



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 4, 2010

No. 65

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 4, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN A. YARMUTH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

THE NEED FOR FINANCIAL REFORM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the economy faced imminent collapse in 2008, the choice between allowing a complete meltdown of the financial sector and initiating taxpayer funded bailouts was at best a choice between the lesser of two evils. It was reflective of the fact that a complete and thorough lack of financial regulation by the previous administration and previous Congresses had allowed years of abuse and risky behav-

ior by many financial institutions to subject the entire economy to unparalleled peril.

We know the system was broken. Consumers weren't protected. They lost trillions of dollars in their retirement funds, housing values declined to record lows, and bank lending dried up. Taxpayers weren't protected. They were forced to bail out the very companies that created the economic disaster. Even Wall Street wasn't protected, as the irresponsible and reckless actions of some institutions left the entire financial industry and the American economy in near collapse. When no one is protected, everybody is endangered.

We know the results: the worst recession since World War II; the highest unemployment since 1983, peaking in January 2009 with 740,000 jobs lost; a stock market that plummeted to less than half its peak value; housing foreclosures that increasingly cast families out of their homes; millions of Americans out of work, and a dramatically shrinking gross domestic product.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, holders of more than two-thirds of all of the mortgages in this country, nearly collapsed and are now in government receivership. General Motors and Chrysler emerged from bankruptcy only with Federal taxpayers owning significant amounts of those companies as well. The financial sector was the epicenter of the recession. Between 2000 and 2007, 27 banks failed. Since then, 215 have failed.

The largest savings and loan failure in American history happened in July 2008 when IndyMac was seized. The largest bank failure in history happened just 2 months later when Washington Mutual, in existence for more than 100 years, collapsed, threatening its customers' \$307 billion in assets. The largest insurance company failure in American history, AIG, also occurred in late 2008. Only the Troubled

Asset Relief Program, initiated under President Bush, and its more than \$170 billion taxpayer funded bailout kept AIG from actual collapse.

It is important to ensure that taxpayer funds are never again used to bail out private companies. We must have a procedure in place that not only ends the concept of too big to fail, but also prevents the financial abuses from endangering the economy in the first place.

The value of the derivatives market as of October 2008 stood at \$668 trillion. I did not misspeak. The value of the derivatives bought and sold, completely unregulated, totaled more than 15 times the entire world's gross domestic product. Although this does not represent \$668 trillion of real wealth, it does indicate hundreds of trillions of dollars worth of speculative investments, which remain void of any transparency today.

How can we allow the massive derivatives market to remain completely unregulated after what we have gone through? How can we allow the risky and abusive actions of certain financial institutions to endanger an entire economy? How can we allow American taxpayers to be faced with the untenable choice of risking further economic collapse or funding financial institutions' misdeeds? Big banks and other financial institutions cannot with one hand wave a finger in America's face decrying any perceived threat to their autonomy while simultaneously holding out the other hand to the American taxpayer asking for a bailout.

It is unconscionable to allow private risk to become public responsibility. That is why the House took action last December passing the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. It is long past time for the Senate to join us and assure American taxpayers that never again will they be asked to bail out misbehaving financial institutions. We must not allow the near-criminal

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.

H3083

lack of oversight again. We must not continue to turn a blind eye to the abuses of the past. On behalf of the American taxpayers and consumers, we must enact financial reform now.

JOBS AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need to create more jobs in the American economy. We have had some good news on jobs lately. The Nation's unemployment rate has finally dipped below 10 percent, and the economy added 162,000 jobs in March alone. It is a start.

The economic stimulus measures in last year's Recovery Act are starting to pay off, but it is still not enough. Over 44 percent of unemployed Americans have been jobless for 6 months or longer, the highest rate since World War II. For the long-term unemployed, that light at the end of the tunnel may feel more like a freight train bearing down on them.

Long-term unemployment cuts across nearly every industry and occupation, and happens to workers of all ages. Long-term unemployment is bad for families, and it is bad for the country.

