, "No." Michigan said, "No." Kansas said, "No." Americans are saying, "No."

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. We ought to stand together in this body and say, "No."

This bill falls short of addressing the serious debate we better have ongoing from a proactive intelligence approach to a law enforcement approach. This is not about you have the right to remain silent and if you can't afford an attorney one will be appointed for you at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. This is about aggressively pursuing terrorists where they live, where they train, where they operate.

If our whole new plan is a law enforcement approach and we are going to catch them at the airport, we are going to lose this fight, and that's exactly what this bill fails to address. You cannot let one stand in the line with any American citizen and hope to God your last defense works, and that's what happens when you go to a law enforcement approach and you treat CIA officers like criminals and you treat foreign terrorists like high-status American citizens. You could get confused on who the good guys are and who the bad guys are in a hurry.

I would recommend strong rejection of this bill. We need to start over, and we need to start asking hard questions

about what this policy is doing to the national defense of the United States.

□ 0945

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. REYES.

Mr. REYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in support of this rule. It provides us with the opportunity to advance the Intelligence Authorization Act to conference and then to the President.

This bill provides essential funding to the intelligence community, improves and updates critical legal authorities, and enhances important oversight authorities that will empower the congressional intelligence committees to carry out their constitutional responsibility to monitor the work of the intelligence agencies.

As everybody knows, I take this obligation very seriously. The work of the intelligence community is of critical importance, but by its nature must be done largely behind closed doors. As a result, the intelligence committees exist to ensure that the work of the intelligence agencies is being done in a manner that is effective, that is legal, and that is without waste. H.R. 2701 provides the funding authorities and the guidance necessary to that function.

First and foremost, this bill will dramatically improve the process for congressional notification of covert actions. Over the past several years, Democrats and Republicans have both had complaints about the notification process. Provisions in the manager's amendment will require notifications in writing, insist that the President certify the need to restrict briefings to the Gang of Eight, and compel the executive branch to provide the legal authority under which covert action is being conducted.

As I have said before, this bill was truly a team effort. We received input and drafting assistance from a variety of Members. The manager's amendment also includes contributions from many of my colleagues.

Representative GIFFORDS from Arizona crafted a provision that would require the DNI to report on intelligence cooperation between the Federal Government and State and local law enforcement.

Representative BOCCIERI asked for a report on the dissemination of counterterrorism information from the intelligence community to local law enforcement.

Representative BISHOP introduced language to require the DNI to submit to Congress a report describing the strategy of the United States in balancing intelligence collection needs with the prosecution of terrorist suspects.

Representative HARMAN, the former ranking member of the Intelligence

Committee, submitted an amendment that will require the Inspector General of the intelligence community to report to Congress on the problem of overclassification of intelligence and ways to address that issue and those problems.

The manager's amendment also contains language from Representative HINCHEY requiring a report on previous intelligence community activities in Argentina, an issue that has long been a concern of Representative HINCHEY.

Representative LANGEVIN, a leader on the issue of cybersecurity, drafted a provision that requires the President to submit a plan to Congress to secure the networks of the Federal Government.

Finally, Representative MARKEY of Colorado drafted language that will require the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to the congressional Intelligence Committees assessing the threat posed to allies and interests of the United States in the Persian Gulf by Iran's missile arsenal.

Beyond the manager's amendment, the base text of the bill makes several important improvements in oversight of intelligence activities. First, it establishes an Inspector General for the entire intelligence community. This provision will help eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse, and it will also keep a close eye on the protection of the rights of Americans.

The bill will also require the DNI to establish a plan to increase diversity within the intelligence community. As is very clear, this is a measure that is important to all our Members, to me personally, and to the committee's vice chairman, Mr. HASTINGS. For the intelligence agencies, diversity is not just about virtue and equality, though both are important ideals; it is about making sure that we have a clear and complete understanding of the different languages and cultures around the world. In the world of intelligence, diversity translates directly into improved operational capability.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, it has been a privilege to work with both sides of the aisle to craft this bill. It is important to keep in mind that all of these issues are vital and important components of making sure we do our work.

With that, I urge all my colleagues to support this rule and enact these critical provisions into law.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I do so to congratulate the distinguished Chair of the Select Committee on Intelligence, my good friend, for his service in the Border Patrol. And we have worked together on a wide range of issues. I thank him for that.

I have to say that I am very concerned, though, about the fact that we, unfortunately, have not seen what is best described as a forward-leaning policy when it comes to dealing with this threat of terrorism.

We all know that law enforcement by its nature is reactive, and we need to

have a policy that is more proactive. The inclusion of language like the McDermott amendment in this measure in the manager's amendment unfortunately creates a scenario whereby we are not focused on being the forward-leaning entity that we should.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, my friend from Holland, Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank Mr. DREIER from California for giving me the 5 minutes.

Here we go again. This bill could have been done in July, but it was pulled. This is the third rule that we've had on one bill. It's almost unprecedented; I'm not sure that I have ever seen this before. It was pulled in July because of the controversy surrounding the Speaker's remarks saying the CIA lies, the CIA lies all the time. So it sat dormant as this country was under attack.

When we went to the Rules Committee this week, we had a lot of amendments that we thought should have been put in order. An amendment that would direct the DNI to establish a panel to review the capabilities of Iran—it wasn't important enough to debate that when we went through the debate on this bill yesterday. An amendment that would require the CIA to release publicly unclassified versions of documents relating to the use of enhanced interrogation techniques—that wasn't important enough to debate. What we are going to do with the folks in Guantanamo—that wasn't important enough to debate. What the intelligence community did after Fort Hood and in between Fort Hood and Christmas Day—that wasn't important enough to debate. The process for authorization and notification of covert actions that may result in the death of a targeted U.S. citizen—that wasn't important enough to debate.

But then we see that there is an amendment to be offered by the manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, 22 pages, including an amendment from Mr. MCDERMOTT. And here's Mr. MCDERMOTT's own words: "My amendment would have expanded upon the President's executive order to clearly define what constitutes a cruel, inhumane, or degrading interrogation so that it is unmistakable what kinds of techniques are unacceptable. It also creates criminal penalties for those who use those kinds of interrogations." Not a single minute of debate on this amendment, not one hearing on this amendment, and we dump it into a manager's amendment, along with 22 other amendments. Sloppy work.

And how do we know it's sloppy? Because we're back here today for a third time with a third rule pulling it out. It's not because the leadership on the other side believes that this is a bad amendment. They believe it's the right

amendment. That's why they put it into the manager's amendment. That's why the chairman put this amendment into the manager's amendment, because he agrees with it. He defended this yesterday, expansion of criminal penalties only to the intelligence community; on the floor defending this amendment, saying it was the good thing and the right thing to do, and it was consistent with American values. If it's consistent with American values, why are they pulling it out? Because they know it's unfair to the intelligence community.

We asked the question yesterday, what are you going to say to the men and women, the front lines in the intelligence community, when you go and visit them and say you have created a special set of penalties only for them? You know, these rules, this new criminal law, you wouldn't even apply these to your county sheriff, you wouldn't even apply them to your State trooper, but they wanted to sneak them in in the middle of the night, with no debate, no hearing, saying this is the right way to go. They're pulling it today because they recognize, their leadership on this issue, that when they turned around, they had no followers. They didn't have enough votes to pass this. It jeopardized their bill. It was sloppy work to put this in in the first place, and it's an indication of how this bill has gone through the process. This amendment was put in without any consultation with the other side of the aisle. This is a partisan bill. As my colleague said earlier, it creates some real confusion as to whether we're in the law enforcement business or whether we're in the fighting terrorism business.

I'm glad this is coming here today, but we could have dealt with this yesterday. It should never have been in the manager's amendment to begin with. If they wanted to put it up, put it up for a separate vote as a separate amendment. But they knew they couldn't do that.

We asked questions yesterday that they didn't answer. Why does this amendment define a criminal offense that only intelligence community personnel would be guilty of? They wouldn't answer that, they wouldn't engage in that debate. The amendment would make it a crime for depriving an individual of necessary food, water, sleep. How does the bill define "necessary?" Participate in acts intended to violate the individual's religious beliefs. Is there an objective standard? Then it gets into phobias. Exploit the phobias of the individual. We asked the other side, please define this for us, and they didn't.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague.

They weren't willing to answer any of those questions or even have a de-

bate or a discussion on what the amendment meant. So that is why we're back here today. But the bottom line is it's a symptom, it's a symptom of the confusion on the other side, the sloppiness with which they brought this bill to the floor. I am glad that they have taken this lousy amendment and they are going to trash it today. It should never have been in there. It jeopardized and attacked our men and women on the front lines who are keeping us safe each and every day.

The McDermott amendment was an insult, an insult to American men and women in the intelligence community.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) has 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the committee, Mr. REYES.

Mr. REYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

You know, facts are pesky things, and sometimes we have to keep reminding those on the other side of the aisle that they are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

When the ranking member made reference to the Speaker and her comment about being misled by the CIA, it is important to keep in perspective that we are talking about the last administration, where the policymakers repeatedly misled the Congress. He himself complained bitterly many, many times about those kinds of issues. In fact, one of the amendments, the amendment on the issue of Peru, is a direct result of complaints voiced by the ranking member and others on the committee.

He asked a rhetorical question: What will we say to the men and women of the intelligence community? My message has always been consistent: We appreciate their work, we honor their professionalism, we depend on them, and the safety of our country relies on them doing the job that they need to do.

□ 1000

It's interesting for me to note that, over the course of the last few months, because of an issue that the minority has with Miranda warnings, they have been repeatedly questioning the proficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have 26½ years of experience in Federal law enforcement. I've had an opportunity to work with the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I know they are the best we have.

Do you know why I say that?

Because they didn't need to resort to waterboarding. They didn't need to resort to enhanced interrogation techniques. All they did was conduct interrogations professionally and bring all

the tools to bear that they have traditionally relied on, and they got information from the individual who tried to take down the airliner on Christmas Day.

I know it's a tough contrast, because some would like to take shortcuts. Some would like to subscribe to the last administration's policy of "anything goes." Well, facts and rules are pesky things. I know the Constitution, which they like to quote, is pesky because it provides protection to anyone here in the United States, whether you are here legally, illegally, whether you are in a car, on a plane or in another type of conveyance. The Federal Bureau of Investigation understands that, and that's why, once they determined that there was a violation, they gave the Miranda warnings.

The other side would like to mischaracterize that and say, "We're in favor of the FBI's going around the world, giving the Miranda warnings to those who would seek to harm our country." Well, the difference between us and the rest of the world should be that we are a Nation of laws, that we don't seek to take shortcuts, that we don't think it's a good idea to waterboard and to torture and do those kinds of things. That's a basic and fundamental difference in political philosophy, I think, here today.

Do you know what? As I go around the world and talk to members of the intelligence community in the CIA, the NSA, the DIA, the FBI, and others, that's what they want to do. They want to be given the tools to carry out their jobs and to do their jobs within the framework that we are so proud of as Americans. That's what we should be doing. That's, more than anything, what this debate is about.

Are we going to honor the traditions that our country stands for—the reasons that we are held up as a model around the world—or are we going to subscribe to the policies of the previous administration which say, because people are intent on attacking us, that anything goes, that we throw the rule book out the window, that we throw the Constitution out the door and let people do whatever they want, whenever they want, however they want? That is not who we are. That is not what we should be about. Believe me, the men and women who are charged with keeping us safe want those issues to be clear-cut and understood.

I will close by saying it is very telling that, when the last administration made a decision under enhanced interrogation, to waterboard, two things happened. First of all, the CIA did not have that expertise in-house. They had to go to the DOD to get it. Secondly, when the FBI realized that that was part of the interrogation process, they said, you know, that's not what we're about. We can get the job done the right way without resorting to those kinds of techniques, and they returned back to headquarters.

So, with that, I hope that we can have a substantive debate on issues

that are important to our country, on issues that are relevant and, most importantly, on issues that provide the men and women, the professionals in whatever agency you're talking about, the tools and the direction that we are a Nation of laws. We have to respect our Constitution.

Mr. DREIER. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another hardworking, thoughtful member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from metropolitan Chumuckla, Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use my 2 minutes in a colloquy with the chairman of the full committee.

If you believe what you've just said, why are we striking section 506 from your manager's amendment?

Mr. REYES. If the gentleman would yield, last night, we offered a unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Reclaiming my time, why did you do that?

Mr. REYES. The issue, after reflecting on it, was, at least as I understood from the comments that were being made by your side, there were some misimpressions of what, actually, the amendment was intending on doing, so I offered to withdraw that under unanimous consent, and your side decided not to.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, again, please, I am going to continue the colloquy.

You are saying there are misimpressions on our side. It was your side last night that blew up when this issue was brought forward, and you didn't have the votes to do it. So my next question is: If you had defended it all-day long, why did you allow it to be put in the bill in the first place?

Mr. REYES. Well, we can only do so much to make sure that your side understands that the concerns that you were raising were not, in fact, what was meant by the amendment. That's the long and short of it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Thank you, sir.

Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what I am trying to put forth to the public today.

You talk about our being entitled to our own opinions but not to our own facts. Facts are facts. The facts are the chairman of the committee had this put into the bill. The chairman of the committee is now having it pulled out of the bill, which is the way they want to go.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend from Gold River, California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I am sorry, I had to come over here and just respond to what was said by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

You said, in the previous administration, anything goes. Read the memo that just came out of the Justice De-

partment. Look at the actions of the Justice Department. They suggest that anything did not go. To say that now is to besmirch the reputations of good men and women who have worked both career and political to save us from the threat of terrorists since 9/11. To come here and to say "anything goes" is a continuation of besmirching the reputations of good men and women. Frankly, it ought not to stand. Look at the facts. Look at the recent memo that reviewed those analyses. You will see that is not the case.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman such time as he may consume.

Mr. REYES. First of all, in response to my friend from California's comment, I will just give you one example.

The issue of waterboarding has been characterized as the equivalent of a training exercise, that the SERE training does it to train our pilots. Don't you think there is a big difference between categorizing it in that way and waterboarding an individual 183 times?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would look at the memo that just came out which reviews the legal analysis provided by the Justice Department in terms of waterboarding, you would see that there is not only a historic but a legal and substantial difference between the waterboarding referenced in the complaints versus that which we did.

Mr. REYES. Answer the question: Do you think there is a difference between a training exercise that simulates waterboarding?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would be happy to respond if the gentleman would allow me to.

Mr. REYES. Please.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. There is no difference in the application—the numbers, yes.

The fact of the matter is, after that individual was waterboarded multiple times, we received actionable information from the intelligence community, which allowed us to stop plots that were aimed at killing Americans. That has been said under oath by the highest levels of the intelligence community in the United States.

Mr. REYES. Reclaiming my time, that doesn't deserve a response.

What I will say is that the FBI and our interrogators, the professionals that they are, have proven that you can get better information by following the traditional interrogation procedures. You don't have to resort to "enhanced interrogation techniques."

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. The facts are difficult.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the White House, Speaker PELOSI said that people sitting around the kitchen table don't care about process; they care about results.

Well, the fact of the matter is this has been an extraordinarily sloppy process. As we've just seen from the exchange that has taken place, it looks like we had the potential for very, very

serious, far-reaching results which could have been devastating had we included the McDermott language in this measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this pattern, it is unfortunate. I think we have made history here today by having the third rule considered for the first step of legislation. It has taken 8 months for us to get here when we should have dealt with it last summer when it was a priority for us.

I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, when you have bad process, you end up with bad results, and that's exactly what has happened here. So I am very, very troubled that we are at this point, but we are going to try to do what we can to move forward.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say that I am pleased we are removing the language today.

I want to remind my colleagues that, in this bill, we are helping to prevent the disastrous consequences that faulty intelligence and misinformed Congresses can have on national security. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to House amendment to the Senate amendment to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1299. An act to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain administrative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1105 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2701.

□ 1013

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. RAHALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday,

February 25, 2010, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-419, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER), had been postponed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1113, amendment No. 1 shall be considered as modified by striking the matter proposed to be inserted as section 506.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. REYES:
Page 9, line 21, strike "\$672,812,000" and insert "\$643,252,000".

Page 23, line 14, strike "a grant program" and insert "grant programs".

Page 23, line 15, strike "subsection (b)" and insert "subsections (b) and (c)".

Page 24, after line 10, insert the following:
“(c) GRANT PROGRAM FOR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—(1) The Director of National Intelligence may provide grants to historically black colleges and universities to provide programs of study in educational disciplines identified under subsection (a)(2) or described in paragraph (2).

“(2) A grant provided under paragraph (1) may be used to provide programs of study in the following educational disciplines:

“(A) Foreign languages, including Middle Eastern and South Asian dialects.

“(B) Computer science.

“(C) Analytical courses.

“(D) Cryptography.

“(E) Study abroad programs.”.

Page 24, line 11, strike “(3) An” and insert “(d) APPLICATION.—An”.

Page 24, line 15, strike “(4) An” and insert “(e) REPORTS.—An”.

Page 25, line 1, strike “(c)” and insert “(f)”.

Page 25, line 4, strike “(d)” and insert “(g)”.

Page 25, line 10, strike the quotation mark and the second period.

Page 25, after line 10, insert the following:
“(3) ANALYTICAL COURSES.—The term ‘analytical courses’ mean programs of study involving—

“(A) analytic methodologies, including advanced statistical, polling, econometric, mathematical, or geospatial modeling methodologies;

“(B) analysis of counterterrorism, crime, and counternarcotics;

“(C) economic analysis that includes analyzing and interpreting economic trends and developments;

“(D) medical and health analysis, including the assessment and analysis of global health issues, trends, and disease outbreaks;

“(E) political analysis, including political, social, cultural, and historical analysis to interpret foreign political systems and developments; or

“(F) psychology, psychiatry, or sociology courses that assess the psychological and social factors that influence world events.

“(4) COMPUTER SCIENCE.—The term ‘computer science’ means a program of study in computer systems, computer science, computer engineering, or hardware and software analysis, integration, and maintenance.

“(5) CRYPTOGRAPHY.—The term ‘cryptography’ means a program of study on the conversion of data into a scrambled code that can be deciphered and sent across a public or private network, and the applications of such conversion of data.

“(6) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.—The term ‘historically black college and university’ means an institution of higher education that is a part B institution, as such term is defined in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061).

“(7) STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM.—The term ‘study abroad program’ means a program of study that—

“(A) takes place outside the geographical boundaries of the United States;

“(B) focuses on areas of the world that are critical to the national security interests of the United States and are generally underrepresented in study abroad programs at institutions of higher education, including Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, Eurasia, Latin American, and the Middle East; and

“(C) is a credit or noncredit program.”.

Page 30, strike lines 10 through 12.

Page 30, line 13, strike “(C)” and insert “(B)”.

Page 30, line 16, strike “(D)” and insert “(C)”.

Page 30, line 19, strike “(E)” and insert “(D)”.

Page 31, line 1, strike “any information” and all that follows through “dissenting legal views” and insert “the legal authority under which the intelligence activity is being or was conducted”.

Page 31, line 11, strike “any information” and all that follows through “legal views” and insert “the legal authority under which the covert action is being or was conducted”.

Page 31, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 8 on page 32 and insert the following:

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “in writing” after “be reported”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “If the President” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (5), if the President”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5)(A) The President may only limit access to a finding in accordance with this subsection or a notification in accordance with subsection (d)(1) if the President submits to the Members of Congress specified in paragraph (2) a certification that it is essential to limit access to such finding or such notification to meet extraordinary circumstances affecting vital interests of the United States.

“(B) Not later than 180 days after a certification is submitted in accordance with subparagraph (A) or this subparagraph, the Director of National Intelligence shall—

“(i) provide access to the finding or notification that is the subject of such certification to all members of the congressional intelligence committees; or

“(ii) submit to the Members of Congress specified in paragraph (2) a certification that it is essential to limit access to such finding or such notification to meet extraordinary circumstances affecting vital interests of the United States.”;

Page 32, strike lines 12 through 15 and insert the following:

(B) in paragraph (1), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by inserting “in writing” after “notified”; and

Page 33, line 13, insert “or to the limiting of access to such finding or such notice” after “notice”.

Page 33, line 13, strike “48 hours” and insert “seven days”.

Page 33, line 22, strike “on the content of” and insert “regarding”.

Page 34, strike lines 14 through 20.

Strike section 334 (Page 41, line 8 and all that follow through line 25 on page 44) and insert the following new section:

SEC. 334. REPORT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for four years, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the proficiency in foreign languages and,

as appropriate, in foreign dialects, of each element of the intelligence community, including—

(1) the number of positions authorized for such element that require foreign language proficiency and the level of proficiency required;

(2) an estimate of the number of such positions that each element will require during the five-year period beginning on the date of the submission of the report;

(3) the number of positions authorized for such element that require foreign language proficiency that are filled by—

(A) military personnel; and

(B) civilian personnel;

(4) the number of applicants for positions in such element in the preceding fiscal year that indicated foreign language proficiency, including the foreign language indicated and the proficiency level;

(5) the number of persons hired by such element with foreign language proficiency, including the foreign language and proficiency level;

(6) the number of personnel of such element currently attending foreign language training, including the provider of such training;

(7) a description of the efforts of such element to recruit, hire, train, and retain personnel that are proficient in a foreign language;

(8) an assessment of methods and models for basic, advanced, and intensive foreign language training;

(9) for each foreign language and, as appropriate, dialect of a foreign language—

(A) the number of positions of such element that require proficiency in the foreign language or dialect;

(B) the number of personnel of such element that are serving in a position that requires proficiency in the foreign language or dialect to perform the primary duty of the position;

(C) the number of personnel of such element that are serving in a position that does not require proficiency in the foreign language or dialect to perform the primary duty of the position;

(D) the number of personnel of such element rated at each level of proficiency of the Interagency Language Roundtable;

(E) whether the number of personnel at each level of proficiency of the Interagency Language Roundtable meets the requirements of such element;

(F) the number of personnel serving or hired to serve as linguists for such element that are not qualified as linguists under the standards of the Interagency Language Roundtable;

(G) the number of personnel hired to serve as linguists for such element during the preceding calendar year;

(H) the number of personnel serving as linguists that discontinued serving such element during the preceding calendar year;

(I) the percentage of work requiring linguistic skills that is fulfilled by an ally of the United States; and

(J) the percentage of work requiring linguistic skills that is fulfilled by contractors;

(10) an assessment of the foreign language capacity and capabilities of the intelligence community as a whole;

(11) an identification of any critical gaps in foreign language proficiency with respect to such element and recommendations for eliminating such gaps;

(12) recommendations for eliminating required reports relating to foreign-language proficiency that the Director of National Intelligence considers outdated or no longer relevant; and

(13) an assessment of the feasibility of employing foreign nationals lawfully present in

the United States who have previously worked as translators or interpreters for the Armed Forces or another department or agency of the Federal Government in Iraq or Afghanistan to meet the critical language needs of such element.

Page 45, beginning on line 18, strike “one of the congressional intelligence committees” and insert “a committee of Congress with jurisdiction over such program or activity”.

Page 46, beginning on line 8, strike “the congressional intelligence committees” and insert “each committee of Congress with jurisdiction over the program or activity that is the subject of the analysis, evaluation, or investigation for which the Director restricts access to information under such paragraph”.

Page 46, line 13, strike “report” and insert “statement”.

Page 46, line 16, strike “report” and insert “statement”.

Page 46, beginning on line 17, strike “the congressional intelligence committees any comments on a report of which the Comptroller General has notice under paragraph (3)” and insert “each committee of Congress to which the Director of National Intelligence submits a statement under paragraph (2) any comments on the statement”.

Page 46, line 21, strike the closing quotation mark and the final period.

Page 46, after line 21, insert the following:
“(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—(1) The Comptroller General shall maintain the same level of confidentiality for information made available for an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a) as is required of the head of the element of the intelligence community from which such information is obtained. Officers and employees of the Government Accountability Office are subject to the same statutory penalties for unauthorized disclosure or use of such information as officers or employees of the element of the intelligence community that provided the Comptroller General or officers and employees of the Government Accountability Office with access to such information.

“(2) The Comptroller General shall establish procedures to protect from unauthorized disclosure all classified and other sensitive information furnished to the Comptroller General or any representative of the Comptroller General for conducting an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a).

“(3) Before initiating an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall provide the Director of National Intelligence and the head of each relevant element of the intelligence community with the name of each officer and employee of the Government Accountability Office who has obtained appropriate security clearance and to whom, upon proper identification, records and information of the element of the intelligence community shall be made available in conducting such analysis, evaluation, or investigation.”.

Page 48, line 15, strike “BIENNIAL” and insert “BIENNIAL”.

Page 48, line 19, strike “biannually” and insert “biennially”.

Page 62, line 14, strike “NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE” and insert “REPORT”.

Page 62, beginning on line 18, strike “National Intelligence Estimate or National Intelligence Assessment” and insert “report”.

Page 62, strike line 20 and insert the following: “supply chain and global provision of services to determine whether such supply chain and such services pose”.

Page 62, line 21, strike “counterfeit”.

Page 62, line 22, strike “defective” and insert “counterfeit, defective”.

Page 62, line 23, insert “or services that may be managed, controlled, or manipulated by a foreign government or a criminal organization” after “organization”.

Page 63, beginning on line 5, strike “counterfeit”.

Page 63, line 6, strike “defective” and insert “counterfeit, defective”.

Page 63, line 8, insert “or services that may be managed, controlled, or manipulated by a foreign government or a criminal organization” after “organization”.

Page 63, at the end of line 8 insert the following: “Such review shall include an examination of the threat posed by State-controlled and State-invested enterprises and the extent to which the actions and activities of such enterprises may be controlled, coerced, or influenced by a foreign government.”.

Strike section 353 (Page 67, line 20 and all that follows through line 25 on page 68).

Page 69, beginning on line 5, strike “Federal Bureau of Investigation” and insert “Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Secretary of State.”.

Insert after section 354 (Page 69, after line 15) the following new sections:

SEC. 355. REPORT ON QUESTIONING AND DETENTION OF SUSPECTED TERRORISTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) a description of the strategy of the Federal Government for balancing the intelligence collection needs of the United States with the interest of the United States in prosecuting terrorist suspects; and

(2) a description of the policy of the Federal Government with respect to the questioning, detention, trial, transfer, release, or other disposition of suspected terrorists.

SEC. 356. REPORT ON DISSEMINATION OF COUNTERTERRORISM INFORMATION TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the dissemination of critical counterterrorism information from the intelligence community to local law enforcement agencies, including recommendations for improving the means of communication of such information to local law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 357. REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the intelligence capabilities of State and local law enforcement agencies. Such report shall include—

(1) an assessment of the ability of State and local law enforcement agencies to analyze and fuse intelligence community products with locally gathered information;

(2) a description of existing procedures of the intelligence community to share with State and local law enforcement agencies the tactics, techniques, and procedures for intelligence collection, data management, and analysis learned from global counterinsurgency and counterterror operations;

(3) a description of current intelligence analysis training provided by elements of the intelligence community to State and local law enforcement agencies;

(4) an assessment of the need for a formal intelligence training center to teach State and local law enforcement agencies methods of intelligence collection and analysis; and

(5) an assessment of the efficiency of collocating such an intelligence training center with an existing intelligence community or military intelligence training center.

SEC. 358. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON OVER-CLASSIFICATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to Congress a report containing an analysis of the problem of overclassification of intelligence and ways to address such overclassification, including an analysis of the importance of protecting sources and methods while providing law enforcement and the public with as much access to information as possible.

(b) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 359. REPORT ON THREAT FROM DIRTY BOMBS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall submit to Congress a report summarizing intelligence related to the threat to the United States from weapons that use radiological materials, including highly dispersible substances such as cesium-137.

SEC. 360. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN ARGENTINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the following:

(1) A description of any information in the possession of the intelligence community with respect to the following events in the Republic of Argentina:

(A) The accession to power by the military of the Republic of Argentina in 1976.

(B) Violations of human rights committed by officers or agents of the Argentine military and security forces during counterinsurgency or counterterror operations, including by the State Intelligence Secretariat (Secretaria de Inteligencia del Estado), Military Intelligence Detachment 141 (Destacamento de Inteligencia Militar 141 in Cordoba), Military Intelligence Detachment 121 (Destacamento Militar 121 in Rosario), Army Intelligence Battalion 601, the Army Reunion Center (Reunion Central del Ejercito), and the Army First Corps in Buenos Aires.

(C) Operation Condor and Argentina's role in cross-border counterinsurgency or counterterror operations with Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, or Uruguay.

(2) Information on abductions, torture, disappearances, and executions by security forces and other forms of repression, including the fate of Argentine children born in captivity, that took place at detention centers, including the following:

(A) The Argentine Navy Mechanical School (Escuela Mecanica de la Armada).

(B) Automotores Orletti.

(C) Operaciones Tacticas 18.

(D) La Perla.

(E) Campo de Mayo.

(F) Institutos Militares.

(3) An appendix of declassified records reviewed and used for the report submitted under this subsection.

(4) A descriptive index of information referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) that is classified, including the identity of each document that is classified, the reason for continuing the classification of such document, and an explanation of how the release of the document would damage the national security interests of the United States.

(b) REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS.—Not later than two years after the date on which the report required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Director of National Intelligence shall review information referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) that is classified to determine if any of such information should be declassified.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 361. REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY STRATEGY TO PROTECT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NETWORKS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Security Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the strategy of the National Security Agency with respect to securing networks of the Department of Defense within the intelligence community.

SEC. 362. REPORT ON CREATION OF SPACE INTELLIGENCE OFFICE.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of creating a national space intelligence office to manage space-related intelligence assets and access to such assets.

SEC. 363. PLAN TO SECURE NETWORKS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a plan to secure the networks of the intelligence community. Such plan shall include strategies for—

(1) securing the networks of the intelligence community from unauthorized remote access, intrusion, or insider tampering;

(2) recruiting, retaining, and training a highly-qualified cybersecurity intelligence community workforce and include—

(A) an assessment of the capabilities of such workforce;

(B) an examination of issues of recruiting, retention, and the professional development of such workforce, including the possibility of providing retention bonuses or other forms of compensation;

(C) an assessment of the benefits of outreach and training with both private industry and academic institutions with respect to such workforce; and

(D) an assessment of the impact of the establishment of the Department of Defense Cyber Command on personnel and authorities of the intelligence community;

(3) making the intelligence community workforce and the public aware of cybersecurity best practices and principles;

(4) coordinating the intelligence community response to a cybersecurity incident;

(5) collaborating with industry and academia to improve cybersecurity for critical infrastructure, the defense industrial base, and financial networks;

(6) addressing such other matters as the President considers necessary to secure the cyberinfrastructure of the intelligence community; and

(7) reviewing procurement laws and classification issues to determine how to allow for greater information sharing on specific cyber threats and attacks between private industry and the intelligence community.

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the plan referred to in sub-

section (a) is submitted to Congress, and every 90 days thereafter until the President submits the certification referred to in subsection (c), the President shall report to Congress on the status of the implementation of such plan and the progress towards the objectives of such plan.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The President may submit to Congress a certification that the objectives of the plan referred to in subsection (a) have been achieved.

SEC. 364. REPORT ON MISSILE ARSENAL OF IRAN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report assessing the threat posed by the missile arsenal of Iran to allies and interests of the United States in the Persian Gulf.

SEC. 365. STUDY ON BEST PRACTICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN COMBATING VIOLENT DOMESTIC EXTREMISM.

(a) STUDY.—The Director of National Intelligence shall conduct a study on the best practices of foreign governments (including the intelligence services of such governments) to combat violent domestic extremism.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 366. REPORT ON INFORMATION SHARING PRACTICES OF JOINT TERRORISM TASK FORCE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to Congress a report on the best practices or impediments to information sharing in the Federal Bureau of Investigation-New York Police Department Joint Terrorism Task Force, including ways in which the combining of Federal, State, and local law enforcement resources can result in the effective utilization of such resources.

SEC. 367. REPORT ON TECHNOLOGY TO ENABLE INFORMATION SHARING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress and the President a report describing the improvements to information technology needed to enable elements of the Federal Government that are not part of the intelligence community to better share information with elements of the intelligence community.

SEC. 368. REPORT ON THREATS TO ENERGY SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report in unclassified form describing the future threats to describing the future threats to the national security of the United States from continued and increased dependence of the United States on oil sources from foreign nations.

Page 70, strike lines 1 through 7.

Page 74, line 16, strike “includes” and insert “means”.

Page 75, line 24, strike the closing quotation mark and the final period.

Page 75, after line 24, insert the following:

“(D) TERRORIST SCREENING PURPOSE.—The term ‘terrorist screening purpose’ means—

“(i) the collection, analysis, dissemination, and use of terrorist identity information to determine threats to the national security of the United States from a terrorist or terrorism; and

“(ii) the use of such information for risk assessment, inspection, and credentialing.”.

Page 86, line 11, strike “the congressional defense committees” and insert “Congress”.

Page 87, line 17, strike “the”.

At the end of subtitle E of title III (Page 88, after line 18), add the following new section:

SEC. 369. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MONITORING OF NORTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that suspected terrorists have attempted to enter the United States through the international land and maritime border of the United States and Canada.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the intelligence community should devote sufficient resources, including technological and human resources, to identifying and thwarting potential threats at the international land and maritime border of the United States and Canada; and

(2) the intelligence community should work closely with the Government of Canada to identify and apprehend suspected terrorists before such terrorists enter the United States.

Page 96, line 14, insert after the period the following: “Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action with respect to the Inspector General otherwise authorized by law, other than transfer or removal.”.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV (Page 116, after line 6), add the following new section:

SEC. 407. DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT FOR REVIEWS OF INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ARMS REGULATIONS AND EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.

The Director of National Intelligence may provide support for any review conducted by a department or agency of the Federal Government of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations or Export Administration Regulations, including a review of technologies and goods on the United States Munitions List and Commerce Control List that may warrant controls that are different or additional to the controls such technologies and goods are subject to at the time of such review.

Strike section 411 (Page 116, line 9 and all that follows through line 2 on page 118) and insert the following new section:

SEC. 411. REVIEW OF COVERT ACTION PROGRAMS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

Section 17 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4)—

(A) by striking “(4) If” and inserting “(4)(A) If”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) The Director may waive the requirement to submit the statement required under subparagraph (A) within seven days of prohibiting an audit, inspection, or investigation under paragraph (3) if such audit, inspection, or investigation is related to a covert action program. If the Director waives such requirement in accordance with this subparagraph, the Director shall submit the statement required under subparagraph (A) as soon as practicable, along with an explanation of the reasons for delaying the submission of such statement.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subsections (F) and (G), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) a list of the covert actions for which the Inspector General has not completed an audit within the preceding three-year period;” and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) COVERT ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covert action’ has the meaning given the term in section 503(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413b(e)).”.

Strike section 426 (Page 128, line 21 and all that follows through line 15 on page 129).

Strike section 427 (Page 129, lines 16 through 25).

Strike section 502 (Page 133, line 1 and all that follow through line 10 on page 134).

At the end of subtitle A of title V (Page 135, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 505. CYBERSECURITY TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a cybersecurity task force (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall consist of the following members:

(A) One member appointed by the Attorney General.

(B) One member appointed by the Director of the National Security Agency.

(C) One member appointed by the Director of National Intelligence.

(D) One member appointed by the White House Cybersecurity Coordinator.

(E) One member appointed by the head of any other agency or department that is designated by the Attorney General to appoint a member to the Task Force.

(2) CHAIR.—The member of the Task Force appointed pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall serve as the Chair of the Task Force.

(c) STUDY.—The Task Force shall conduct a study of existing tools and provisions of law used by the intelligence community and law enforcement agencies to protect the cybersecurity of the United States.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) INITIAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Task Force shall submit to Congress a report containing guidelines or legislative recommendations to improve the capabilities of the intelligence community and law enforcement agencies to protect the cybersecurity of the United States. Such report shall include guidelines or legislative recommendations on—

(A) improving the ability of the intelligence community to detect hostile attacks and attribute attacks to specific parties;

(B) the need for data retention requirements to assist the intelligence community and law enforcement agencies;

(C) improving the ability of the intelligence community to anticipate nontraditional targets of foreign intelligence services; and

(D) the adequacy of existing criminal statutes to successfully deter cyber attacks, including statutes criminalizing the facilitation of criminal acts, the scope of laws for which a cyber crime constitutes a predicate offense, trespassing statutes, data breach notification requirements, and victim restitution statutes.

(2) SUBSEQUENT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the initial report is submitted under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter for two years, the Task Force shall submit to Congress an update of the report required under paragraph (1).

(e) TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the last update of a report required under subsection (d)(2) is submitted.