Long-term unemployment can permanently depress a person's future wages. A study published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago followed up on workers who lost their jobs during the recession of 2001 to 2003. It found that those working again by 2004 earned 17 percent less per week than they would have if they had kept their old job.

Long-term unemployment also drains the Federal purse, not only increasing costs for unemployment, Medicaid, and food assistance, but also severely reducing income tax revenue.

I strongly support safety net programs to help families survive bouts of unemployment; but, in the end, Americans would rather work. We must help get them back to work in jobs that will allow them to care for their families and send their children to college.

That is why I have introduced the Public Lands Rehabilitation and Job Creation Act, which will create well-paying jobs fixing roads and buildings in our Nation's parks and forests.

It is why I introduced the Sustainable Property Grants Act, to create jobs manufacturing and installing energy efficient equipment for commercial properties throughout the Nation. It is why I am working to support the President's export initiative, to create well-paying manufacturing jobs by expanding overseas markets for U.S.-made products. It is why I work hard to ensure that our trade laws and agreements are enforced, so U.S. firms don't get undercut by countries that don't play by the rules.

And it is why I spend each day in Congress working with my colleagues to fix our economy. I am working to renew the American dream.

Unfortunately, there are many obstacles in the way. Some Members of the other body have played games with efforts to extend unemployment benefits. Others are more concerned about retaining corporate tax giveaways than they are in working to find solutions that would help us pay for job creation efforts, job creation efforts that would help families while helping to restore Federal revenues.

Regardless of the obstacles we face, no matter how bitter our fights, nothing we experience in Congress will ever compare to the challenge of supporting a family without a job. That is why to my neighbors back home in southern California, I pledge to redouble my efforts, to keep fighting the good fight, to work tirelessly to bring back jobs and get America back on track. And to make sure the light at the end of the tunnel really is a ray of hope for a brighter tomorrow.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Out of silence Your Word is heard. From small evidence, an investigation arises and justice is pursued. With attentive listening, a child enjoys good judgment and learns trouble can be avoided. From the bottom of the sea comes oil and custodial wisdom.

Within one conversation one Member is affirmed; another ignored; another offended.

For a moment, a hospital bed holds good news. While some fields are flooded, the sun scorches life out of some others.

Lord, in this complex world give us discernment in all circumstances that we may find You present both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois 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.

PASS THE WAXMAN-MARKEY CLIMATE CHANGE BILL

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the extreme weather events that have occurred over the last several months. From the massive rains and flooding this week in Tennessee, to the historic tornado in Mississippi, to this spring's flooding in New England and Connecticut and Rhode Island, to the February mudslides in Madeira, to the freak March Hurricane Xynthia that killed 40 people on the coast of France, it is clear that storms are getting more intense and weather patterns are changing, consistent with computer models of climate change.

In Orange County, New York, my farmers have had to cope with so-called 50-year floods that now seem to occur every year. Rivers may truly be the canary in the coal mine of global climate change. What more evidence do we need?

It's time to stop denying that this change is happening and work together to stop the pollution that causes it. In the House we have acted, and now it's time for the Senate to take up and pass an energy and climate bill, which also by the way is a big jobs bill.

TEACHER AWARENESS WEEK AND NATIONAL TEACHER DAY

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Nation's teachers. This week we celebrate National Teacher Appreciation Week. And today, May 4, is National Teacher Day. As a former PTA president and as a former school board president, I want to pay tribute to our Nation's teachers for the hard work, dedication, and selfless sacrifice they make every day to educate our young people.

One teacher I think can make all the difference in a child's life. For me, that one person was Mrs. Oker, my fourth grade teacher. She taught me how to think beyond the box. I remember trying to calculate how many Christmas trees it would take end to end to go from the Earth to the Moon. I did calculate that. I can't remember how many there were, but she taught me

that I could do most anything I set my mind to. That was really to think beyond the box.

Today is an opportunity not only to thank Mrs. Oker, but to thank all of the teachers in the 13th District of Illinois and the Nation for following their calling and enlightening the next generation of American leaders.

CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MS. ELISE JONES MARTIN

(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, longtime South Carolina resident Ms. Elise Jones Martin is a leader throughout the communities in our State, particularly in the capital of Columbia. It was on Washington Street that she opened a thriving beauty salon. It was at South Carolina State University that she furthered her education by taking teacher training courses. This eventually led to her teaching position at Booker T. Washington High School, where she enriched the lives of many young students.

Ms. Elise Jones Martin has many passions: teaching, politics, and philanthropy. Her contributions in each of these areas are extensive. But it was Ms. Martin's lifetime dedication of fighting for viable neighborhoods that recently culminated in the launch of the Elise Jones Martin Place. This housing community carries Ms. Elise Jones Martin's name because of her work to improve neighborhoods by establishing solid foundations for America's young citizens.

It is my honor to celebrate the contributions of Elise Jones Martin today and thank her for making Columbia a stronger city and inspiring people of all ages to give back to their communities.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

God bless Duane Jackson for stopping the terrorist attack on New York City.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, April 30, 2010:

H.R. 5146, to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

AMERICANS WANT SECURE BORDERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Arizona's immigration enforcement law mirrors what is already in Federal law. So why are some special interest groups in an uproar? It shouldn't be surprising. The very same people who want to throw out Arizona's new immigration law also want Congress to throw out America's immigration laws. Open borders advocates want amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants, so they find fault with any law that tries to reduce illegal immigration.

Arizona has every right to protect its residents and secure the border. The message from Arizona is not to pass an amnesty bill in Washington, but to enforce immigration laws and strengthen border security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

HONORING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1307) honoring the National Science Foundation for 60 years of service to the Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1307

Whereas Congress created the National Science Foundation in 1950 to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and to secure the national defense;

Whereas the National Science Foundation, under the capable leadership of its directors, advised by the distinguished members of the National Science Board, has worked continuously and successfully for 60 years to ensure that the United States maintains its leadership in discovery, innovation, and learning in science, engineering, and mathematics;

Whereas the National Science Foundation strengthens the economy and improves the quality of life in the United States as the Federal Government's only agency dedicated to the support of fundamental research and education in all scientific and engineering disciplines;

Whereas the National Science Foundation supports a network of 200,000 individuals each year, including scientists, engineers, students, and educators at over 2,000 colleges and universities, schools, nonprofit organizations, science centers and museums, and small businesses throughout our Nation, and funds multi-user facilities and tools for conducting world-class research and research training;

Whereas during the past decade, the National Science Foundation has met increasingly challenging national needs with strategic planning, hard work, and unrelenting dedication;

Whereas the National Science Foundation supports science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education at all levels, including support for undergraduate and graduate students, early-career researchers, and K-12 STEM teachers, and emphasizes broadening participation in the Nation's science and engineering research and education enterprises;

Whereas the National Science Foundation, through its National Hazards Reduction Program, the George E. Brown, Jr., Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation, the Approaches to Combat Terrorism program, and similar research activities, has contributed to predicting and reducing the risk of devastation from natural and manmade disasters, and during the past decade has funded quick-response research at the sites of unprecedented national and international tragedies, including the September 11 attacks on the United States, the South Asian earthquake and tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and the Haitian earthquake, which in turn will contribute to further preventing and mitigating the impact of future disasters;

Whereas the contributions of the National Science Foundation to understanding the fundamental nature of the universe included the completion, during the past decade, of the Robert C. Byrd Green Bank Telescope, the Gemini South Telescope, the Long-Range Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory, the South Pole Telescope, and the United States contribution to the Large Hadron Collider; and

Whereas the research and observations supported by the National Science Foundation and conducted in the United States in the polar regions and across the planet increasingly contribute to our understanding of the climate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the significance of the anniversary of the founding of the National Science Foundation;

(2) acknowledges that 60 years of National Science Foundation achievements and service to the United States have advanced our Nation's leadership in discovery, innovation, and learning in science, engineering, and mathematics; and

(3) reaffirms its commitment to support investments in basic research, education, and technological advancement through the National Science Foundation, one of the premier scientific organizations in the World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1307, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Science Foundation for 60 years of service in promoting the discoveries and innovations that have made this country great. As the Federal agency charged with ensuring U.S.

excellence in science, engineering, and mathematics through basic research and education, the Foundation's efforts have been critical to maintaining our leadership in a competitive world.