□ 1015

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will

now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-419 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1, as modified, by Mr. REYES of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. SCHAUER of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. REYES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 166, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—246

Adler (NJ)	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.
Altmire	DeGette	Kagen
Andrews	Delahunt	Kanjorski
Arcuri	DeLauro	Kaptur
Baca	Dicks	Kennedy
Baird	Dingell	Kildee
Baldwin	Doggett	Kilpatrick (MI)
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Kilroy
Bean	Doyle	Kind
Becerra	Driehaus	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Berkley	Edwards (MD)	Kissel
Berman	Edwards (TX)	Klein (FL)
Berry	Ellison	Kosmas
Bishop (GA)	Ellsworth	Kratovil
Blumenauer	Engel	Langevin
Boccieri	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bordallo	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Boren	Faleomavaega	Lee (CA)
Boswell	Farr	Levin
Boyd	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA)	Foster	Lipinski
Braley (IA)	Frank (MA)	Loeback
Bright	Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown, Corrine	Garamendi	Lowey
Butterfield	Giffords	Lujan
Cao	Gonzalez	Lynch
Capuano	Gordon (TN)	Maffei
Cardoza	Grayson	Maloney
Carmahan	Green, Al	Markey (CO)
Carney	Green, Gene	Markey (MA)
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Marshall
Castor (FL)	Gutierrez	Massa
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Matheson
Childers	Halvorson	Matsui
Christensen	Hare	McCarthy (NY)
Chu	Harman	McCollum
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Clay	Heinrich	McGovern
Cleaver	Herseth Sandlin	McIntyre
Clyburn	Higgins	McMahon
Cohen	Hill	McNerney
Connolly (VA)	Himes	Meek (FL)
Conyers	Hinchev	Meeks (NY)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Melancon
Costa	Hirono	Michaud
Courtney	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Crowley	Holden	Miller, George
Cuellar	Holt	Minnick
Cummings	Honda	Mitchell
Dahlkemper	Hoyer	Mollohan
Davis (AL)	Israel	Moore (KS)
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee	Moran (VA)
Davis (TN)	(TX)	Murphy (CT)

Murphy (NY)	Rodriguez	Snyder
Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Space
Nadler (NY)	Rothman (NJ)	Speier
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Spratt
Neal (MA)	Ruppersberger	Sutton
Norton	Rush	Taylor
Nye	Ryan (OH)	Teague
Oberstar	Sablan	Thompson (CA)
Obey	Salazar	Thompson (MS)
Olver	Sanchez, Linda	Tierney
Ortiz	T.	Titus
Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Pallone	Sarbanes	Towns
Pascrell	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Pastor (AZ)	Schauer	Van Hollen
Payne	Schiff	Velázquez
Perlmutter	Schrader	Vislosky
Perriello	Schwartz	Walz
Peters	Scott (GA)	Wasserman
Peterson	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Pingree (ME)	Serrano	Watson
Polis (CO)	Sestak	Watt
Pomeroy	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Price (NC)	Sherman	Weiner
Quigley	Shuler	Welch
Rahall	Sires	Wilson (OH)
Rangel	Skelton	Woolsey
Reyes	Slaughter	Wu
Richardson	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth

NOES—166

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary
Akin	Galleghy	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Austria	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Nunes
Bachus	Gohmert	Olson
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pence
Biggert	Graves	Petri
Bilbray	Griffith	Pitts
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Blunt	Heller	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hensarling	Putnam
Bono Mack	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hoekstra	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jones	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Royce
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Kingston
Buyer	Kingston	Schmidt
Calvert	Kirk	Schock
Camp	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Kucinich	Sessions
Cantor	Lamborn	Shadegg
Capito	Lance	Shimkus
Carter	Latham	Shuster
Cassidy	LaTourette	Simpson
Castle	Latta	Smith (NE)
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Coffman (CO)	Linder	Souder
Cole	LoBiondo	Stearns
Conaway	Lucas	Terry
Costello	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Thornberry
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Tiahrt
Davis (KY)	E.	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Upton
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Walden
Duncan	McCaul	Wamp
Ehlers	McClintock	Waters
Emerson	McCotter	Whitfield
Filner	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Flake	McKeon	Wittman
Fleming	McMorris	Wolf
Forbes	Rodgers	Young (AK)
Fortenberry	Mica	Young (FL)
Fox	Miller (FL)	
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	

NOT VOTING—26

Abercrombie	Fallin	Radanovich
Ackerman	Hall (TX)	Reichert
Barrett (SC)	Inslee	Scalise
Bishop (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Stark
Boehner	King (NY)	Stupak
Boucher	Mack	Sullivan
Capps	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Deal (GA)	Paul	Westmoreland
Dent	Pierluisi	

□ 1047

Mr. CASSIDY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TAYLOR and WU changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 401, noes 11, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—401

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

Hinche	McHenry
Hinojosa	McIntyre
Hirono	McKeon
Hodes	McMahon
Hoekstra	McMorris
Holden	Rodgers
Holt	McNerney
Honda	Meek (FL)
Hoyer	Meeke (NY)
Hunter	Melancon
Inglis	Mica
Israel	Michaud
Issa	Miller (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Miller (MI)
Jackson Lee	Miller (NC)
(TX)	Miller, George
Jenkins	Minnick
Johnson (GA)	Mitchell
Johnson (IL)	Mollohan
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (KS)
Johnson, Sam	Moore (WI)
Jones	Moran (VA)
Jordan (OH)	Murphy (CT)
Kagen	Murphy (NY)
Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick
Kaptur	Murphy, Tim
Kennedy	Myrick
Kildee	Nadler (NY)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Napolitano
Kilroy	Neal (MA)
Kind	Neugebauer
Kingston	Norton
Kirk	Nunes
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Nye
Kissell	Oberstar
Klein (FL)	Obey
Kline (MN)	Olson
Kosmas	Ortiz
Kratovil	Owens
Kucinich	Pallone
Lamborn	Pascrell
Lance	Pastor (AZ)
Langevin	Paulsen
Larsen (WA)	Payne
Larson (CT)	Pence
Latham	Perlmutter
LaTourette	Perriello
Latta	Peters
Lee (CA)	Peterson
Lee (NY)	Petri
Levin	Pingree (ME)
Lewis (CA)	Pitts
Lewis (GA)	Platts
Linder	Poe (TX)
Lipinski	Polis (CO)
LoBiondo	Pomerooy
Loeb	Posey
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)
Lowe	Price (NC)
Lucas	Putnam
Luetkemeyer	Quigley
Lujan	Rahall
Lummis	Rangel
Lynch	Rehberg
Maffei	Reyes
Maloney	Richardson
Manzullo	Rodriguez
Marchant	Roe (TN)
Markey (CO)	Rogers (AL)
Markey (MA)	Rogers (KY)
Marshall	Rogers (MI)
Massa	Rooney
Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen
Matsui	Roskam
McCarthy (CA)	Ross
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
McCaul	Roybal-Allard
McCollum	Ruppersberger
McCotter	Rush
McDermott	Ryan (OH)
McGovern	Ryan (WI)

NOES—11

Akin	King (IA)
Brown (GA)	King, Daniel
Campbell	E.
Franks (AZ)	McClintock

NOT VOTING—26

Abercrombie	Fallin
Ackerman	Hall (TX)
Barrett (SC)	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	King (NY)
Boehner	Mack
Boucher	Moran (KS)
Capps	Olver
Deal (GA)	Paul
Dent	Pierluisi

Sablan	Salazar
Salazar	Sánchez, Linda
T.	Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes	Sarbanes
Schakowsky	Schakowsky
Schauer	Schauer
Schiff	Schiff
Schmidt	Schmidt
Schock	Schock
Schrader	Schrader
Schwartz	Schwartz
Scott (GA)	Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner
Serrano	Serrano
Sessions	Sessions
Sestak	Sestak
Shadegg	Shadegg
Shea-Porter	Shea-Porter
Sherman	Sherman
Shimkus	Shimkus
Shuler	Shuler
Shuster	Shuster
Simpson	Simpson
Sires	Sires
Skelton	Skelton
Slaughter	Slaughter
Smith (NE)	Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Snyder
Souder	Souder
Space	Space
Speier	Speier
Spratt	Spratt
Stearns	Stearns
Sutton	Sutton
Taylor	Taylor
Teague	Teague
Terry	Terry
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Thornberry	Thornberry
Tiahrt	Tiahrt
Tiberi	Tiberi
Tierney	Tierney
Titus	Titus
Tonko	Tonko
Towns	Towns
Tsongas	Tsongas
Turner	Turner
Upton	Upton
Van Hollen	Van Hollen
Velázquez	Velázquez
Visclosky	Visclosky
Walden	Walden
Walz	Walz
Warr	Warr
Wamp	Wamp
Wasserman	Wasserman
Schultz	Schultz
Waters	Waters
Watson	Watson
Watt	Watt
Waxman	Waxman
Weiner	Weiner
Welch	Welch
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wilson (OH)	Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Wolf	Wolf
Woolsey	Woolsey
Wu	Wu
Yarmuth	Yarmuth
Young (FL)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1055

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SCHAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 410, noes 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—410

Aderholt	Cardoza	Ellsworth
Adler (NJ)	Carnahan	Emerson
Akin	Carney	Engel
Alexander	Carson (IN)	Eshoo
Altmire	Carter	Etheridge
Andrews	Cassidy	Faleomavaega
Arcuri	Castle	Farr
Austria	Castor (FL)	Fattah
Baca	Chaffetz	Filner
Bachmann	Chandler	Flake
Bachus	Childers	Fleming
Baird	Christensen	Forbes
Baldwin	Chu	Fortenberry
Barrow	Clarke	Foster
Bartlett	Clay	Fox
Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Frank (MA)
Bean	Clyburn	Franks (AZ)
Becerra	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Berkley	Coffman (CO)	Fudge
Berman	Cohen	Gallely
Berry	Cole	Garamendi
Biggart	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)
Bilbray	Connolly (VA)	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Conyers	Giffords
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Gohmert
Blackburn	Costello	Gonzalez
Blumenauer	Courtney	Goodlatte
Blunt	Crenshaw	Gordon (TN)
Boccieri	Crowley	Granger
Bonner	Cuellar	Graves
Bono Mack	Culberson	Grayson
Boozman	Bordallo	Cummings
Bordallo	Boren	Dahlkemper
Boren	Boswell	Davis (AL)
Boswell	Boustany	Davis (CA)
Boustany	Boyd	Davis (IL)
Boyd	Brady (PA)	Davis (KY)
Brady (PA)	Brady (TX)	Davis (TN)
Brady (TX)	Braley (IA)	DeFazio
Braley (IA)	Broun (GA)	DeGette
Bright	Brown (SC)	Delahunt
Brown (SC)	Brown, Corrine	DeLauro
Brown, Corrine	Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.
Ginny	Buchanan	Dicks
Buchanan	Burgess	Dingell
Burgess	Burton (IN)	Doggett
Burton (IN)	Butterfield	Donnelly (IN)
Butterfield	Buyer	Doyle
Buyer	Calvert	Dreier
Calvert	Camp	Driehaus
Camp	Cantor	Duncan
Cantor	Cao	Edwards (MD)
Cao	Capito	Edwards (TX)
Capito	Capuano	Ehlers
		Ellison

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

NOES—1

Woolsey

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Pierluisi
Ackerman	Dent	Radanovich
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Reichert
Bishop (NY)	Hall (TX)	Scalise
Blackburn	Inslee	Stark
Boehner	King (NY)	Stupak
Boucher	Mack	Sullivan
Bright	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Capps	Paul	Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1102

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 71, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Accordingly, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1105, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoekstra moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2701, to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 407. COORDINATION OF HIGH-VALUE DETAINEE INTERROGATION.

Section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(S) INTERROGATION OF HIGH-VALUE DETAINEES.—(1) The Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with the heads of departments and agencies of the United States Government containing elements of

the intelligence community, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

"(A) coordinate the interrogation of high-value detainees associated with international terrorism captured, held, or questioned by a department or agency that is or contains an element of the intelligence community;

"(B) be responsible for any interagency group conducting an interrogation of a high-value detainee associated with international terrorism; and

"(C) before an officer or employee of the Federal Government provides the warnings of constitutional rights described in *Miranda vs. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (U.S. 1966) to a high-value detainee who is suspected of terrorism, associated with terrorists, or believed to have knowledge of terrorists and who is captured, held, or questioned by a department or agency that is or contains an element of the intelligence community, approve the providing of such warnings to such high-value detainee.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a detainee who is captured on the battlefield by the Armed Forces of the United States, unless the Director of National Intelligence determines that such detainee is a high-value detainee.

"(3) The Director of National Intelligence may not delegate the authority to approve the providing of warnings under paragraph (1)(C)."

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 417. REVIEW OF BRIEFINGS ON COVERT ACTIONS BY THE CIA; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF UNCLASSIFIED VERSIONS OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO USE OF ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES.

(a) REVIEW OF BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency shall—

(1) compile any objections raised by a Member of Congress to a covert action (as defined in section 503(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413b(e))) on which such Member of Congress was briefed by personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency after September 11, 2001; and

(2) assess whether the Central Intelligence Agency addressed such objections.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF UNCLASSIFIED VERSIONS OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO USE OF ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES.—The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall make publicly available—

(1) an unclassified version of all Memoranda for the Record memorializing briefings made to Members of Congress on the use of enhanced interrogation techniques; and

(2) an unclassified version of finished intelligence products produced after September 11, 2001, assessing the information gained from detainee reporting, including documents dated July 15, 2004, or June 1, 2005.

Mr. HOEKSTRA (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading?

Mr. REYES. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Our country and our intelligence community are at a crossroads. Over the last 14 months, we've been struggling as to whether we're going to be focused on defeating terrorists or whether we're going to be focused on a law enforcement approach. This couldn't have been defined more clearly than what it was yesterday when the manager of this bill brought forward an amendment that would have put our intelligence community professionals at risk putting them under criminal statutes that you wouldn't even apply to your local sheriff or your local State trooper.

Thankfully, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle joined with us and forced the majority to go back and rewrite the rule and come back and strip that provision from the bill.

But that move yesterday should not have been a surprise. It was only last year that the Attorney General appointed a special prosecutor to investigate CIA personnel even though career Justice Department officials had already decided that there was no basis for prosecution. It appears that the majority wants to investigate and prosecute everyone who has been involved in our critical interrogation programs—except themselves.

The records of briefings have shown clearly and repeatedly that Democratic and Republican leadership of the House were briefed early and often on the use of the same techniques that they wanted to criminalize yesterday. And they never objected. And while there has been a selective release of certain briefing documents over the last few days, the record is far from complete because the administration and the majority have repeatedly blocked requests and amendments to publicly release a full, unclassified briefing of the classified records: who knew what and when.

The motion to recommit would stop the criminalization of our national security policy and ensure that Members of Congress would be as accountable for their conduct as the majority wants to hold the men and women of the CIA.

The motion would ask the CIA Inspector General to conduct an independent review of whether any Member of Congress objected to the use of the techniques to review what steps were taken and to require the release of all of the briefing memos. If the majority was not briefed or raised concerns, it should have nothing to fear from an independent and objective review by the facts of the Inspector General.

And, secondly, the motion would also clarify once and for all that the Director of National Intelligence should be in charge of coordinating interrogation of terrorists and should ensure we have collected all actionable intelligence before reading terrorists their Miranda rights.

This is a proposition that should not be controversial. Why is this in here? It was only on Christmas Day that the

DNI, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, and the Secretary of Homeland Security all said that they were not consulted before the Christmas Day bomber was read his Miranda rights.

These provisions are fully consistent with all of the other authorities that have been given to the DNI to coordinate the activities of the intelligence community. It makes no sense for the DNI to be in charge of coordinating all other intelligence activities but then the Attorney General is in charge of interrogation of foreign terrorists.

This motion would place the emphasis back where it belongs. It would align accountability and authority for those who make the decisions with the DNI.

□ 1115

The DNI is responsible for collecting intelligence to prevent attacks. This is where we need to go.

We can answer two fundamental questions with this motion to recommit. Who knew what, when, on enhanced interrogation techniques. Before we go and prosecute people in the intelligence community, let's have a clear record of what Members of this body knew and approved, because basically the administration and this Congress asked the intelligence personnel to do what they did. They were following our orders and instructions to keep America safe.

The second thing is, let's make sure that the DNI, the person with the responsibility to keep us safe, has the final decision on when and how we will interrogate foreign terrorists to keep America safe. It's his job. It's his responsibility. Let's get rid of the confusion. Let's get the alignment. Let's do what's necessary to keep America safe and to protect and recognize the service of our men and women in the intelligence community.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. REYES. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, to me, it seems that the minority would have us fight terrorism with one hand tied behind our back. This motion to recommit would require that before a Miranda warning can be issued, an investigator or a beat cop would have to get permission from a gaggle of Cabinet-level officials in Washington. This is simply absurd.

The minority would put FBI agents who arrest potential terrorists in a bitter catch-22. The courts require that Miranda warnings be given in certain circumstances. The minority would have an FBI agent ignore those rules and shut down the possibility of ever building a criminal case, or the agent can stop an interrogation while someone tries to get signatures from half of Washington.

The provision doesn't even include authority for these officials to delegate

the required certification. This means that if one official happens to be traveling, it's just going to take that much longer for that beat cop or that FBI agent to start gathering evidence.

Let's get the facts straight about Miranda. Federal agents are not required to Mirandize terrorism suspects when there is an imminent risk to public safety. They are free to interrogate suspects on concerns about any immediate or ongoing threat to our country. Federal agents questioned the Christmas Day bomber without the Miranda warnings under this very public safety exemption. Federal agents also don't need to give Miranda warnings when an interview is voluntary. The FBI routinely secures intelligence from suspected terrorists without Miranda in this manner.

But even when Miranda warnings are given, the record is crystal clear; suspected terrorists do not stop talking. Just this week, in the case of Najibullah Zazi, who pled guilty to charges of attempting to kill innocent civilians on the New York subway, was apprehended by law enforcement, given Miranda warnings, and interrogated thoroughly. In that questioning, Zazi provided valuable information about the plot and now he will be convicted without any fanfare. That is just one example among many. The Christmas Day bomber, the shoe bomber, Richard Reid, and scores of other suspected terrorists provided valuable intelligence after receiving Miranda warnings.

But this really, today, isn't about Miranda at all. What the minority really wants to take away is our ability to use the criminal justice system to go after suspected terrorists. I urge my colleagues not to make such an irresponsible and reckless decision. Don't support this motion to recommit.

The Federal criminal justice system has proven to be the most reliable and effective means we have for putting terrorists behind bars. Federal prosecutors, law enforcement officials, and judges know better than anybody else how to interrogate, how to try, how to convict, and how to hold terrorists.

In the 10 years since 9/11, the Justice Department has successfully convicted more than 300 terrorists in Federal criminal courts. These include hardened members of al Qaeda such as the so-called 20th hijacker, Zacarias Moussaoui.

One case in particular on this point, Richard Reid was arrested for attempting to ignite a bomb in his shoe while on a flight to Miami in December of 2001. Reid was advised of his Miranda rights within 5 minutes of being removed from the aircraft and was reminded of these rights four times within 48 hours and now is serving a life sentence in Federal prison. To my knowledge, my Republican friends did not criticize the Bush administration for its handling of that case or any of the other cases that we have on file.

This motion to recommit applies to the high-value detainees, so that in the

toughest cases, they want us to play by a completely unreasonable set of rules that will slow us down and make us weaker. That is why the Department of Defense opposes this, the Director of National Intelligence opposes this, the Department of Justice opposes this.

I think this morning, it's time to say enough with the games. It's time for us to stop playing politics with our national security. It's time for us to create a system that makes those responsible for our safety not play it with one hand tied behind their back.

Let's let our law enforcement professionals do their jobs. Above all, let's stop attacking the FBI agents that know what they are doing, know how to do it, and let's vote down this motion to recommit. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 2701, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Con. Res. 238.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 217, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—186

Aderholt	Childers	Hastings (WA)
Adler (NJ)	Coble	Heller
Akin	Coffman (CO)	Hensarling
Alexander	Cole	Herger
Altmire	Conaway	Herseth Sandlin
Austria	Costello	Hoekstra
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Hunter
Barrow	Culberson	Inglis
Bartlett	Dahlkemper	Issa
Biggart	Davis (KY)	Jenkins
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Donnelly (IN)	Jones
Bonner	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Bono Mack	Duncan	King (IA)
Boozman	Ehlers	Kingston
Boren	Emerson	Kirk
Boustany	Flake	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Kline (MN)
Bright	Forbes	Lamborn
Brown (GA)	Fortenberry	Lance
Brown (SC)	Foster	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Fox	LaTourette
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lee (NY)
Burgess	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Buyer	Gerlach	Lipinski
Calvert	Giffords	LoBiondo
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Campbell	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Cantor	Goodlatte	Lummis
Cao	Granger	Lungren, Daniel
Capito	Graves	E.
Carter	Griffith	Manzullo
Cassidy	Guthrie	Marchant
Castle	Halvorson	Marshall
Chaffetz	Harper	McCarthy (CA)

McCaul	Peters	Shuster
McClintock	Petri	Simpson
McCotter	Pitts	Smith (NE)
McHenry	Platts	Smith (NJ)
McKeon	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
McMahon	Pomeroy	Souder
McMorris	Posey	Space
Rodgers	Putnam	Stearns
McNerney	Rehberg	Taylor
Melancon	Roe (TN)	Teague
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Minnick	Rooney	Tiberi
Mitchell	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Upton
Myrick	Royce	Walden
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Nunes	Schmidt	Whitfield
Nye	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
Owens	Sessions	Wolf
Paulsen	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Pence	Shimkus	Young (FL)

NOES—217

Andrews	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)
Baca	Hare	Oberstar
Baird	Harman	Obey
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Bean	Heinrich	Ortiz
Becerra	Higgins	Pallone
Berkley	Hill	Pascarell
Berman	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Berry	Hinche	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hirono	Perriello
Boccheri	Hodes	Peterson
Boswell	Holden	Pingree (ME)
Boyd	Holt	Polis (CO)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Rahall
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Cardoza	(TX)	Richardson
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Carson (IN)	Kagen	Rothman (NJ)
Castor (FL)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Chandler	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kennedy	Rush
Clarke	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kilpatrick (MD)	Salazar
Cleaver	Kilroy	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kind	T.
Cohen	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly (VA)	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kosmas	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kratovil	Schauer
Costa	Kucinich	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Schrader
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (AL)	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sestak
Davis (IL)	Loebsack	Shea-Porter
Davis (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowey	Shuler
DeGette	Luján	Sires
Delahunt	Lynch	Skelton
DeLauro	Maffei	Slaughter
Dicks	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Markey (CO)	Snyder
Doggett	Markey (MA)	Speier
Doyle	Massa	Spratt
Driehaus	Matheson	Sutton
Edwards (MD)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Edwards (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	McCollum	Tierney
Ellsworth	McDermott	Titus
Engel	McGovern	Tonko
Eshoo	McIntyre	Towns
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Tsongas
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Fattah	Michaud	Velazquez
Finer	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Walz
Fudge	Mollohan	Wasserman
Garamendi	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Waters
Gordon (TN)	Moran (VA)	Watson
Grayson	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Green, Al	Murphy (NY)	Waxman
Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick	
Grijalva	Nadler (NY)	

Weiner	Wilson (OH)	Wu
Welch	Woolsey	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—29

Abercrombie	Capps	Price (GA)
Ackerman	Deal (GA)	Radanovich
Bachus	Dent	Reichert
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Scalise
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)	Stark
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Stupak
Blackburn	King (NY)	Sullivan
Blunt	Mack	Tanner
Boehner	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Boucher	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1140

Mr. HODES and Ms. SHEA-PORTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DONNELLY of Indiana and PLATTS and Mrs. HALVORSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 72 on H.R. 2701, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 72.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. 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 235, noes 168, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—235

Adler (NJ)	Clarke	Farr
Altmire	Clay	Fattah
Andrews	Cleaver	Foster
Arcuri	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baca	Cohen	Fudge
Baird	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Baldwin	Conyers	Giffords
Barrow	Cooper	Gonzalez
Bean	Costa	Gordon (TN)
Becerra	Courtney	Grayson
Berkley	Crowley	Green, Al
Berman	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Berry	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Dahlkemper	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Hall (NY)
Boccheri	Davis (IL)	Halvorson
Boren	Davis (TN)	Hare
Boswell	DeFazio	Harman
Boyd	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Higgins
Bright	Dicks	Hill
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Himes
Butterfield	Doggett	Hinche
Cao	Donnelly (IN)	Hinojosa
Capuano	Doyle	Hirono
Cardoza	Driehaus	Hirono
Carnahan	Edwards (MD)	Hodes
Carney	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Castor (IN)	Ellison	Holt
Castor (FL)	Ellsworth	Honda
Chandler	Engel	Hoyer
Childers	Eshoo	Israel
Chu	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee (TX)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kilroy
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Kissell
 Klein (FL)
 Kosmas
 Kratovil
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Luján
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Massa
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McMahon
 McNerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)

NOES—168

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Bartlett
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Billirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costello
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Ehlers
 Emerson
 Filner
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes

Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Harper
 Hastings (WA)
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Hergert
 Herseth Sandlin
 Hoekstra
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline (MN)
 Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Ehlers
 Emerson
 Filner
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes

Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta

McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Olson
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Rehberg
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Souder

Space
 Stearns
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Barrett (SC)
 Barton (TX)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Boucher
 Capps

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1149

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE DIFFICULT CHALLENGES AND HEROISM OF BLACK VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 238, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 238.

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]
 YEAS—383

Aderholt
 Adler (NJ)
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Boccheri
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell

Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cao
 Caputo
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Childers

Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden
 Wamp
 Whitfield
 Davis (AL)
 Deal (GA)
 Dent
 Fallin
 Hall (TX)
 Inslee
 King (NY)
 Lynch
 Mack
 Moran (KS)

Paul
 Radanovich
 Reichert
 Scalise
 Stark
 Stullivan
 Tanner
 Westmoreland
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Graves
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Driehaus
 Duncan
 Edwards (MD)
 Edwards (TX)
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Graves
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kilroy
 Kind
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Kissell
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Kosmas
 Kratovil
 Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Lance

Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Massa
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahan
 McMorris
 Simpson
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Putnam
 Quigley

Rahall
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Latta
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Sutton
 Taylor
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultzt
 Waters
 Watson
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (OH)
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—49

Abercrombie	Dent	Murphy, Tim
Ackerman	Dingell	Owens
Baca	Doyle	Pascarell
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Paul
Barton (TX)	Gallegly	Radanovich
Bishop (NY)	Gohmert	Rangel
Blackburn	Grijalva	Reichert
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Boehner	Herger	Scalise
Boucher	Hoekstra	Stark
Boustany	Inslee	Stupak
Calvert	Jordan (OH)	Sullivan
Capps	King (NY)	Tanner
Carter	Larson (CT)	Westmoreland
Cole	Linder	Whitfield
Davis (AL)	Mack	
Deal (GA)	Moran (KS)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1159

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the Leave of Absence request granted by the U.S. House of Representatives, I was not in attendance for votes February 22–26, 2010, so that I could support my family through the tragic and unexpected death of my 16-year-old niece.

Were I in attendance, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4425 (RC No. 49); H.R. 4238 (RC No. 50), H. Res. 1066 (RC No. 52), H. Res. 1059 (RC No. 53), H. Res. 1039 (RC No. 54), H. Res. 1046 (RC No. 55), Hastings (WA) Amendment to H.R. 2314 (RC No. 56), Flake Amendment to H.R. 2314 (RC No. 57), H. Res. 1074 (RC No. 61), H. Res. 944 (RC No. 62), the Motion to Recommit H.R. 4626 (RC No. 63), H.R. 4626 (RC No. 64), H. Res. 1085 (RC No. 65), Concurring with the Senate Amendments to H.R. 3961 (RC No. 67), H. Con. Res. 227 (RC No. 68), Hastings (FL) Amendment to H.R. 2701 (RC No. 70), Schauer Amendment to H.R. 2701 (RC No. 71.), the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2701 (RC No. 72), and H. Con. Res. 238 (RC No. 74).

I would have opposed H. Res. 1083 (RC No. 51), Abercrombie Amendment to H.R. 2314 (RC No. 58), H. R. 2314 (RC No. 59), H. Res. 1098 (RC No. 60), H. Res. 1105 (RC No. 66), Reyes Amendment to H.R. 2701 (RC No. 69), and passage of H.R. 2701 (RC No. 73).

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2701, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2701, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, we will consider H.R. 4247, Keeping All Students Safe Act, and further action on the jobs agenda.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, we have 4 weeks before our next district work period, and I would like to inquire from the gentleman about the upcoming legislative schedule during the next 4 weeks and what bills does he expect the House to consider prior to the Easter recess.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would expect a number of items, certainly the jobs agenda, which will be fulsome and we will be pursuing over the next months. Small business growth, tax cuts to spur growth and jobs will certainly be on the agenda in the coming weeks, in addition to addressing health care and the 2011 budget.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that.

So, from my understanding, we can expect to have a vote on a health care bill between now and the Easter recess. If that is the case, I ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, what is the thought about what that bill would look like? And I would ask the gentleman does he expect this bill to be the President's bill or will there be actually a chance for the minority to participate in crafting a health care bill?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Well, the gentleman and I had the opportunity, a historic opportunity, I might say, to participate in an extraordinary event in the history, perhaps, of our country. I'm not sure that I can cite another instance certainly in my career when a President has spent a whole day sitting with the legislative branch, the leadership both of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the Senate and the House and also of the committee Chairs. I think that was an unprecedented meeting. I thought it was an extraordinarily good meeting

for the American public as I thought it was a good meeting for all of us who participated.

I think what the public saw was each side thoughtfully and clearly, from an informed basis, expressing their view as to what was needed and how to get to where we wanted to go. It also indicated, I think, to the American public legitimate differences of opinion on the ways and means, if you will, of effecting health care reform, which obviously the overwhelming numbers of the American public believe is necessary. As I quoted, as you recall, both President Obama and Presidential candidate MCCAIN in the debate in October of 2008 both said that health care reform was necessary, and Presidential candidate MCCAIN indicated that he thought we needed a program that covered all Americans with affordable health care.

Now, that's the context in which we're going to move forward. I thought it was a productive, positive opportunity for us and, as I said, the American public. We are moving forward. The President indicated we'd be moving forward. The President, as you point out, I don't think he has a bill yet, but he's put language of the 11-page document you've seen and that was referenced at the meeting—he's put that on the table. It is obviously an attempt to reach agreement between the Senate-passed bill and the House-passed bill, which, although this was not a conference in the classic sense of a conference, in many ways it was, I suppose, a superconference in that rarely is the President in the room, but obviously Republicans and Democrats were in the room and had their time to discuss the President's proposals, trying to resolve differences between the two Houses. Certainly it's going to be taken into consideration over the next few days, I would think, to see whether or not there can be a resolution.

In addition to that, I tell my friend honestly that we went through a number of aspects of the health care bill in which I think we found common ground, and many of us said that. I think some of us were surprised that some Members were as focused as we think we are on certain items.

First of all, I think there was agreement on principle, if not on application of that principle, and that was that the solution is to be found in the delivery of health care through the private sector. And, in fact, both bills in the Senate and the House provide for private sector insurance companies to be involved and to be the insurers and to be the agents for financing health care insurance for Americans.

In addition, Dr. COBURN was very clear that he thought we needed to focus on wellness, on prevention. There are, in both bills, substantial provisions which deal with that, with wellness and prevention, best practices, with innovation, with efficiencies in the delivery of health care, health information technology, other issues.

In addition, he spoke of eliminating fraud, waste, and abuse. As you recall,

and both of us listened to him, he made the point that he thought 1 in 3 health care dollars were not spent on the delivery of health care. Now, they weren't all waste, fraud, and abuse. We know that there are very substantial administrative costs in health care. And as I responded to Senator COBURN, there are very substantial provisions related to waste, fraud, and abuse in both bills and in the President's suggestion.

In addition, the purchasing of policies of insurance across State lines was discussed by both sides. I think the President indicated, I think, we can reach agreement on that. I hope we do. And insurance pooling to acquire health insurance at lower prices was also discussed, not only with respect to small business, but, obviously, we discussed it with individuals who do not have availability to group policies.

The answer, therefore, to your question is we certainly hope we can move forward. We hope we can reach some areas of agreement.

I want to tell you very frankly, I don't think we have any intention of starting over with a clean slate, as you requested. I want to be honest with the gentleman. Literally thousands and thousands of hours have gone into countless hearings participated in by both of our parties, countless markups, public markups with amendments offered both in the House and the Senate. But that does not mean that these are set in stone. Therefore, the answer to your question is I continue to be interested in your thoughts, but if the thoughts are simply to, as Mr. BOEHNER indicated, scrap it, and Mr. ALEXANDER said that as well, I frankly don't think that's a very productive direction to go in given the complexity and challenge that confronts us.

There was a lot of discussion about polling data in yesterday's meeting. In point of fact, we believe that the polling data does indicate that Americans are not happy with this bill. In my view, in part they're not happy because they've seen it be the center point of confrontation, controversy, and, from my perspective, a lot of misinformation.

But having said that, I think every poll seems to reflect that when you ask them about component parts, do they believe that preexisting conditions ought not to be a disabling factor in the receipt of insurance, a very high percentage of the American public says, yes, they think that ought to be not a factor. Do they think that there ought to be lifetime caps? They think no. If they have insurance, they want to keep it, and if they get really sick, they want to make sure their insurance compensates them for that. They also want to make sure that they are not bankrupted in a year that they have a very serious illness because the insurance company has capped what they can get in any one year.

So there seems to be, on the individual items, pretty high support—and

when I say "pretty high," high 50s, 60s, and sometimes in the low 70s—of various component parts of the bill. I think if we can respond to that which the public is for and listen to the public, I think we can have some success. And we look forward to working with you over the next few weeks to see if we can come to agreement. The President made it very clear that he wants to do that. I reiterate we want to do it.

But the President also made it clear, if we can't do it, then we're going to proceed, and that's what he told the American people he was going to do. And, very frankly, he was elected handily just a little over a year ago, and he said what he wanted to do was a health care plan which would provide access for Americans to affordable quality health care. And, in fact, that's what JOHN MCCAIN said in that debate in October of 2008 when they were both debating each other. That was not a contentious issue. They had differences of how to get there, but covering all Americans with affordable, quality health care was not one of the contentious issues.

I know that was a long answer, but I wanted to place it in context for my friend so that productively we can work on what has passed the House, passed the Senate, and if we can make changes that would lead you or members of your party to support legislation, then I think we can have a productive discussion about that. On the other hand, frankly, if it's simply scrap all the work you've done or we're not going to play, then I think we won't have much progress.

□ 1215

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that in-depth explanation of where he and his side is on this debate.

Without prolonging this colloquy, I would just say to the gentleman, on display yesterday were clearly two different visions for how we want to address health care in this country. Clearly, the Republicans, by our attendance there and the engagement in that discussion, indicated that we too care about people's health care and want to do something to increase the quality, access, and affordability. We just have a very different way of trying to go about it.

There are some areas in concept where we do have agreement. We just don't care for the bill. And the reason is, Mr. Speaker, the bill, from our opinion, is very much a bill which imposes on people in this country a preferred way of going about providing health care and covering people in terms of their illnesses. And we believe that on balance, it is better to err on the side of people and their individual choices and the way they think their health care should be delivered and in what form.

So I look forward to perhaps the gentleman working with us to see if we could, if he doesn't like the word "scrap," move away from the construct

of the bill which, as the gentleman indicates, the public has rejected, as well as a significant portion of his caucus has rejected, and perhaps moving away from that construct and to try and address some of the issues that we discussed in a different context would be a way forward.

But if, as the gentleman indicates, the majority is unwilling to set aside the Senate bill, will the gentleman indicate whether we would then proceed with reconciliation? And is it his position that he will not take reconciliation off the table?

Mr. HOYER. It is my position, in the Republican tradition of using reconciliation for very major pieces of legislation, all of your tax bills in 2001 and 2003; as a matter of fact, reconciliation has been used 22 times since 1980. Sixteen of those times it was used by the Republican Party when you were in charge. Apparently you thought that was a procedure that was appropriate to pass. As a matter of fact, JUDD GREGG, when he was criticizing us for criticizing reconciliation, said, "What is wrong with a majority vote?" We think there is nothing wrong with a majority vote.

There is a filibuster in the Senate. That is under their rules. I think those rules are impeding the work of the American people. But be that as it may, they are the rules. There is also a rule that provides for consideration of legislation through a process that is called reconciliation, a fancy name for simply saying there are things that are important, you can put them on the table, you can pass them in a time frame. But, as Americans would expect, a majority of the representatives of the American people have to vote for it. So I am not going to take that off the table.

But it has been the President's expression, my expression, the Speaker's expression, the Majority Leader of the Senate's expression we would prefer not to use that, not because we think it is a wrong procedure, but because we would like to create a broader consensus if we can.

But I will tell my friend, I think he to some degree misquoted me, I think you could draw that inference, the American people don't like the bill because of what surrounds it. When you ask them about the internals of the legislation, as I said, they respond positively to it.

And I will tell my friend about polls. A lot of expression about polls yesterday in our meeting. My friend will recall that we considered expanding the Children's Health Insurance Program. You will recall President Bush vetoed that program. You will recall that I stood on this floor and said, "Do you understand 72 percent of Americans are for expanding SCHIP?" Notwithstanding that, we couldn't get sufficient votes from your side of the aisle to override the President's veto, notwithstanding the fact that 72 percent of the American people thought children in the richest country on the face

of the earth ought to be covered, ought to be healthy, ought to be included in our health care system. So you saw it differently. I understand that. You used your judgment.

I frankly think that the American people want us to do what we are trying to do. They want to make sure we do it right and don't undermine the security they now have. And that is our intent as well.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

I would ask the gentleman if we could turn, Mr. Speaker, to the question of jobs. As he indicated, that will be a focus of the next 4 weeks. The gentleman said earlier in this colloquy that we just participated in an historic event yesterday, that he in his career here has not seen an opportunity like that where both sides sat down with the President for 7 hours and the President spent the time on the issue of health care.

In that vein, in terms of trying to open up dialogue and discussion, it would be very appropriate, I believe, Mr. Speaker, for us to give equal or more time to the pressing issue of jobs in this economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Leader BOEHNER and I have forwarded to the gentleman as well as Speaker PELOSI a letter indicating that we would like to have a bipartisan jobs summit akin to what we had yesterday with the President, but perhaps just in this body. The Speaker's press reports have indicated that the Speaker is willing to engage in such a jobs summit. And I would just like to ask the gentleman if he intends to respond to the Leader and my letter. And if not, certainly responding here is just as well as to perhaps a scheduled time for such a summit to occur.

Mr. HOYER. I think the same letter was sent to both of us, and I was yielding to the Speaker to respond. But I will respond here. I think that is a good idea.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that. Does he have any sense of when we could expect the acceptance and the scheduling of such an event?

Mr. HOYER. Let me talk to the Speaker about it and see what schedule, and we will talk to you about it. But I think certainly jobs is an absolutely critical objective of ours this year, as you know, as it was last year.

The good news, as you know, is that CBO says that over a million jobs were created in the last quarter, or retained in the last quarter as a result of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. As the gentleman also knows, in the last quarter, the last 3 months of the Bush administration, we lost on average per month 726,000 jobs. As the gentleman also knows, on average over the last 3 months we have lost 35,000 jobs. That is extraordinary. That is 5 percent of what we lost the last 3 months just a year ago. So that is progress. We are moving forward, but that is not success. Success will be, as you and I both know, when we are adding jobs, when we are creating jobs.

Unfortunately, over the last 8 years we have had the lowest job production in this country than we have had since Herbert Hoover. As a result, we are very much down in terms of supply of jobs for people who are out of jobs and need jobs to support themselves and their family.

I want to also say, I want to thank the gentleman and his colleagues on his side of the aisle for their positive participation yesterday, positive in the sense that yes, we didn't agree, but nobody expected there to be agreement down there, that everybody was all of a sudden going to change their perspective of how you get to where we all want to get. But I thought the American people, as I said, had an opportunity to see some serious people who had differences of opinion discuss them in a civil and, I thought, productive manner. I think that is a good civics opportunity for the American people.

Very frankly, we ought to do more of that. Because, unfortunately, all too often they see us on the floor not on the uncontentious, which we do pretty much working together, but they see us on the contentious, where tempers can get pretty hot, and the American public draws the inference that that's all we do. They don't like it, and I don't blame them. I know you and I don't like it either.