In addition to its primary mission to support fundamental research in all science and engineering disciplines, the Foundation supports many cross-cutting and transformative research and education programs that should serve as models for other agencies and other nations. I will cite just a few examples here.

First, the Foundation supports Engineering Research Centers, which serve as models for public-private partnerships in areas of national needs. Today, the Foundation is funding ERCs in such areas as smart lighting, nanotechnology, and robotics.

Second, the Foundation supports much of the basic climate science and model development that will enable scientists and policymakers to understand and predict changes to the climate on a regional scale.

Finally, the Foundation supports the Noyce Teacher Scholarship program, a central piece of the K-12 STEM education initiatives included in the 2007 America COMPETES Act. The Noyce program provides scholarships to undergraduates who major in a STEM field while preparing to become certified or licensed to teach in a K-12 classroom. But this program is about more than providing scholarships. It is about reforming how K-12 STEM teachers are prepared. And no agency is better positioned to do this than the National Science Foundation.

Keeping America competitive provides good jobs and a strong, growing economy. That process begins with a high-quality educational system and continues with investments in new ideas and skilled people. The National Science Foundation's capable leadership and its staff meet these national needs with expertise and enthusiasm, and I commend them for the continued high caliber of their performance.

I want to thank the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. GORDON and Mr. HALL, for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support and as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 1307, honoring the 60th anniversary of the National Science Foundation. We are proud of the work of this independent agency that focuses on basic research in the frontiers of knowledge and is a very vital asset to our Nation. It's the only Federal agency that supports all fields of fundamental science and engineering, and makes sure that research is integrated with education so that our next generation of scientists and engineers are also world class. According to

NSF, basic research is, quote, "where discoveries begin," and I could not agree more.

NSF funds more than 10,000 new awardees a year. From those awards have come discoveries that have revolutionized the way every American lives in one way or another. It was NSF-funded research that led us to the Internet and to the Web browsers that we use today. Fundamental research supported by NSF is responsible for what we now know as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technology.

Bar codes appear on nearly everything we purchase today, from toys to shoes to boxes of cereal, helping industries with a range of activities from inventory to marketing to pricing. This is yet another technology where the National Science Foundation plays a crucial role. The American Sign Language Dictionary, speech recognition technology, fiber optics, Doppler radar—all end results of NSF-sponsored research.

NSF-funded researchers have won more than 180 Nobel Prizes in numerous disciplines, and the agency leads a robust international research program in the polar regions, including managing U.S. interests in Antarctica.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention the role of the current director of the Foundation and its recent accomplishments. Dr. Arden L. Bement, Jr., has led the agency with distinction for the past 6 years. He will be returning to Purdue University in June. This Congress and Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his service.

Likewise to those National Science Board members whose term is up next week, including President Steven G. Beering. We also appreciate his hard work and dedication in ensuring our scientific enterprise remains unsurpassed.

I encourage our colleagues to join Chairman GORDON and me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I rise a little off topic to honor two extraordinary young women who are here with us today in the gallery, Lauren Henschel and Taylor Davis, for receiving the Prudential Spirit of Community Award.

At age 12, Taylor found out that due to budget constraints her school was considering canceling art education. So she sent handwritten letters to 45 art supply CEOs in United States and Europe, securing \$30,000 worth of donated art supplies.

Now 13, Taylor has started a non-profit called The Traveling Canvas to provide arts education to students around the world.

At age 14, when Lauren saw her father struggling with psoriasis, she took

action, spearheading the country's first psoriasis fund-raising walk. In the last 4 years, Lauren's vision has spread nationally, raising more than \$750,000 for the National Psoriasis Foundation. And in the spirit of this legislation and promoting research, I know we are all proud of her accomplishments.