I want to thank you and your colleagues for your participation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I look forward, along with the Leader and the rest of my colleagues, to begin working with the gentleman and the majority to start on an earnest attempt to create an environment for job creation so that people in this country can get back to work.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

WE MUST PASS A JOBS BILL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I think it is important to note the change in the economy as we move forward. But the challenge to us as Members of Congress, even as we reflect on the enormous impact the investment dollars have had, last year in January of 2009 we had lost 779,000 jobs. In January of 2010, only 22,000 jobs were lost and the

economy is percolating. But 22,000 is unacceptable.

So we must pass a jobs bill now. But we must also be concerned not only for the recently unemployed, for the white collar workers, but we have to be concerned about the young workers, 18 to 30. We have to be concerned about the chronically unemployed, or the ex-felon who has paid his or her dues, has a family, and other than getting work, they would be dependent on a government handout. They don't want that.

So when we talk about jobs, we have to worry about seniors, and working families, and people who have been unemployed for a long period of time. We have got to put a job in their hand. And that is what I want to do, work to get jobs for the American people and the 18th Congressional District.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE NEED FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, besides the question and the need for jobs, I think it is important for America and for my colleagues to know that the meeting yesterday at the White House at Blair House was a vitally important meeting. I know that many Americans were able to see it in its purity, meaning that you were able to watch it live.

The President intended that we have the opportunity to hear real discussion. And I would beg to differ whether this was an opportunity for just show

and tell. I have listened to the President's commitment to health care reform. I have listened to the Democratic leadership's commitment to health care reform. And I have spent hours listening to constituents through town hall meetings in August and traveling throughout the district. As they speak about jobs, I want us to be very clear.

□ 1230

Every time I am in the district, someone says, are you going to get health care reform passed?

This is real meat and potatoes. This is about premiums that go up about \$1,400 to \$2,500 a year on a family of four. This is about 36 million to 40 million who are now uninsured. This is about working people who are uninsured. This is about families whose children have asthma or respiratory illnesses or preexisting conditions and are not able to get insurance because of birth defects or other illnesses that their children are born with, a preexisting disease. And presently, you cannot get insurance if you have a preexisting disease.

This is, likewise, about the non-competitive atmosphere that health carriers live in and that we suffer under. And you know what?

Before we began discussing this health care reform, we accepted it as the norm. We didn't think anything of it. In Alabama, one insurance company in the entire State. In a State like Texas, only three insurance companies. That is not competition. That is, you take me the way I want you to take me, and if you don't like it, move on.

That's the kind of atmosphere that health care insurance companies live in. They tell us, move on. Preexisting disease, move on. You can't pay your premiums, move on. You're in the hospital and we don't want to pay it, get out. That's what atmosphere Americans are living in.

And I realize that those who have insurance that they like, they don't see these horror stories of people dying because they don't have insurance. And I want the people who have insurance to keep their insurance. But 45,000 people die every year because they don't have health insurance.

So yesterday's meeting was a serious meeting, because the bottom line of it was, we're listening and we're open, but we have to move on because we're losing people's lives.

And so this preexisting disease will be eliminated. Premiums will go down. We'll save billions of dollars because of the health care reform process.

At the same time, I want us to do good. I want to make sure that we save physician-owned hospitals. Many of you probably have been patients in physician-owned hospitals, where doctors have come back in and purchased failing hospitals by a small percentage of ownership, where their name is on the line, where they want high quality hospitals like the 40-plus that are in the State of Texas, like Doctors Hospital, like St. Joseph's Hospital, like

the hospitals down in the Valley, where individuals who are paying the amount of money can count on doctors being there who care. And so I want this health insurance reform not to close down those hospitals and eliminate those employees who are there.

We can do a lot of good, and we must pass health care reform. We have to already recognize that we've passed the antitrust exemption so that you can have more competition in these States. We did that this past week. That's a good thing.

But we've got to make sure that we increase CHIPS for our children, Children's Health Insurance Program, protect Medicare and Medicaid, and open the floodgates for Americans who work and have dignity to have dignity when they are sick. The last thing you want to do is to be on your sickbed and to lose your house, your car, your ability to support yourself while you're losing your job because you're sick.

So I simply say that it is time now for the wake-up call to go out amongst all of those who care. America needs to wake up. When America demands, this legislative body, this People's House acts.

And so I thank the President for transparency yesterday. I thank the Democratic leadership for transparency. I thank my friends on the other side of the aisle for attending and engaging.

But after all is said and done, there will still be 45,000 people that are dying every year because they don't have insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the call is being made. The question is, will we answer. I will, for one, answer for health care reform for America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO STACY PALMER-BARTON

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my long-time

staff member and dear friend, Stacy Barton, as she departs from her distinguished service to the United States Congress.

Stacy has served as my chief of staff for four terms as the Representative from Ohio's Third Congressional District. She has served the people of my community with great enthusiasm and unrivaled commitment, and will be missed by all who have had the honor of working with her.

Stacy grew up in Calvert County, Maryland, where her grandparents owned a tobacco farm. She attended both Northern Middle and Northern High schools, later enrolling at St. Mary's College to major in psychology and sociology.

After beginning her graduate studies at the University of Delaware, Stacy enrolled in a fellowship program through the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. It was then that she began her Hill career, serving the distinguished Member from Washington, D.C., ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Following her fellowship, Stacy remained in Representative NORTON's office for another year before leaving the Hill.

She later served as the director of government relations for a firm with a focus on urban development, representing clients such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

I first met Stacy in her work with the U.S. Conference of Mayors and for the City of Dayton, Ohio.

Stacy formed her own lobbying firm, the Barton Company, in January 1999, advocating for many mayors throughout the country. She served as the city of Dayton's Washington, D.C., office when I served as the mayor of Dayton.

In 2002, Stacy closed her firm to serve as chief of staff in my Congressional office on the seventh floor of the Longworth House office building. She served with great distinction and, at times, has been the only African American chief of staff to a Republican Member in either the House or the Senate. It has been suggested that Stacy Barton may be the first female African American to serve as chief of staff to a Republican Member of the House. And I dare say that she probably is the only staffer from ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON's office to serve as chief of staff to a Republican Member of Congress.

As is often the case with life on the hill, Stacy's public service has come with many personal sacrifices, including spending a great deal of time away from her husband, Lee, and her two incredible children, Morgan and Miles.

In addition to the battles fought daily on Capitol Hill, Stacy has lived with multiple sclerosis, cared for her mother who was diagnosed with cancer, and raised a daughter with autism.

Stacy and I have worked together for over 10 years. Stacy, as you leave the seventh floor of Longworth this evening, I owe you my sincere thanks and gratitude for your friendship and for your counsel.

I wish you a happy new beginning.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
POPE COUNTY JUDGE JIM ED
GIBSON

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Pope County Judge Jim Ed Gibson for his commitment to the citizens of Arkansas. Judge Gibson's efforts and participation within the community continues to make an impact. For his service and leadership, Judge Gibson has been named the Russellville Area Chamber of Commerce's 2009 Citizen of the Year.

This is a fitting honor for a man who not only has served the public, first as a member of the Pope County Quorum Court for 15 years, but since 1999, as the County Judge. His service continues beyond the office, serving as a member of a long list of organizations and boards across Arkansas.

Judge Gibson has spent his life putting his community first. It was just a few short years ago the city of Atkins was hit by a tornado. Judge Gibson was one of the first people at the scene making sure people were taken care of. I appreciate his dedication, and I'm confident that that will continue.

The people of Pope County are fortunate to have such an exceptional neighbor. I ask my colleagues today to join with me in honoring Judge Jim Ed Gibson, a wonderful public servant who is always and always will be dedicated to the people of Pope County.

CLOTURE AND RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. And in the aftermath of the summit yesterday, the February 25th health care summit that took place, and over the 7-plus hours from gavel in to gavel out, the 6½ or so hours of actual dialogue that took place, I think a lot of the American people were watching. And I'd like to think also that a lot of the American people were busy at work and didn't have the opportunity to sit and watch it all in a transfixed, focused fashion, like a lot of us tried to do, and some of us actually succeeded, although I was not among them. I watched as much as I could and I had the closed caption crawler going underneath the screen while I was conducting meetings. So I tried to pay attention to the flow and look back on what happened.

I listened to the dialog in here a little bit earlier with the majority leader on the Democrat side and the Whip on the Republican side going through their end-of-the-week colloquy that

gives us a sense of where we're going next week and a little bit of a feel for how we work together with each other. In fact, some of those negotiations are taking place here in front of the American people in an open fashion, as we would like to think that most of our negotiations and deliberations are.

I would go back through some of that discussion to put a bit of a different perspective on the situation of reconciliation, which is the nuclear option. And even though the gentleman from Maryland continually made the point that Republicans had used the reconciliation option, Democrats called it the nuclear option back then. The means of putting an end to the filibuster—you have two choices in the United States Senate: One of them is you come up with 60 votes to break the filibuster. That's called a cloture vote. And if you can't come up with the 60 votes, the other thing is, in tax or spending issues, so the government doesn't come to a grinding halt due to lack of revenue to keep the machinery of government working, they have devised a method called reconciliation. And that reconciliation will require only 51 votes, not 60 votes in the Senate to move a bill.

But the point that is missed here today is that the reconciliation-nuclear option—and it depends, on the Democrats' part, on whether they're talking about Republicans implementing reconciliation or Democrats implementing reconciliation. To a Democrat, when Republicans discussed implementing reconciliation in the United States Senate, they called it the nuclear operation. But when it's HARRY REID and the Democrats seeking to implement reconciliation, they say it is reconciliation. Don't you know that's getting together to get things resolved, rather than blowing the place up. Isn't that something? That you can have two different terminologies for the same action, and they can be so far apart, 180 degrees apart from each other. Democrats committing reconciliation is reconciliation, warm, fuzzy, group hug, 51 votes. What would you have against a simple majority passing something here in the United States Congress? That's their argument. We heard it here a little bit earlier. Who would be against a simple majority?

And the second part of it is the nuclear option. The last time Republicans discussed the reconciliation tactic in the Senate that Democrats continually pounded upon and called it the nuclear option was when we were seeking to confirm judges to the Federal court. And to get a vote in the Federal court, there was a filibuster in the Senate.

Now, you can look through the history of this and study who said what when and all the protocol that's part of that. That's for Senate historians to know most of that.

But for me, Mr. Speaker, I'll take it down to this: When I read the Constitution, it requires for confirmation of

these Federal judges the advice and consent of the Senate. It doesn't say the consent of 60 votes in the Senate. It says, the advice and consent. Consent implies the majority of the Senate. And many of those Senators that were opposed to reconciliation because they were Democrats in the minority at the time also argued that the President of the United States, President Bush, didn't accept enough of their advice.

Well, you can work about this term, but any time that the Constitution contemplates the consent, it never requires a super majority for the concept. It always requires a simple majority in the United States Senate for consent of the Senate, advice and consent. And so, when a confirmation, or the ratification of a treaty, or something that is in our Constitution required by the Constitution, comes up for confirmation in the Senate and it requires advice or consent in the Constitution, I believe that it is a constitutional violation for the Senate to use a filibuster, because they're denying the consent of the Senate, or they're setting an arbitrary majority after the Constitution, the fact of the Constitution, to take it up to 60 votes.

So the argument that this Republican made in 2005 against a whole series of active Democrats that were for the nuclear option was, you have a constitutional obligation to provide a vote to confirm or not confirm these appointments by the President of the United States. You cannot hold them out to a cloture vote and a filibuster simply by one Senator putting a hold on an appointment to the Supreme Court, for example.

So it's a constitutional restraint. I've had this debate with many of the Senators on the other side, including my junior Senator from Iowa, TOM HARKIN, who disagreed with me.

□ 1245

But in any case, that's the Republican position. We default to the Constitution.

The Democrat position is Republicans use reconciliation. Well, not when it came to confirming judges, for example. That's a simple majority because that is the definition of consent in the Senate.

So here we are with this large initiative called—well, I think the President used it yesterday—the term ObamaCare.

Now, Thomas Jefferson once said large initiatives should not be used on slender majorities. And a slender majority could only be how this large initiative of ObamaCare—to use his term for it—has been advanced through the House by only a three-vote margin and only one Republican—and I think he would reconsider if he could do it today—voted for that bill.

Many Democrats voted against the bill. The margin was so utterly slender and narrow in its majority that it can't be defined as anything else except as exactly one of those things that Thomas Jefferson warned against doing. And

when you go to the United States Senate, they wheeled and dealt in back rooms—happened here on the House side, too—until they got right down until the night before the announcement of the cloture vote, and they made their last deal with BEN NELSON to exempt Nebraska from the increases in Medicaid costs. This is a word, Mr. Speaker, that everyone should be alarmed at that when they see it show up in any legal document: in perpetuity. Exempt Nebraska from the increase in Medicaid costs in perpetuity.

And that deal, along with lowering the language of the Stupak language in the House, the House language—which did a fairly effective job in preventing Federal dollars from being used for abortions should the ObamaCare pass—the Senate version of it and the language that was negotiated by BEN NELSON certainly rolled this thing back to where there would be more Federal dollars used for abortion because of the language change, even though they made the argument that there would be an accounting of those dollars.

I would say that the Nelson language still set the Federal Government up to be the broker of insurance premium dollars that would be directed to insurance companies that were paying for abortions out of those premiums and to compel the American people to fund something that is, to them, fundamentally immoral is an unjust thing for this Congress to do.

We did it inadvertently in the aftermath of *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. By 1976, we had implemented language that prevented Federal dollars from funding abortions under either the Hyde amendment or the Mexico City Policy.

But this language—and the House actually allows some—the language from the Senate allows a lot more to go to abortions.

And to reflect back on my position, Mr. Speaker, this would have been I believe in the 1980s or perhaps in the very early 1990s when my Congressman came to my district and we had a meeting. Just a town hall meeting in the basement of the Lutheran church, and I remember the count of the chairs that were there, and they were mostly full. In fact all, I believe, were likely full. There were 80 people in the basement of the church in a town hall meeting. Pretty good-sized meeting for a little town. Not by last August standards, Mr. Speaker, but by normal standards.

And as my Congressman presented his pitch on his proposal for a national health care act that was essentially dovetailed into *HillaryCare* later on, he asked, How many of you in the room are employers? And that's why I remember the room. Eighty people in the room, 12 of us raised our hands that are employers. He said, Now I want to ask you how many of you provide health insurance for your employers. And 11 hands went down, and mine was the only hand that was up. So I was the only employer in that room of 80 with

12 employers, I was the only one that provided health insurance for my employees.

And so my Congressman walked over to me where I was sitting in the front row—and I remember him—and he looked at me and he leaned down, folded his hands behind his back and he leaned down and said, How much would it change the way you do business if my health care bill, the way I propose it, becomes law? And I looked at him and I answered the way I usually answer, which is what's on top of my mind and tip of my tongue. And my answer to his question, How much would it change the way you do business? And I said, Probably not very much unless you're going to compel me to fund abortion. In that case, I quite likely will no longer be an employer. And those were the exact words that I used.

And so it was essentially said that I don't think I can go forward and make a living and take money out of people's paychecks and contribute out of our own asset base of the company and fund a Federal machine that is funding abortions that I am compelled to pay for if I have employees. I could have laid all of my employees off. I could have gone off to operate my business alone, cut down our revenue stream substantially—and my stress load, I might add. But still under that bill, it probably would have compelled me to carry my own insurance that I would have had to fund abortion with.

In any case, when I made that statement that I quite likely would no longer be an employer if they compelled me to fund abortions through the premiums that I would be compelled to pay, that brought the house down. I had no idea that the people in that church felt as strongly about that issue as I believe on that issue and believe today. But that emotion in that church was a solidly held fundamental, moral, and religious principle that remains today stronger than it was then.

And this Nation operating within the House of Representatives and within the United States Senate could contemplate the idea that they could produce or approve a product called health insurance, confer everyone a new policy that they own, and among those policies set up a health insurance exchange that is going to bring dollars in and flow dollars out that would go to fund abortion clinics? With the majority of people in America opposed to abortion and a smaller percentage yet that are in favor of abortion, elective abortion, abortion on demand? That is a fundamental moral principle that would be violated.

And when the Speaker of the House at the end of the meeting yesterday chastised the Republican leader and said there is no abortion coverage in this bill, it was an incorrect statement. One might make the argument that the Stupak amendment in this House reduced—and they might argue—and I think it's an uninformed argument—that the Stupak amendment in this

House eliminated Federal funding for abortion. It eliminated a lot of it, and it was a significant step forward; but it didn't eliminate it all. So the Speaker's statement at the President's meeting yesterday at the Blair House was incorrect.

And it was further incorrect because it seems as though as we listened to all of the dialogue that unfolded yesterday, that the President was negotiating off of the Senate version of the bill more so than he was of the House version of the bill, in which case there is no question that Federal funding would flow in and pay for abortions. And at a very minimum, no matter how you argue it, at a very minimum there would be Federal funds that would be paying for the administration of abortions and the administration of an exchange that would be brokering policies that funded abortion. That is how the language works. I have read the language carefully, and I know that some of that has been amended but not to the satisfaction of the pro-life groups in America. Not to my satisfaction either, Mr. Speaker.

So we've watched as this unfolded, and we asked what about this reconciliation package that the majority leader seems to speak in support of, although he didn't answer the question directly. He accused Republicans of using reconciliation. He didn't actually call it the "nuclear option" this time. Of course he wouldn't because they are loading the gun getting ready to cock the hammer and pull the trigger on the nuclear option. And they can't have us calling it the nuclear option because the American people then understand it blows up the system in the United States Senate.

But, truthfully, we don't have much to say about it from a formal perspective here in the House of Representatives because we do have a simple majority that controls. We have a Speaker of the House that controls the entire protocol from top to bottom right down to whether there will be amendments offered, what those amendments will be, and who will be able to offer them. And it's happened over and over and over again, and Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know this.

There is a Rules Committee that meets up here on the third floor of the House. Tiny little room. It is, I believe, the smallest committee room in the House of Representatives. It's the least frequented by the press. It doesn't have cameras in it like C-SPAN cameras cover every other committee on this Hill. This is a hole in the wall on the third floor at the end of the elevator where nobody goes. It's the hole in the wall. And it's the hole in the wall gang and they're directed by the Speaker of the House. And they shut down the amendments that are offered especially by Republicans unless they deem that amendment would embarrass or divide Republicans, in which case they'll allow that to be debated so Republicans can be embarrassed, divided and have a vote here on the floor.

So when I go up there, I offer amendments that I believe are constructive, that are designed to perfect legislation, designed with things in mind that the Founding Fathers had when they designed the Constitution itself. In other words, it was imagined that there would be people of open minds and differing levels of experience that would come together to have a dialogue and discussion about what's good and right for America.

And then we get to the formal process of our discussion. First, we do hearings and we listen to the American people come in and tell us what we they have to say about the policy, and presumably the members sitting on the panel don't know as much about the subject as the witnesses.

So we learn; then we ask questions. Then we go back and do research. Then we come back together and decide whether we want to start to move a piece of legislation, in which case in the subcommittee there is a markup process. And that is that any Member can offer an amendment; they can offer an unlimited amount of amendments. They can debate each of those amendments, 5 minutes for each member of the committee if they so choose. And they can ask for a recorded vote and vote that amendment up or down.

That process does take place in the committee, and a lot of it is outside the scope of what the American people are paying attention to. And then the subcommittee product is designed to go to the full committee. And I will speak about the Judiciary Committee because we've seen the example this week where for their time in this past year, out of the Judiciary Committee, even though there is a relatively legitimate amendment process and debate process that takes place there—not on the floor; I wouldn't argue that takes place on the floor in that fashion with any regularity, but in the committee it seems to.

And three times out of the Judiciary Committee there has been a Republican that has offered an amendment to an important bill, that amendment has passed with bipartisan support, and the product of the committee's work, the product that after the bills are amended and receive a final passage out of the committee, then they come over to be put on the calendar to be debated on the floor of the House.

And the majority leader controls that agenda, and the Speaker's power influences it considerably. And the bill does go through the hole-in-the-wall Rules Committee to be reviewed and consider any other amendments other Members might want to offer. And in a perfect world, every bill would come to the floor under an open rule for any Member that had a good idea would have the opportunity to convince the other Members of the merits of their good idea in the form of an amendment or perhaps submit themselves to the rejection of the House if the House did not approve such an amendment.

But what has happened three times just out of the Judiciary Committee and just in the last year has been a bill that was amended by a Republican in the Judiciary Committee that changed by the time it got to the hole-in-the-wall Rules Committee and was written up differently by committee staff and presented to the Rules Committee with a different bill number in it, but the substance of it changed because they amended and struck the very legitimate amendments that were voted on by Republicans and Democrats. And I will be specific about this.

In the Bankruptcy Clawback Bill, I introduced an amendment in the Judiciary Committee that would have banned anyone from receiving relief under the bill for bankruptcy if they had defrauded their lender. Now, that vote on that amendment passed by a vote by 23-3 in the Judiciary Committee. And curiously when the Bankruptcy Clawback Bill came to the floor, it had been passed through the Rules Committee, given a new number and almost, but not exclusively, but I will say from my view the only substantive change was they took my language out of the bill that had been approved by Democrats and Republicans by a vote of 23-3 and inserted language that said only if you have been convicted of defrauding can you be denied the benefits under the bill. That is what took place after the fact which renders the very formerly legitimate work of the committee moot.

What is the point of meeting and having this discussion and this dialogue? What's the point in hearings for information? What's the point of the subcommittee and the committee markup and all of the staff work and all of the debate work that we do and introducing the amendments and voting them up and down and building the legitimacy of a proposal to go to the Rules Committee and have the product of the Judiciary Committee pulled down, put through the shredder, so to speak, and a whole new bill manufactured with a similar, maybe even identical, bill title on it?

□ 1300

That's what's going on in this Congress, and then the bill comes to the floor under a closed rule so that no Member can offer to put the language back in. And we call this America, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, and this is the draconian approach. The American public doesn't find out unless I come down here and say, Mr. Speaker, because the hole-in-the-wall gang is controlling this at the direction of the Speaker.

If anyone wonders whether I am embellishing this or not, they could actually look at the records of the Rules Committee on the eve of November 7 when the health care bill finally passed here in the House of Representatives. On that morning, near 1:30 in the morning, I offered 13 separate amendments to seek to perfect—well, I couldn't

have perfected that bill—improve the health care bill. Thirteen separate amendments I offered them. I argued them before the Rules Committee, and I was chastised by at least one member of the Rules Committee because I had wasted the paper and the staff time, and I should have known that the Speaker had ordered that my amendments would not be approved by the Rules Committee, so I was wasting all of their time by making my argument on how to improve the health care bill.

Now, I will suggest, and I will hold firmly to this, Mr. Speaker, the franchise that I am entrusted with by the voters of the Fifth District of the State of Iowa is every bit as legitimate as the franchise of the Speaker of the House, the House majority leader, the House majority whip, any committee Chair, subcommittee Chair, let alone the Republican leaders and the ranking members.

Every one of us has a franchise. We are $\frac{1}{435}$ of the American people, and the people in my district deserve every bit as much representation in this Congress as the people do in any district. But the structure, this iron-fisted structure in this House of Representatives, that's what breaks down deliberative democracy and it undermines our constitutional Republic and it denies the very legitimate, knowledgeable input from all across this country.

Think about how this works. Each one of us, 435 of us, we go home to our respective districts. We build a network of advisers that are continually providing input for us, teams of people that are experts in their field, and it filters that information and it comes to us in a whole series of ways, town hall meetings, individual meetings, individual lobbyists, yes. Lobbyists do a very effective and useful job on this Hill, and if anyone gave me information that wasn't accurate or honest, if they found out about it, they would bring it back and correct it to me first.

If I thought they were doing so intentionally, they would not come back to talk to me, ever. There's a credibility there in that arena that I think somebody needs to stand up for the lobby, and it is a matter of providing a lot of valuable information. We find that directly from our individual constituents in our town hall meetings and our professionals and all of the outside organizations that work outside and on this Hill trying to effect the change.

All of that information that I have talked about, the input from 300 million people pours through to us in all of these avenues that I have described and many more—and through the media, I might add. And all of that, save what might be in the mind of the Speaker and the Speaker's staff, maybe the leader and the leader's staff, but I am not sure of that. All of that, all the rest of that is denied by the draconian approach here in the House of Representatives that shuts down the debate process, prohibits amendments,

and limits an important bill to just selected amendments that help some people look good or position themselves so they will vote for the broader bill. That's what it has come down to. It has not come down to the evaluation of what's the best policy or even taking the risk of allowing someone to have their say and forcing a vote on an important issue.

It was amazing to some degree that the Stupak amendment, which is the pro-life amendment in the health care bill, was even allowed to be debated here on the floor. Many people didn't think that would happen. I will suggest that it wasn't the wishes of the Speaker of the House, clearly. She seems to want to tell the Pope where the church stands on the life issue. I suggested it was the political dynamics that enough Democrats would vote against the bill if they didn't get to have their debate in the vote on the pro-life Stupak amendment, and that was the dynamic.

So often the American people don't get to see what goes on behind the scenes or what's going on in the calculus. When you read your history book, it comes down to, well, the Congress evaluated this policy and that policy and some thought this, some thought that. The decision came down to a policy decision, and we had a vote and moved forward. Way too often the American people need to know it's not a policy decision; it's a political decision.

When you see someone make a tough political decision, way too often they are making a decision that has more to do with their political survivability than it has to do with the policy. And statesmanship is hard to find, but thank God we still have some in this House. I am hoping we will get a lot more statesmanship coming in November when the energy of the American people will be manifested at the polls.

I am very grateful that I have seen 9, 12 Tea Party, patriot, constitutional conservatives all over this country filling up the town hall meetings, doing their own rallies, packing the west side of this Capitol out here to the tune of tens of thousands of people with only a 2- or 3-day actual notice. Another 2- or 3,000 came in for a press conference the following Saturday—it was on the 5th—and the 9th of November the American people came here to have their voice heard.

After this bill passed the House at 11 o'clock on a Saturday night, then the fight went over to the Senate. There in the Senate, in the Senate, there was a rally that took place with thousands of people there, in a press conference, I should probably call that, to be technically correct. As that battle went on in the Senate and they were counting votes one after another and special deals were being made—not just for the Cornhusker Kickback, but to exempt Florida from the cuts to Medicare Advantage.

A lot of people look at Florida and conclude that that's the most senior

State in the Union because a lot of retirees went to Florida. Well, you should look, really actually look at Iowa, and the Fifth District in Iowa is the most senior congressional district in America. Iowa has the highest percentage of its population over 65, and of the 99 counties in Iowa, I represent 10 of the 12 most senior counties in the most senior State in the Union. So I will say the Fifth District of the State of Iowa is the most senior congressional district in America.

We didn't get an exemption from the cuts in Medicare Advantage. Just Florida. Why? Because TOM HARKIN was already going to vote for the bill and because CHUCK GRASSLEY was going to vote "no" on the bill, so Iowa didn't get that particular exemption, and I am thankful we didn't. If we had, I would have liked to think that Iowans would have stood up like Nebraskans did and say, We don't want any special favors. We want to be considered in the same category as all the other Americans. In fact, it's unconstitutional to treat members—citizens of the United States and one State differently than we treat citizens or residents in another State. That is unconstitutional, and I believe the Cornhusker Kickback was unconstitutional. I believe the Florida exemption for Medicare Advantage was unconstitutional, and I believe the special clinics up in Vermont that went to BERNIE SANDERS to get him on board also—I don't know that I would actually say they are unconstitutional, but they are unsavory.

If one looks at the bill and the language that came out from the President on last Monday at 10 a.m. exactly and, not coincidentally, 72 hours before the Blair House meeting started yesterday, that proposal, which is not a bill but only bullet points and platitudes, does include at least 11 other special treatments that look a lot like the Cornhusker Kickback or the Louisiana Purchase or the Florida Medicare Advantage exemption or all of the expensive billions of dollars for community health clinics in the State of Vermont. The list goes on and on and on, the unsavory list.

A significant number of United States Senators have spoken against reconciliation. They called it the "nuclear option." The quotes are there from President Obama, Hillary Clinton, JOE BIDEN, name your Senator on the Democrat side. CHRIS DODD is another one.

There are others that have spoken, have spoken against the nuclear option because they wanted to block confirmations to the Federal court. Now they say, warm and fuzzy, we will all join hands. What do you have against a simple majority vote?

Well, I have a good number of things against the way things are being done here. To think that the President of the United States is negotiating with the Senate and the House, trying to put together enough votes to pass an amendment to the Senate version of

the bill—now, remember, the Senate version of the bill passed Christmas Eve, and presumably that's the will of the United States Senate.

Now they are talking about passing amendments to the Senate bill out of the Senate so that they can amend it and pass two pieces here in the House, send it to the President and the President would sign a bill, and then he would sign a reconciliation bill right behind that that would amend the first bill. All of that to avoid, what? A conference committee, a conference committee that was envisioned by the Founding Fathers that would have Democrats and Republicans sitting at the table.

This is the first time in history, as far as I know, that the President of the United States has convened a conference committee from the executive branch of government. This is a legislative function, Mr. President. He taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago. I have a lot of constitutional disagreements with the President of the United States. And I will say that my chief of staff studied at the University of Chicago Law School during that period of time but was adept enough to study her constitutional law in a different classroom. I am thankful for that. That has been useful to me to have that kind of input and advice.

I see my friend from Georgia, one of our outstanding Dr. Phils in the conference and one of the most knowledgeable about health care and many other things, here to join us. I would point out that the OB/GYN, Dr. PHIL GINGREY, has, by my recollection, delivered about 5,200 babies in his time. That's a great gift of life that I appreciate.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously the gentleman has, during this hour, spoken of, already, some of the arcane machinations that are going on in regard to how the Democratic majority and President Obama plan to get this bill, this massive health care reform bill, through the Congress and to describe, of course, that process called reconciliation.

I know it's difficult for a lot of folks, Mr. Speaker, even Members of Congress sometimes, to understand all of these parliamentary tricks which can be used, but clearly, the American people, the American people can't be tricked. I absolutely have faith in them. We have heard from them during the town hall meetings all across this country; last August, the Million Med March on Washington; the Doctors for Patient Care march on Washington; the Tea Party Patriots; the Freedom First Foundation, led by a former majority leader, Dick Armey.

Mr. Speaker, these folks cannot be tricked, and I was really disappointed in yesterday's proceedings. I think it was a good thing that the Republican minority was willing to go over to Blair House, realizing that the deck

was stacked against them, but to have an opportunity, in a very respectful way. And I commend my colleagues in the House and the Senate and my Republican colleagues. I think they did a great job of that.

But it was clear, it really was clear on Monday of this week, Mr. Speaker, when the President put his 11-page edition online to add to the Senate bill, it was pretty clear that there was going to be no opportunity—and my colleague from Iowa has stated this so well—no opportunity, as the President, Mr. Speaker, gave, indeed, to Iran and their leader, Ahmadinejad, to say, We are going to unclench the fist. I guess, Mr. Speaker, the President was referring maybe to the fist of the previous administration, his predecessor in the oval office. I am not sure. But to say to Ahmadinejad, of all people, We are going to unclench this fist and we are going to reach out with the hand of friendship as we negotiate with you in regard to trying to appease you and beg you and triple-dog dare you to stop in your progress toward developing a nuclear weapon.

I didn't see that kind of outreach yesterday at the Blair House as I watched the deliberations on television, Mr. Speaker, and that really is what we needed. That really and truly is what we needed. We needed to have an agreement from the President and from the Democratic majority to start over, to reject this bill that the American people, what, 70 percent, Mr. Speaker, had rejected. They want us to start over, and they know now that we have great Republican ideas. They were articulated.

I can't go through a litany of all the Members. I think there were 18 or 20, including House and Senate Republicans. Dr. TOM COBURN talked about medical liability reform. Senator ALEXANDER spoke eloquently. Our own Dr. BOUSTANY from this body I thought did a great job representing our doctors.

□ 1315

We know now what's in store for us. I want to just say to my colleagues and to my friends back home, let's don't give up the fight. If this is what they want to do, if this is what the Democratic majority wants to do, if this is what the President insists on, they're going to pay the consequences politically. Unfortunately, that's not the greatest concern; the greatest concern is, of course, the health, both the physical health and the economic health of this country, and I think it's at great peril.

I know we have other Members, Mr. Speaker, that have joined Representative KING and want to weigh in on this, and so I will yield back. But I thank you for the opportunity to be with you this afternoon.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the doctor, the Congressman, the gentleman from Georgia for joining us. We have about 23 minutes or so to continue the dialogue.

I appreciate the intellect that has been brought to this debate. I think that there were some outspoken conservatives that would have contributed substantially to the discussion yesterday had that been the format. And perhaps this is our format to weigh in on that. So I am happy to see that also my friend from Minnesota, MICHELE BACHMANN, has arrived on the floor, and I would be happy to yield so much time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you. I appreciate my colleague, Mr. KING, and also Mr. GINGREY. I will only be just a few minutes. I really wanted to be just a part of this discussion. I saw that you all were down here speaking on a very important topic that has captured a lot of people's attention this week, in particular with this event that happened yesterday.

I think one thing that we have demonstrated very clearly is that those of us on the Republican side of the aisle from the beginning of this debate have always had positive solutions that we have wanted to address. I know Dr. GINGREY has even laminated on a little card that he carries in his breast pocket, "Rules of the Road Going Forward on Health Care." And of course, he's a physician; he understands better than anyone how patients are impacted by what we do here in Washington, D.C., and I appreciate the work that he has done.

We also have the Declaration of Health Care Independence that my colleague, Mr. KING, has put up. Mr. GINGREY has contributed mightily to this document as well. It states, "A Road Map Going Forward, The Rules of the Road on What We Need to Do Going Forward on Health Care." There are 10 items. Some of them include: Don't add to the crushing Federal debt that our Nation is currently experiencing; don't force people to violate their moral conscience and pay for other people's abortions; don't force taxpayers to pay for the health care of people who are residing illegally in the United States.

It goes through a series of 10 items that we should at least be able to agree on. As a matter of fact, if I recall, I think the President himself has agreed on almost all 10 of these items about health care. So let's go ahead and sign. And I think about 100 Members of Congress so far, or thereabouts, have signed this document. We hope the President will, we hope the Members of the Senate will. We think this is a good roadmap going forward. But we also think, as an olive branch, we truly can have bipartisan health care reform. That's what we want to have because it's not about us, and it's not about Washington, D.C.; it's about people back home and what the costs are going to be in health care.

Eighty-five percent of Americans really like their doctor, they like their health care—they just want it to be cheaper. We agree. Very simple plan that we can do. We can let any American buy any health care policy they

want anywhere in the United States, number one. Do it with your own tax-free money. And beyond that, fully deduct on your income tax return any other expenses. That alone is a 32-page bill. Anyone can understand that. We can at least start there and bring the cost down on health care for all Americans. Why can't we at least start there? Do something to help the American people, but not create a big bureaucracy, not have the government take over one-sixth of the economy, all the things that the American people don't want us to do. But this is a great roadmap going forward.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield just for a second on the gentledady's point.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. The gentledady from Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely right. And it was interesting, in that discussion yesterday that was a little tête-à-tête between the President and Senator ALEXANDER about whether or not the health insurance premiums for people within the exchange, as they were forced, according to provisions in the law, if it becomes law, the requirement that everybody has health insurance—it was pointed out by the President that many in the exchange would be paying less for their premiums. But as we deciphered through that—and I think maybe the President finally came to the realization that what Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER from Tennessee, a part of the Republican team, the point he made was absolutely right, the premiums were coming down, Mr. Speaker, only because some of those that were purchasing as individuals through the exchange mechanism were getting government subsidies. So if you subtract the subsidy from the cost of their health insurance policy—that by law they would be forced to purchase, even if they didn't want to—then, yeah, the price would come down. But it ain't free, Mr. Speaker. That subsidy is paid for by, guess who? John Q. Taxpayer, that's who. And that's where the big cost driver in this bill is. That's why the bill costs \$1 trillion over 10 years, all these subsidies.

So to suggest that these individuals, albeit forced to purchase health insurance, are going to get a reduction in their premium, absolutely not true when you add what they pay and what their taxpayer friends, men and women of this country that are busting their you-know-whats to try to support themselves and the people in the exchange, pay, the price goes up.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I take us to the Declaration of Health Care Independence, as has been spoken about by us, the "New Rules of the Road." I wanted to point out that of these 10 provisions, first, there are six items here on what went wrong.

And then I think it would be instructive to simply read, if I can, the conclusions that are drawn.

First it says, of all of these things that have happened—the cavalier attitude of ignoring the Constitution, denying the interests of the people, it irreparably cripples the American economy, it creates an inescapable new tax by imposing individual and employer mandates on it—now, we go through all of these laments on what went wrong, it sounds a lot like the Declaration of Independence, where you have those laments on what went wrong. Then it says, and I'll read from it, "We have appealed to the decency of the elected majority to respect the rights of all Americans, but their leaders have been deaf to the voice of the people. We are appalled by their cavalier disregard of the Constitution and the demands of the people. We are repulsed by their blatant political bribes and kickbacks. We, therefore, the people and Representatives of the United States of America, do solemnly publish and declare that health care reform, as a matter of principle, must"—and we hit these 10 principles, which I will read.

But I want to point out that Dr. GINGREY brought the tablets down from on high. We looked them over a little bit and said, we like these principles, we like a few other principles in addition to. And then we think that your eloquence is lacking, but your principles are very sound. And so the Gingrey tablets are into the middle of this document, and the language is something that is more to the credit of the Founding Fathers than it is the father who has delivered 5,200 babies. But the substance there is substantial, and the 10 points that remain are that we are committed to these 10 principles to go forward.

"We will preserve and protect as inviolate the doctor-patient relationship"—and I will summarize the balance rather than read them. We refuse to add to the national debt. We will enhance rather than diminish the quality of care. Our negotiations will be transparent, and there will be no favoritism. We will treat people the same. Whether they are Members of Congress, the Speaker of the House, or whether they are the poorest person in America, we are all going to have an equal opportunity here in this country—no special deals for Members of Congress.

There will be no funding for abortion. There will be no new mandates for people, for employers, or for States. We will not fund illegals. We will provide equal protection under the law and the Constitution for everyone. No special treatment. And we will use the marketplace of choice as the ideas.

That is the "New Rules of the Road Going Forward" that have these 100 or so signatures of Members of Congress on it. This is the foundational piece of work that was collaborated by many, sparked by MICHELE BACHMANN, the tablets, many of them from Dr. GINGREY, whom I would yield to.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This Declaration of Health Care Independence that Representative KING just so eloquently described—and I love the format—Mr. Speaker, when you look at those principles, those 10 principles that Representative KING just described, these were—and are—promises that this majority, this Democratic majority—Speaker PELOSI, Leader REID and, indeed, President Obama—have said on so many occasions over the last—well, really 2 years now, because he was saying these things as he was asking the American people to give him an opportunity to bring "change you can believe in" as the next President. Indeed, he was successful in doing that. But many of these principles, if not all of them, were promised by the President.