When Lauren herself was diagnosed with psoriasis—and remember that she is 14 years old—she said the following: I now understand that if anyone on earth should have been diagnosed, it was me, so I could use all of my abilities to make a difference for the millions of sufferers around the world.

Lauren, Taylor, through your actions, you remind us that our capacity to help others is truly limitless. Congratulations, you are both truly the pride of the Sunshine State.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members that it is not in order to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1307 to honor the National Science Foundation for 60 years of service to the nation.

The National Science Foundation is a remarkably important federal agency that is tasked with promoting the progress of science and advancing our national health, prosperity, welfare, and defense. Americans and people across the world have led more fulfilling and dynamic lives due in large part to the technological revolution that has shaped our world in the last half-century. It is important that we give credit to the National Science Foundation for their role in engineering this transformation and making our world safer, easier, and more efficient.

One of the main roles of the National Science Foundation is to fund and support unique research proposals, and throughout the years, more than 180 Nobel prizes have been awarded to foundation-funded researchers. Additionally, the National Science Foundation works diligently to ensure that young people are studying science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. We know that the jobs of tomorrow are going to rely heavily on a sound understanding of the hard sciences, and this part of the National Science Foundation's mission is central to our country's longterm economic and technological viability.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the National Science Foundation, and I look forward to the next sixty years of technological and scientific breakthroughs. The National Science Foundation truly is one of our country's greatest treasures, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me today in honoring this foundation for the discoveries that they have achieved and their long-lasting support of the sciences.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1307, "Honoring the National Science Foundation for 60 years of service to the Nation." As a former member of the House Science Committee, I would like to thank my colleague Representative BART GORDON for introducing this legislation as it is important that we recognize the important role that the National Science Foundation has played in support of education, research and innovation in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation was originally created by this very body—the United States Congress—in 1950. The intent of Congress at the time was to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and to secure our nation through defense technology and innovation.

Since that time, the National Science Foundation has worked diligently to ensure that the United States maintains its expertise and precision in discovery and innovation in addition to education in science, engineering, and mathematics.

Additionally, the National Science Foundation was created with the intent of helping to educate the children of our nation and give them the tools necessary to become doctors, researchers, astronauts and chemists. As the Chairwoman of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I fully support the National Science Foundation in its efforts towards childhood education and I understand the great importance of educating our children in these areas.

Moreover, the National Science Foundation supports science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education at all levels from elementary schools to national research universities. We all know the great importance this type of education has on children and I applaud the National Science Foundation for its dedication to high-quality education for the children of our nation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation had made many significant contributions to our collective standard of living and economy. By creating opportunities for research and innovation in new areas, our nation has benefited from cutting-edge medical tools, safer cars and transportation systems as well as defense innovations that have helped to protect the American people from those that would seek to do us harm.

Through its research capacities, the National Science Foundation supports a network of 200,000 individuals each year, including scientists, engineers, students, and educators at over 2,000 colleges and universities, schools, nonprofit organizations, science centers and museums, and small businesses throughout our Nation. The National Science Foundation also works with and funds multi-user facilities and tools for conducting world-class research and training initiatives.

In addition to these efforts, the National Science Foundation has taken a protective stance for our country against the threat of earthquakes and other natural and man-made disasters. Through its National Hazards Reduction Program, Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation, the Approaches to Combat Terrorism program, and similar research activities the National Science Foundation has contributed to predicting and reducing the risk of devastation from natural and man-made disasters during the past decade.

The National Science Foundation has also funded quick-response research at the sites of unprecedented national and international tragedies, including the September 11 attacks on the United States, the South Asian earthquake and tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and the Haitian earthquake. These response and research efforts have helped to contribute to further preventing and mitigating the impact of future disasters.

I stand today with Representative BART GORDON and other members of Congress in

reaffirming our national commitment and appreciation for the National Science Foundation as it celebrates its 60th anniversary.