I don't know what the total number, Mr. Speaker, of signatures on the Declaration of Health Care Independence Representative KING has. I think it approaches 100. I'm not going to ask him specifically how many of those are Republican versus how many are Members of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives. But golly, I would think that Speaker PELOSI would love to sign this Declaration of Health Care Independence. Indeed, yesterday at the Blair House, in her summary remarks, she said that absolutely not one dime of taxpayer money was going to fund abortions. I don't know if she really believes that, Mr. Speaker. I guess the proof of the pudding will be whether or not she can get that contingent of people that agreed with Representative BART STUPAK and insisted that the House version of health care reform be amended such that there was absolutely a provision that would make sure the Hyde amendment was not violated, that being that no public dollars would go toward the funding of abortion.

So I just bring that point up. And I would say to Representative KING, I'm sure he's going to continue to try to get signatures, but this ought to be bipartisan. And maybe he has already done that; maybe, Mr. Speaker, he can explain that to us. But from my vantage point, I don't see Speaker PELOSI's name on the bottom of the declaration, but hope springs eternal.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution to this document and the thought process that this defines.

If there are those in this House of Representatives who have objections to the positions that are taken here on this road map, the "New Rules of the Road Going Forward," I would like to hear them step forward and tell me what it is that they object to. Do they object to protecting the doctor-patient relationship as inviolate? Do they want the government to make those decisions out of their computer base and their committee?

A lot of us have seen the flowchart, the Health Choices Administration czar. It's really interesting, when you see a piece of legislation—H.R. 3200 in this House—that says in there that there will be all of these decisions made and power invested in the Health Choices Administration Commissioner—I call him "the commissarissioner"—and this is a person to be named later and a committee to be named later by legislation to be passed whenever they can put the votes together and get the President to sign it. And you give the power of that discretion to an individual and a commission to be appointed by the President—and yes, some of them confirmed by the Senate; I don't think all of them are confirmed by the Senate—and they take a look at all 1,300 health insurance companies in America, they take a look at all 100,000 policy varieties in America, and then they decide, what are all these companies going to have to do to amend their policies so they can be approved by the Health Choices Administration commissarissioner's judgment? And that is competition? That is top down, ends up, crams it into single payer.

For the people who objected and said I wasted paper when I took 13 amendments up there to the "hole in the wall gang" to try to get an opportunity to have a debate here on the floor, they said I wasted paper and I wasted staff time. I would say, take that 3,200-page bill in the House and however many thousand pages you cooked up together in the Senate and all the pages that are back there in the secret staff meetings that nobody sees in those formerly smoke-filled rooms that by order of the Speaker now aren't smoke filled anymore, but they do have guards on the outside and regular people don't get in, Republicans don't get in, low-ranking Democrats don't get in. The guards are there to guard the high-ranking officials. It isn't necessarily that they're better defended than they normally are. But I want to paint the image right: Doors with lots of wood down the hallway and on the inside, and leather in the middle of that, formerly smoke-filled, big conference tables, key staff in there, key leaders of only the Democrats in there—meaning HARRY REID, NANCY PELOSI, and whoever they approve—doors closed, thousands of pages, decisions being made by staff because Members can't keep all this in their head either. Take all of that paper, Madam Speaker, and put that back in the tree.

□ 1330

I think I can invent an extruder to turn that into a tree, and we could put a little bark on that and stand it up somewhere in one of those—what do we have? We've got some of those rainforests that exist in our zoos. If you put your fingernails into the bark of those trees in the rainforests, it's made out of rubber. So, on the inside, let's put that bill right back in the tree, Mr. Speaker.

I've had enough of this. The American people want to wipe this bill off the board. If they do anything, they want to start over. A lot of them don't even want to do anything because they don't trust this Congress.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding back to me. I realize time is getting short, but thank you for a few more moments.

Of course, I think it's important that our colleagues understand that those 13 members of the whole-in-the-wall gang—I think our colleague from Iowa was referring to the esteemed Rules Committee. It's just one more opportunity that we don't have to get our amendments made in order so that we can bring them down on the floor, whether we are Republicans in the minority or Democrats in the majority who are very concerned about many provisions in this bill. Yet, you know, they don't get to have an up-or-down vote, which is totally wrong.

I just want to say, just within the past week, I got a call from a former physician Member from Georgia, from Middle Georgia, Dr. Roy Rowland, who served with distinction here for about 12 years. He was here during the HillaryCare debate.

In a very bipartisan way, Dr. Rowland, along with Dr. Ganske from Iowa and other Members, had some great ideas in regard to not only bringing down the cost, Mr. Speaker, but also in regard to making sure that more people had not only an insurance card—you know, that doesn't guarantee you access to care—but that they had an opportunity, through expanded community health centers, which were not necessarily government subsidies, to pay on a sliding scale depending on what their incomes were. Obviously, Medicaid patients, many of them, were seen in community health centers.

Also, Dr. Rowland had the idea of having medical liability reform—Dr. Rowland, a family practitioner from Dublin, Georgia. I just mention him because I would say to the President and to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: we can do this. Yes, let's unclench the fists. Let's get away from what we were trying to cram down the throats of the American people that they clearly don't want. Let's start over with good ideas like Dr. Rowland had 16 years ago and like, I think, many of my colleagues have today on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back for concluding remarks from my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time, I thank the doctor from Georgia.

I was just thinking what it would be like if you'd sit around your card club at night and you'd deal out a deck of cards, 52, and for every one of those cards, this man has delivered 100 babies. That's pretty impressive, and I can't get over that number and what that means.

Some people think that Republicans don't have compassion. How could you

have more compassion than Dr. GINGREY has?

So, when I look at this debate that's going on, it is past the point of the nuances of what's right and what's wrong here. It's pretty simple stuff. The White House, the Speaker PELOSI majority and the Harry Reid majority, right down those doorways, have started from this beginning. The beginning that they started with was single-payer national health care, HillaryCare as referred to by Dr. GINGREY. That goes back 15 years ago.

When they first put that together, I had the flowchart. In fact, I've got the replication of that flowchart in my office, the HillaryCare flowchart. That is a scary thing. It was only in black and white back in the early 1990s. The one we see today is in full color. With the next generation, when they try this again, it will be in 3-D, and you'll have automatic built-in 3-D, and you'll be able to see all of the components they put together. The more you can see, the more it scares you.

That's what they started with—the single-payer National Health Care Act. It is socialized medicine. I don't know what you'd produce if it weren't. I don't know how you would devise socialized medicine to look much differently than the way they've started.

Now, they did morph it along the way and move away from the more pure definition, but when you start with something—let's just say that the goal is to cook up a pot of stew. You start with a big old soup bone, a meat bone, and get as much meat as you have on that bone that hasn't been trimmed off. You toss that in a pot, and then you put a lot of water in there, and you start to simmer that. Then you look at it and you think, Well, what does this thing need?

Well, it looks a little sick and gray, so you start cutting some vegetables in there, and you throw in some carrots and some celery and some potatoes, and whatever else you can find to pitch into that stew. You know, after a while, it might look pretty good. They were making it look better and better, the Democrats on the other side. By the way, it was buying votes. Yeah, I might vote for that if you put some carrots in the stew. Give me a little celery. I like the flavor of that. I like a little corn in there myself. I'm from Iowa, you know. After a little while, here is this simmering pot of stew.

Then they tasted it. The American people let them know. They spit it out. They didn't want a potful. This is a toxic stew. They started with a tainted soup bone with HillaryCare in the beginning. If you start with a tainted soup bone and if you cook up a stew, no matter what you add to it, it's still going to be toxic. The American people concluded they don't want a potful of toxic socialized medicine stew. They don't want a bowlful. They don't want a cupful. They don't want a spoonful. They don't want any measure. They have spit out ObamaCare. It is a toxic stew that has been cooked up by the

liberals in this Congress. Less than a fourth of the people in this country think something like that ought to be done, and they haven't tasted it yet. A lot of us have looked ahead and have a sense of what it tastes like.

So I will suggest this, that we should clean the slate off, as the gentleman from Georgia has intimated and has maybe not specifically said when he said, Mr. President, you need to unclench your fist.

I'd suggest the President ought to treat Republicans as good as he did Ahmadinejad when he said to our enemies in Iran who have pledged to annihilate us—the Great Satan—in a nuclear war, if they can. He said to them—dialogue, in his mind, solves it all, you might notice. He said, If you'll just unclench your fist, speaking to Ahmadinejad, we will extend our hand. We will negotiate with the Iranians without preconditions. We will just talk. We will talk it through.

Did you notice, when the President met with Republicans and Democrats yesterday, President Obama insisted upon preconditions? He insisted that his bill, which was the Senate and House bill, plus the 11-page bullet point talking points with no legislative language added by the White House, would be the basis for the discussion. He refused to take the nuclear option off the table. Can you imagine negotiating with the Iranians that way? Because that's what he has initiated. They have the nuclear option on the table. They refuse to take everything off the table. The President insisted upon preconditions of starting with his bill, ObamaCare, by his own definition.

I'm saying, Couldn't you at least have treated the Republicans as good as you treated the Iranians? Give us a clean slate. Start without preconditions. I'd be willing to take Republicans' comprehensive plans off the table. Let's just go ahead and take them up one at a time—single, stand-alone pieces of legislation that we all know are good policy and that don't have to have a backroom deal.

Let's end lawsuit abuse, number one; full deductibility; sell insurance across State lines; and respect the time of the Speaker's gavel. Also, we have made that part very clear, I think, in this presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence. I appreciate the participants in this Special Order hour here that closes out the week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

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. JACKSON LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3961. An act to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 until February 28, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 2, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2009, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Kathy Dahlkemper	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
Hon. Kathy Dahlkemper	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
Hon. Kathy Dahlkemper	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
Hon. Kathy Dahlkemper	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94		2,193.80				2,386.74
Aleta Botts	11/30	12/03	Switzerland		1,947.00		6,144.90				8,091.90
Margaret Nicole Scott	11/29	12/03	Switzerland		2,176.00		4,066.10				6,242.10
Committee total					4,745.88		12,404.80				17,150.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Israel	12/27	12/30	United Arab Emirates		1,543.95						1,543.95
Commercial Air							7,755.10				7,755.10
Hon. Linda Pagelsen	12/27	12/30	United Arab Emirates		1,543.95						1,543.95
Commercial Air							8,225.10				8,225.10
Hon. Kay Granger	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
Commercial Air							2,727.00				2,727.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
Commercial							2,727.00				2,727.00
Hon. Maurice Hinchey	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Hon. Norm Dicks	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Hon. John P. Murtha	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
BG Wright	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Paul Juola	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Jeff Shockey	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
Commercial Travel							2,727.00				2,727.00
John Blazey	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Celes Hughes	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/26	11/28	Italy		500.00						500.00
Hon. Jerry Lewis	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	11/23	11/24	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	11/25	11/26	United Arab Emirates		192.94						192.94
Commercial Travel							2,727.00				2,727.00
Hon. Nita Lowey	11/12	11/15	Israel		1,471.00						1,471.00
Hon. Steve Israel	11/12	11/16	Israel		378.00						378.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	11/10	11/13	Switzerland		1,994.25						1,994.25
	11/13	11/15	France		2,364.47						2,364.47
Commercial Travel							9,365.25				9,365.25
Hon. Mike Honda	11/10	11/13	Switzerland		2,276.94						2,276.94
	11/13	11/15	France		3,535.92						3,535.92
Commercial Travel							8,125.20				8,125.20
Paul Terry	11/9	11/15	Korea		2,400.00						2,400.00
	11/15	11/17	Japan		458.50						458.50
Commercial Travel							8,490.50				8,490.50
Kristi Mallard	11/9	11/15	Korea		2,400.00						2,400.00
	11/15	11/17	Japan		458.50						458.50
Commercial Travel							8,420.50				8,420.50
Jeff Ashford	11/9	11/11	Mexico		676.10						676.10
Commercial Travel							563.83				563.83
Stephanie Gupta	11/8	11/10	Mexico		676.10						676.10
Commercial Travel							563.83				563.83
Ben Nicholson	11/8	11/10	Mexico		676.10						676.10
Commercial Travel							563.83				563.83
Jim Holm	11/8	11/10	Mexico		676.10						676.10
Commercial Travel							563.83				563.83
Jennifer Miller	11/7	11/13	England		2,036.00						2,036.00
Commercial Travel							9,618.38				9,618.38
Adrienne Ramsay	11/7	11/11	England		1,058.00						1,058.00
Commercial Travel							7,696.38				7,696.38
Shalanda Young	11/7	11/17	Kenya		3,130.05						3,130.05
Commercial Travel							9,224.10				9,224.10
Committee total					41,228.49		90,083.83				131,312.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to United Arab Emirates (UAE), Afghanistan, Israel, Germany, October 19–29, 2009:											
David Kildee	10/20	10/21	UAE		310.37						310.37
	10/21	10/22	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/22	10/23	UAE		359.47						359.47
	10/23	10/27	Israel		504.00						504.00
	10/27	10/29	Germany		640.00						640.00
Commercial Transportation							9,668.60				9,668.60
Debra Wada	10/20	10/21	UAE		310.37						310.37
	10/21	10/22	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/22	10/23	UAE		359.47						359.47
	10/23	10/27	Israel		504.00						504.00
	10/27	10/29	Germany		640.00						640.00
Commercial Transportation							9,668.60				9,668.60
Jeanette James	10/23	10/27	Israel		504.00						504.00
	10/27	10/28	Germany		320.00						320.00
Commercial Transportation							9,668.60				9,668.60
Rebecca Ross	10/20	10/21	UAE		310.37						310.37
	10/21	10/22	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	10/22	10/23	UAE		359.47						359.47
	10/23	10/27	Israel		504.00						504.00
	10/27	10/29	Germany		640.00						640.00
Commercial Transportation							9,668.60				9,668.60
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, October 26–30, 2009:											
Michael Casey	10/26	10/27	Kuwait		109.00						109.00
	10/27	10/28	Iraq								
	10/28	10/29	Kuwait		109.00						109.00
Commercial Transportation							7,138.60				7,138.60
Paul Arcangeli	10/26	10/27	Kuwait		109.00						109.00
	10/27	10/28	Iraq								
Commercial Transportation							7,138.60				7,138.60
Roger Zakhem	10/26	10/27	Kuwait		109.00						109.00
	10/27	10/28	Iraq								
	10/28	10/29	Kuwait		109.00						109.00
Commercial Transportation							7,138.60				7,138.60
Visit to Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates (UAE), October 29–November 2, 2009:											
Hon. Madeleine Z. Bordallo	10/30	10/31	UAE		710.00						710.00
	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/1	11/2	UAE		710.00						710.00
Commercial Transportation							8,184.10				8,184.10
Hon. Duncan Hunter	10/30	10/31	UAE		710.00						710.00
	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/1	11/2	UAE		710.00						710.00
Commercial Transportation							8,184.10				8,184.10
Hon. Larry Kissell	10/30	10/31	UAE		710.00						710.00
	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/1	11/2	UAE		710.00						710.00
Commercial Transportation							8,184.10				8,184.10
Robert L. Simmons, II	10/30	10/31	UAE		710.00						710.00
	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial Transportation	11/1	11/2	UAE		710.00						710.00
Michael Higgins	10/30	10/31	UAE		710.00		8,184.10				8,184.10
	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/1	11/2	UAE		710.00						710.00
Commercial Transportation							8,184.10				8,184.10
Visit to Norway, United Kingdom (UK), Germany, November 2–10, 2009:											
Vickie Plunkett	11/3	11/6	Germany		1,072.00						1,072.00
	11/6	11/7	Norway		192.00						192.00
	11/8	11/11	UK		450.75		9,860.00				9,860.00
Commercial Transportation											9,860.00
Lynn Williams	11/3	11/6	Germany		1,072.00						1,072.00
	11/6	11/7	Norway		192.00						192.00
	11/8	11/11	UK		435.75		9,860.00				9,860.00
Commercial Transportation											9,860.00
Cathleen Garman	11/3	11/6	Germany		1,072.00						1,072.00
	11/6	11/7	Norway		192.00						192.00
	11/8	11/11	UK		435.75		9,853.30				9,853.30
Commercial Transportation											9,853.30
Eryn Robinson	11/3	11/6	Germany		1,072.00						1,072.00
	11/6	11/7	Norway		192.00						192.00
	11/8	11/11	UK		435.75		9,860.00				9,860.00
Commercial Transportation											9,860.00
Delegation Expenses	11/2	11/9	UK					4,216.19			4,216.19
Visit to Israel, November 12–16, 2009:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	11/13	11/16	Israel		1,203.00						1,203.00
Mike Casey	11/13	11/16	Israel		1,203.00						1,203.00
J. Phillip MacNaughton	11/13	11/16	Israel		1,203.00						1,203.00
John Wason	11/13	11/16	Israel		1,203.00						1,203.00
Delegation Expenses	11/13	11/16	Israel					13,733.74			13,733.74
Visit to India, Japan, Singapore, November 10–19, 2009:											
Kevin Gates	11/12	11/14	India		871.99						871.99
	11/15	11/17	Japan		833.02						833.02
	11/17	11/19	Singapore		806.69						806.69
Commercial Transportation							10,880.90				10,880.90
Douglas Bush	11/12	11/14	India		871.99						871.99
	11/15	11/17	Japan		833.02						833.02
	11/17	11/19	Singapore		806.69						806.69
Commercial Transportation							10,880.90				10,880.90
Visit to Israel with CODEL Lieberman, November 12–17, 2009:											
Hon. Susan Davis	11/13	11/17	Israel		1,332.17						1,332.17
Visit to Germany, November 15–18, 2009:											
Mark Lewis	11/16	11/18	Germany		640.00		7,148.00				7,148.00
Commercial Transportation											7,148.00
Visit to Romania, Italy, Germany, Luxembourg, United Kingdom (UK), November 21–29, 2009:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Solomon Ortiz	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Carol Shea-Porter	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. David Loebsack	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Erin C. Conaton	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Thomas Hawley	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Mark Lewis	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. J. Phillip MavNaughton	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Jennifer Kohl	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89
	11/25	11/26	Italy		250.00						250.00
	11/26	11/27	Germany		128.00						128.00
	11/27	11/27	Luxembourg								
	11/27	11/29	UK		306.00						306.00
Hon. Ryan Crumpler	11/23	11/25	Romania		611.89						611.89