I would also like to thank and praise the thousands of scientists, engineers, researchers and administrators who have worked in conjunction with the National Science Foundation towards the creation of new technologies and the improvement of our collective standards of living.

I ask my colleagues for their support of H. Res. 1307, as well as for their continued support for the National Science Foundation and its initiatives. By maintaining and increasing the capacity of our nation to research and develop new technologies and innovations, I am confident that the United States will continue to be a leader in the market for technology products for years to come.

I would like to again thank my colleague Representative BART GORDON for his leadership in introducing this bill as well as for his support of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1307.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1307.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING THE IDEALS OF NATIONAL LAB DAY

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1213) recognizing the need to improve the participation and performance of America's students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields, supporting the ideals of National Lab Day, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1213

Whereas in 2005 the National Academy of Sciences published a report entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm", which estimated that in the United States innovations generated by the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields account for nearly half of the growth in gross domestic product;

Whereas in 2006 only 4.5 percent of college graduates in the United States received a diploma in engineering, compared with 25.4 percent in South Korea, 33.3 percent in China, and 39.1 percent in Singapore;

Whereas increasing the number of students pursuing careers in STEM fields is vital to

the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas many STEM occupations do not have representation of women and underrepresented minorities proportional to these groups in the population or their enrollment in higher education;

Whereas strengthening partnerships between the Federal and State governments, the private sector, nonprofit organizations, professional societies, and the education community will improve STEM education in our Nation's schools;

Whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that science and engineering occupations are projected to grow by 21.4 percent from 2004 to 2014, compared to a projected growth of 13 percent in all occupations during the same time period;

Whereas an understanding of science and mathematics is necessary not only for those who will enter STEM fields as majors but for all citizens to understand scientific and technical issues that affect their lives;

Whereas scientific and technical skills are a requirement for an increasingly wide range of occupations and hands-on inquiry-based learning in the STEM fields is an essential element of a well-rounded education;

Whereas the President has launched an "Educate to Innovate campaign" which aims to increase STEM literacy so that all students can learn deeply and think critically in STEM, to move American students from the middle of the pack to the top in the next decade, and to expand STEM education and career opportunities for underrepresented groups, including women and girls;

Whereas National Lab Day is a nationwide initiative to foster community-based collaborations between educators and STEM professionals and other volunteers across the country to support high-quality, hands-on, discovery-based laboratory experiences for students;

Whereas more than 200 business, science and technology, and education organizations have declared their support for National Lab Day; and

Whereas schools and educators across the country will celebrate the first National Lab Day during the first week of May at a time of their own choosing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the ideals of National Lab Day;

(2) calls upon the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the National Science Foundation to continue fostering partnerships such as those involved in National Lab Day; and

(3) encourages scientists, volunteers, and educators to participate in National Lab Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1213.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1213 recognizes the need to improve the performance of American students in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. This resolution support the ideals of National Lab Day, a nationwide effort to connect students, STEM educators, and volunteers in order to build the STEM community.

All children have an innate curiosity about the world around them. Research shows students begin to lose this inquisitiveness as early as middle school. During National Lab Day, students in all grades participate in hands-on scientific educational projects to demonstrate real-life applications of the STEM fields. For example, a teacher in my district posted a project requesting a scientist to illustrate how chemistry is used in real-world applications and careers. The National Lab Day Web site will connect this teacher with a professional scientist to perform experiments and talk to students about careers in chemistry. These activities keep students interested and engaged in math and science throughout primary and secondary school. We hope that by keeping children interested early in life more American students will enter STEM fields.

America has a rich history as a leader in technology and information. However, we are at serious risk of losing our world status if we don't train and encourage and engage our youth. Research shows that the United States is graduating significantly lower percentages of students in STEM fields than other nations. In 2006, for example, a little over 4 percent of American students received undergraduate degrees in engineering compared to 33 percent in China. We can change this trend.