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ed Whitfield	12/27	12/28	United Arab Emirates		1,468.95		8,149.10				9,618.05
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	12/29	12/31	United Arab Emirates								
Hon. Jerry McNerney	12/27	12/28	United Arab Emirates		1,468.95		8,149.10				9,618.05
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	12/29	12/31	United Arab Emirates								
Hon. Cliff Stearns	12/27	12/28	United Arab Emirates		1,468.95		8,149.10				9,618.05
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	12/29	12/31	United Arab Emirates								
Jack Seum	12/27	12/28	United Arab Emirates		1,468.95		8,149.10				9,618.05
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00						75.00
	12/29	12/31	United Arab Emirates								
Committee totals					7,429.37		110,312.80		16,214.10		143,956.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per Diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Doug Anderson	11/8	11/15	Turkey		1,330.00						
Round-trip Airfare							7,662.90				
Alex Cruz	10/5	10/6	Honduras		303.00						
Round-trip Airfare							1,846.70				
Theodros Dagne	11/8	11/9	Uganda		354.00						
	11/9	11/11	Kenya		856.00						
	11/11	11/12	Sudan		268.00						
	11/12	11/13	Kenya		428.00						
	11/13	11/15	Tanzania		646.00						
Round-trip Airfare							17,566.40				
Hon. Bill Delahunt	12/6	12/8	Russia		960.00						
Round-trip Airfare							7,678.40				
Marissa Doran	11/9	11/13	Haiti		1,036.99						
Round-trip Airfare							909.50				
Susan Epstein	11/7	11/15	Kenya		3,130.05						
Round-trip Airfare							11,033.10				
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	10/7	10/9	Samoa		497.00						
One-Way Airfare							119.00				
	10/17	10/18	Samoa		71.54						
One-Way Airfare							81.00				
David Fite	11/8	11/10	Austria		783.00						
	11/10	11/11	Sweden		453.00						
	11/11	11/13	Belgium		906.00						
Round-trip Airfare							7,830.20				
Brian Forni	11/20	11/21	Canada		345.00		(³)				
Daniel Harsha	10/17	10/20	Switzerland		1,088.00						
Round-trip Airfare							6,143.70				
Valerie Heitschusen	11/10	11/14	Macedonia		1,016.00						
Round-trip Airfare							9,212.80				
Jonathan Katz	11/1	11/2	Israel		482.00						
Round-trip Airfare							6,572.60				
	11/20	11/21	Canada		345.00		(³)				
	11/9	11/10	Austria		424.00						
	11/10	11/11	Sweden		453.00						
	11/11	11/13	Belgium		804.56						
Round-trip Airfare							7,830.20				
Noelle Lusane	11/10	11/11	Kenya		428.00						
	11/11	11/12	Sudan		268.00						
	11/12	11/13	Kenya		428.00						
	11/13	11/15	Tanzania		646.00						
Round-trip Airfare							11,237.00				
Don MacDonald	10/22	10/25	Britain		562.00						
Round-trip Airfare							7,271.40				
Alan Makovsky	11/13	11/15	Israel		1,446.00		(³)				
Robert Marcus	11/8	11/13	Turkey		1,448.16						
Round-trip Airfare							7,662.90				
Hon. Gregory W. Meeks	10/9	10/11	Haiti		536.00						
	10/11	10/13	Colombia		538.00						4,13,227.00
Round-trip Airfare							2,371.80				
Jasin Nurjadi	12/13	12/14	Indonesia		313.22						
	12/14	12/19	Timor-Leste		1,351.40						
Round-trip Airfare							688.60				
Diana Ohlbaum	11/9	11/13	Haiti		941.99						
Round-trip Airfare							909.80				
Hon. Donald M. Payne	11/9	11/11	Kenya		856.00						
	11/11	11/12	Sudan		268.00						
	11/12	11/13	Kenya		428.00						
	11/13	11/15	Tanzania		646.00						4,1,130.40
Round-trip Airfare							11,114.40				
Hon. Mike Pence	12/27	12/28	UAE		552.28						
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00		(³)				
	12/29	12/30	UAE		910.56						
Round-trip Airfare							8,184.10				
Yeem Poblete	10/5	10/6	Honduras		283.00						
Round-trip Airfare							2,197.70				
Jason Steinbaum	11/11	11/12	Macedonia		508.00						4,375.96
	11/12	11/16	Kosovo		792.00						
Round-trip Airfare							8,542.60				
Roby Wagner	10/5	10/6	Honduras		283.00						
Round-trip Airfare							2,191.70				
	11/09	11/11	Haiti		589.00						
Round-trip Airfare							944.80				
Lynne Weil	11/8	11/13	Turkey		1,031.00						
Round-trip Airfare							8,636.20				
Hon. Robert Wexler	10/18	10/20	Turkey		495.00						
Round-trip Airfare							7,365.50				
	11/1	11/2	Israel		482.00						4,3,749.06

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per Diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Round-trip Airfare	11/10	11/13	China		1,039.61				6,572.60		
Round-trip Airfare	11/20	11/21	Canada		345		(³)				
Lisa Williams	11/8	11/12	Kazakhstan		1,338.00						
Hon. Ted Poe	12/4	12/5	Kuwait		464.35						
	12/5	12/6	Afghanistan		78.00						
Round-trip Airfare	10/5	10/6	Honduras		303.00				7,188.60		
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen										4,360.00	
Round-trip Airfare	11/9	11/13	Haiti		1,077.99				2,154.58		
Deanne Samuels											
Round-trip Airfare	11/7	11/15	Kenya		3,130.05				909.50		
Margarita Seminario											
Round-trip Airfare	11/21	11/29	Kenya		2,670.99				9,224.10		
Daniel Silverberg	11/23	11/25	Morocco		637.00						
Round-trip Airfare	12/17	12/24	Brazil		2,891.00				8,086.20		
Hon. Christopher H. Smith											
One-Way Airfare	11/9	11/11	Haiti		589.00				6,803.10		
Cliff Stammerman											
Round-trip Airfare	11/12	11/14	Tajikistan		630.00				909.80		
Shanna Winters	11/8	11/13	Turkey		1,427.00				12,255.53		
Round-trip Airfare	11/8	11/12	Kazakhstan		1,237.00				11,241.90		
Brent Woolfork	11/8	11/12	Tajikistan		550.00					4,2003.43	
Round-trip Airfare	11/12	11/14	Tajikistan						12,615.26		
Committee totals					52,493.74				266,247.87		
									20,845.85		339,587.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Indicates delegation costs

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Maffei, Hon.	12/26	12/31	UAE/Afghanistan		1,543.95		8,520.10				10,064.05
Committee total											10,064.05

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Scott Lindsay	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,278.00		10,458.50				11,736.50
	11/14	11/15	London		458.00						458.00
Andrew Wright	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,278.00		10,056.50				11,334.50
	11/14	11/15	London		458.00						458.00
Christopher Hixon	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,267.48		10,458.50				11,725.98
	11/14	11/15	London		458.00						458.00
Hon. Peter Welch	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,267.50		9,896.50				11,164.00
	11/14	11/15	London		458.00						458.00
Hon. John Tierney	11/11	11/14	Pakistan		1,267.50		9,896.50				13,103.10
	11/14	11/15	London		458.00				1,939.10		1,932.11
Talia Dubovi	11/9	11/14	Macedonia		1,016.00		9,212.80		1,474.11		10,228.80
Hon. Darrell E. Issa	12/21	12/22	Kuwait		466.66		7,315.00				7,781.66
	12/22	12/25	Afghanistan								
	12/25	12/27	Jordan		163.84						163.84
Hon. Aaron Schock	12/27	1/2	UAE		1,468.95		8,652.60				10,121.55
	12/28	12/29	Afghanistan		75.00		(³)				75.00
Hon. Darrell E. Issa	11/20	11/21	Canada		1141.00		(³)				141.00
Laurent M. Crenshaw	11/20	11/21	Canada		116.00		(³)				116.00
Beverly Britton Fraser	10/1	10/6	Antigua		455.00		2,287.20				2,742.20
Hon. Edolphus Towns	10/2	10/4	Antigua		182.00		1,409.20				1,591.20
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	10/2	10/3	Antigua		273.00		2,088.14				2,361.14
Adam Fromm	10/2	10/4	Antigua		273.00		1,556.20				1,829.20
Hon. Aaron Schock	10/2	10/2	Honduras				(³)				
Hon. Lynn Westmoreland	11/25	11/26	UAE		505.00		9,902.10				10,407.10
	11/16	11/27	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
	11/27	11/29	Pakistan		76.00		(³)				76.00
Committee total					13,887.93		93,189.74		3,413.21		110,490.88

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bart Gordon	10/31	11/3	United Kingdom		1,413.89		9,950.20				11,364.09
Leigh Ann Brown	10/31	11/3	United Kingdom		1,413.89		9,950.20				11,364.09
Chris King	10/31	11/3	United Kingdom		1,413.89		9,950.20				11,364.09
Hon. Brian Baird	11/10	11/11	Pakistan		90.00		(³)		456.42		546.42
	11/11	11/12	Afghanistan		78.00		(³)				78.00
	11/12	11/13	Kuwait				(³)				
	11/13	11/15	Bosnia-Herzegovina		792.00		(³)				
Hon. Bart Gordon	11/11	11/14	Italy		2,2123.40		7,048.60		75.97		10,639.04
Hon. Bess Cuaghran	11/11	11/14	Italy		2,2123.40		7,048.60		479.24		9,651.24
Hon. Pete Olson	12/4	12/5	Kuwait		574.32		26.84		252.37		9,745.53
	12/5	12/6	Afghanistan		78.00		(³)				853.53
	12/6	12/7	Kuwait				(³)				
Hon. Alan Grayson	12/12	12/13	Kuwait		109.00		(³) 65.96		159.96		334.92
	12/13	12/14	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
	12/14	12/15	Kuwait								
Chuck Atkins	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,764.00		7,138.60				7,138.60
Christopher King	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,764.00		11,209.10				12,973.10
Shimere Williams	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,764.00		10,777.10				12,541.10
Adam Rosenberg	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,764.00		10,777.10				12,541.10
Leslee Koch Gilbert	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,587.00		10,777.10				12,364.10
Kathleen Crooks	11/7	11/12	South Africa		1,606.00		10,777.10				12,383.10
Dahlia Sokolov	12/14	12/16	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
	12/16	12/19	Antarctica				(³)				
	12/19	12/21	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
Marcy Gallo	12/14	12/16	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
	12/16	12/19	Antarctica				(³)				
	12/19	12/21	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
Linda "Mele" Williame	12/14	12/16	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
	12/16	12/19	Antarctica				(³)				
	12/19	12/21	New Zealand		500.00		(³)				500.00
Committee totals					23,469.79		164,296.74		1,997.49		189,764.02

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Commerical air transportation.

HON. BART GORDON, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. James Oberstar	10/9	10/11	Haiti		628.00		(³)				628.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	10/9	10/11	Haiti		628.00		(³)				628.00
Jimmy Miller	10/9	10/11	Haiti		628.00		(³)				628.00
Hon. Laura Richardson	12/4	12/4	Kuwait		359.00		7,103.60				7,462.60
	12/5	12/6	Afghanistan		118.00						118.00
Hon. Brett Guthrie	12/11	12/12	Kuwait		448.00		7,138.60				7,586.60
	12/13	12/14	Iraq								
Committee total					2,809.00		14,242.20				17,051.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE "IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 22, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1754(B)(2), INFORMATION AS WOULD IDENTIFY THE FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF HAVE TRAVELED IS OMITTED." HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mac Thornberry	10/8	10/9	Middle East		193.02						
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/13	Asia		202.00						
James Lewis	10/8	10/9	Middle East		193.02		11,668.30				12,063.32
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/13	Asia		202.00						
Hon. Jan Schakowsky	10/8	10/10	Middle East		193.06		9,040.70				9,389.76
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/13	Middle East		156.00						
Hon. Jeff Miller	10/08	10/10	Middle East		193.06		8,979.70				9,406.76
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/14	Middle East		234.00						
Eric Greenwald	10/08	10/10	Middle East		193.06		9,040.70				9,389.76
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/13	Middle East		156.00						
George Pappas	10/08	10/09	Middle East		193.06		8,979.70				9,406.76
Commercial aircraft	10/10	10/14	Middle East		234.00						
Mark Young	11/10	11/13	Africa		647.00						
Commercial aircraft	11/14	11/16	Africa		534.00		11,511.50				12,692.50

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE "IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 22, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1754(B)(2), INFORMATION AS WOULD IDENTIFY THE FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN WHICH COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF HAVE TRAVELED IS OMITTED." HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
George Pappas	11/10	11/13	Africa		647.00						
Commercial aircraft	11/14	11/16	Africa		534.00						
Hon. Elton Gallegly	11/11	11/13	Europe		642.34						
Commercial aircraft	11/14	11/16	Europe		630.10						
James Lewis	11/11	11/13	Europe		642.34						
Commercial aircraft	11/14	11/16	Europe		630.10						
Adam Lurie	11/11	11/13	Europe		630.10						
Commercial aircraft	11/14	11/16	Europe		642.34						
Hon. Mike Conaway	12/17	12/19	Africa		486.54						
Commercial aircraft	12/20	12/22	Europe		628.09						
George Pappas	12/17	12/19	Africa		486.54						
Commercial aircraft	12/20	12/22	Europe		628.09						
Harry Hulings	12/17	12/19	Africa		486.54						
Commercial aircraft	12/20	12/22	Europe		628.09						
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	12/31	01/01	Africa		242.00						
Commercial aircraft											
James Lewis	12/31	01/01	Africa		242.00						
Commercial aircraft											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SILVESTRE REYES, Chairman, Feb. 3, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6275. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Cooked Pork Skins [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0032] (RIN: 0579-AC80) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6276. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Swine Hides and Skins, Bird Trophies, and Ruminant Hides and Skins [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0113] (RIN: 0579-AC11) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6277. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change in Disease Status of the Republic of Korea With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Rinderpest [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0417] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6278. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual status report of the U.S. Chemical Demilitarization Program (CDP) as of September 30, 2009, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6279. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting annual report as required by Section 723(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6280. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's "Major" final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Regulatory

Capital; Impact of Modifications to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs; and Other Related Issues (RIN: 3064-AD48) received February 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6281. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Membership for Community Development Financial Institutions (RIN: 2590-AA18) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6282. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Shareholder Approval of Executive Compensation of TARP Recipients [Release No.: 34-61335; File No. S7-12-09] (RIN: 3235-AK31) received January 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6283. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2008 annual performance report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA), as amended, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6284. A letter from the President, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's 2008 annual report regarding the activities and expenditures of the independent production service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6285. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, EBSA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definition of "Plan Assets"— Participant Contributions (RIN: 1210-AB02) received January 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6286. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Area Source Standards for Prepared Feeds Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0080; FRL-9095-2] (RIN: 2060-AO98) received December 22,

2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6287. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Chemical Preparations Industry [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0028; FRL-9095-1] (RIN: 2060-AN46) received December 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6288. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2008-0515; FRL-8985-4] received December 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6289. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0350; FRL-9097-1] received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6290. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Update to Include New Jersey State Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2009-0680; FRL-9103-3] received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6291. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2009-0111; FRL-9095-9] received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6292. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air

Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2009-0799; FRL-9095-8] received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6293. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting a report entitled "Survey of National Programs for Managing High-Level Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6294. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6295. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Intergovernmental Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training's annual inventory of U.S. Government-sponsored international exchange and training programs, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g) Public Law 87-256, section Section 112(f) and (g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6296. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on United States contributions to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies for fiscal years 2008, pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 1225; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6297. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2009 report on U.S. Government Assistance to and Cooperative Activities with Eurasia, pursuant to Public Law 102-511, section 104; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6298. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the January 2010 Quarterly Report on reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6299. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2009, ending September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6300. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's fiscal year 2009 annual report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6301. A letter from the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [FWS-R2-ES-2008-0025] (RIN: 1018-AV28) received January 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6302. A letter from the Writer/Editor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safe Harbor Procedures for Employers Who Receive a No-Match Letter: Clarification; Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis [DHS Docket No.: ICEB-2006-0004; ICE 2377-06] (RIN: 1653-AA50) received January 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6303. A letter from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Department of the Treas-

ury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debt Collection Authorities under the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (RIN: 1510-AB19) received December 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6304. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chimes and Lights Fireworks Display, Port Orchard, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0989] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6305. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2008 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges and Transit: Conditions and Performance"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6306. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Integrity Management Program for Gas Distribution Pipelines [Docket No.: PHMSA-RSPA-2004-19854; Amdt. 192-113] (RIN: 2137-AE15) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6307. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting Annual Report on Civil Works Activities for FY 2008; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6308. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Copayments for Medications (RIN: 2900-AN50) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6309. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual financial report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6310. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's first fiscal year 2010 quarterly report on unobligated and unexpended appropriated funds; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

6311. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting FY 2011 Congressional Performance Budget Request; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce.

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:

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. In the matter of the investigation into officially connected travel of House Members to attend the Carib News Foundation Multinational Business Conferences in 2007 and 2008 (Rept. 111-422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. In the matter of allegations relating to the lobbying activities of Paul Magliocchetti and Associates Group, Inc. (PMA) (Rept. 111-423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 3820. A bill to

reauthorize Federal natural hazards reduction programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-424 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3820 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

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

H.R. 2989. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than March 26, 2010.

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. HOLT (for himself, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to award grants to eligible entities for farm to school programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4711. A bill to provide that the delivery vehicle fleet of the United States Postal Service be replaced by electric motor vehicles; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4712. A bill to include the county of Mohave, in the State of Arizona, as an affected area for purposes of making claims under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act based on exposure to atmospheric nuclear testing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the first-time homebuyer credit in the case of joint returns of long-time residents where only 1 spouse meets the ownership and use requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 1122. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Year of the Lung 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1123. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of Yucca Mountain as the Nation's primary permanent nuclear waste storage site; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN):

H. Res. 1124. A resolution supporting President Obama and his agenda to strengthen United States trade relations in Asia and with key partners like South Korea, Panama, and Colombia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

234. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 106 memorializing the Congress to provide that federal health care reforms not impose increased costs on Michigan and other states; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

235. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 107 memorializing the Congress to remove the so-called "Nebraska Compromise" from the final version of the federal health care reform legislation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

236. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Resolution 861 reasserting the right of every American Citizen residing in Puerto Rico to enjoy their right to equality and express the need of initiating a constitutionally sanctioned self-determination process; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 24: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H.R. 442: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 571: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 620: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 919: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 1237: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 1523: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1584: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 1806: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WATT, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1835: Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2049: Mr. MASSA.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. UPTON and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2266: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2277: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2305: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2565: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2855: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 3044: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3240: Mr. TURNER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CAO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 3306: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 3393: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 3554: Mr. LA TOURETTE.
 H.R. 3564: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3567: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3630: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 3656: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 3731: Mr. BOREN and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3757: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. WAMP and Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 3810: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 3820: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4054: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4065: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4115: Mr. HALL of New York.
 H.R. 4116: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 4199: Mr. CHILDERS.
 H.R. 4223: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 4265: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 4274: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4278: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 4302: Mr. OWENS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 4306: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 4309: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4322: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4396: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 4402: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4408: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 4427: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 4440: Mr. FILNER and Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 4453: Mr. BUYER and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 4496: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4505: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 4530: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 4533: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HARE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. WEINER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 4553: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 4554: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4558: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 4567: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4568: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 4596: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4603: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 4625: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 4639: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 4666: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 4671: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 4678: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HALL of New York.
 H.R. 4708: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.J. Res. 74: Mr. HALL of New York and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.J. Res. 76: Mr. CHILDERS and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. BUYER.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H. Res. 213: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H. Res. 267: Mr. LATHAM.
 H. Res. 870: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H. Res. 886: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BOREN, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. BOYD, Mr. ARCURI, Mr.

MELANCON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BERRY, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. WALDEN.

H. Res. 925: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H. Res. 935: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 959: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H. Res. 996: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 1055: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HODES, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H. Res. 1060: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H. Res. 1063: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 1075: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. BUYER.
 H. Res. 1079: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 1086: Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SHULER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 1091: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H. Res. 1099: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H. Res. 1111: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 1117: Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H. Res. 1119: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

106. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 603 urging the fast tracking of the reauthorization of the budget for the FAA; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.