Last week, I was visited by a constituent named Sheari Rice. Sheari is a full-time engineer working toward a Ph.D. at Cleveland State University in my district. She is a strong, powerful role model for female minority students and said she would be thrilled to volunteer for National Lab Day. People like Sheari will make this initiative successful and teach our children that careers such as hers are within their reach.

There are Shearis in every district, and I hope my colleagues will join me in reaching out to these role models. Tell them they can visit www.nationallabday.org to sign up for projects in their communities. I look forward to seeing successful lab days all around the Nation and eventually a more technologically competitive America.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank Ms. FUDGE for her good presentation, and I rise in support of H. Res. 1213, supporting the ideals of National Lab Day.

H. Res. 1213 recognizes the need to improve the participation and performance of America's students in science,

technology, engineering, and math fields, or STEM fields. In order for America to continue its competitive edge in technology and innovation, a solid foundation in STEM education for our students is very vital. Without early exposure to science in the classroom, students will either lack the interest to pursue a career in STEM fields, or will lack the preparation and skills required to be successful.

H. Res. 1213 puts one step forward to ensuring that our children and grandchildren, the innovators of tomorrow, have the well-rounded education they need if they are to become the leading minds of America's future.

National Lab Day's purpose is to raise awareness of the importance of STEM education by creating a "nation-wide initiative to build local communities of support that will foster ongoing collaboration among volunteers, students and educators. Volunteers, university students, scientists, engineers, other STEM professionals and, more broadly, members of the community are working together with educators and students to bring discovery-based science experiences to students in grades K-12."

I applaud those efforts that do not rely on the Federal Government but engage our communities to become more involved in improving lab experiences for students in kindergarten through high school, and hope my colleagues will join me today in recognizing the importance of what National Lab Day presents.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and commend her leadership. As a former member of the Science Committee myself, I think this is a very important resolution which highlights an issue that directly impacts not just national security but employment in my district and many others.

Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics are the backbone of California's 36th District economy. We are the home to the Los Angeles Air Force Base Space and Missile Systems Center and to large facilities of all of the major aerospace firms, as well as critically important innovative second and third tier suppliers. As I am fond of saying, my district is the aerospace center of the universe.

L.A. County's unemployment rate is over 13 percent, but the 36th Congressional District's unemployment is half that, almost entirely because of science and technology jobs, especially in the aerospace industry. But the industry faces a coming "gray wave." Some 60 percent of aerospace workers are over age 50, and almost 26 percent are already eligible for retirement. Not enough young scientists and engineers are coming out of college to fill their ranks.

Mr. Speaker, we can't build rockets without rocket scientists, and other countries know that. The United States graduates about 70,000 engineers annually, a meager 15 percent. China graduates over half a million engineers every year. We not only need the next generation of spacecraft to reach Mars and beyond; we need the next generation of space engineers to get us there. And if we are to maintain space dominance when others, especially China, challenge us, we need more engineers.

While we are struggling to educate enough engineers to assume the torch from those retiring, we are also losing many of them to the sexy new world of Internet technology. Building rockets is losing luster to Facebook, eBay, Google and other IT firms. If we want to continue to be the world's leader in space, we have to get our young people dreaming bigger, literally dreaming out of this world. We need to inspire our young people the same way President Kennedy did 50 years ago when he committed the United States to winning the space race.

STEM education is the key, Mr. Speaker. I urge our colleagues to support this worthy resolution.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1213, a resolution supporting the ideals of National Lab Day.

I would also like to commend the two principal sponsors of this legislation, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), for their continued leadership on the promotion of STEM education.

And I want to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and I too am a former member of the Science Committee, and I agree completely with her remarks on this issue.

Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, better known as STEM, education is instrumental to our ability to stay on the cutting edge of the global economy. Yet the United States is indeed falling behind the rest of the world in the number of students that are graduating from STEM fields.

Mr. Speaker, according to a 2006 Association of American Universities study that is noted in the findings of H. Res. 1213, 33.3 percent of students in China receive their undergraduate degrees in engineering; in Singapore, that number is 39.1 percent; and 25.4 percent of South Korea's graduates fall into these fields. Unfortunately, the United States is lagging so far behind with a staggering 4.5 percent of graduates in engineering. In order for us to remain competitive in a global marketplace, it is imperative that we find ways to increase the number of students coming out of college with a degree in a STEM-related field. That means that we need to build the interest level within STEM education for students at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of Georgia Tech with a degree in chemistry, STEM education is an issue that is near and dear to me, and I am very happy to see that this body consider in a bipartisan way a resolution that supports National Lab Day. This is a nationwide initiative that provides a forum for scientists to work directly with students in a hands-on learning experience. By allowing students the opportunity to collaborate with scientists in this way, National Lab Day can provide them with the tools to keep them engaged in STEM fields, with the hope that those students will pursue higher education opportunities and careers in these cutting-edge fields.

During the 110th Congress, I believe our Nation took a very crucial step, due in large part to the leadership of Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL of the Science Committee, to address this issue in the America COMPETES Act, and that was passed in a bipartisan way in 2007 and signed into law by former President Bush.

□ 1430

As the former ranking member of the Science Committee's Technology and Innovation Subcommittee, I was so proud to support that important legislation, which will make STEM education a priority both now and in the future.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. As we likely consider the reauthorization of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act next week, I hope this body will approach this legislation in the same manner.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this great resolution, H. Res. 1213.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our chairman, BART GORDON, and I would like to compliment Congresswoman FUDGE and our ranking member, Mr. HALL, for this resolution because it is greatly important.

I support H. Res. 1213, a resolution in support of improving participation in the STEM fields, STEM—Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee and of the House Science and Technology Committee, it is absolutely clear to me that our country's ability to develop, to prosper, and to compete will depend upon investing in our children's educations and in the scientific community.

A central piece of this effort must be to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to be involved in STEM at the K-12 undergrad and graduate levels so they can, if they choose,

turn their educations into careers. They don't have to take the careers of STEM, but they have to be prepared to make those choices by the time they get to college.

That is why I sponsored the Patsy T. Mink Fellowships, which President Bush signed into law in 2008 as part of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. The Patsy T. Mink Fellowships provide encouragement for women and minorities to go into the graduate programs where they are represented, such as into the STEM programs, and then to move into teaching in these fields.

I am also preparing to reintroduce a bill, Go Girl, as it has been previously entitled for the many, many years that I've been here, which will provide grants to schools to promote STEM education for girls, and we have included underrepresented minorities for K-12 students.

Mr. Speaker, helping young women and minorities go into these STEM fields is an investment in our future as a country, so I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H. Res. 1213.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1213 to support the goals and ideals of National Lab Day.

I want to commend National Lab Day and its partners for their efforts to ensure America's workforce is proficient in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). In order to keep the United States at the leading edge of discovery, it will take committed partnerships with volunteers, university students, scientists, engineers, other STEM professionals, and communities to inspire and cultivate our youth.

I strongly believe that in order for a child to believe, they must first see. Today, our children are in desperate need of positive role models. When STEM professionals enter the classroom and work with children, they are providing an example of what one day they too can become. We need to increase professional involvement with our youth throughout our educational pipeline. Efforts such as National Lab Day will help bring about positive change for our country.

It is no mystery that STEM professionals will cure the next epidemic and invent the next technological breakthrough. Ultimately, a nation that graduates a high amount of STEM professionals will be a nation that will thrive in the 21st century. These fields are among the highest paying and the most stable. Their rate of growth is increasing exponentially as our society grows increasingly technological and our world becomes more interconnected.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. I ask my fellow colleagues today to join me in honoring National Lab Day and efforts that will raise standards, improve teaching, and motivate more students to pursue careers in science and math.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Science Committee and a strong supporter of education, I rise in strong support of this resolution Recognizing the need to improve the participation and performance of America's students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields.

This legislation recognizes the importance of equipping young minds with the technological

and scientific knowledge necessary to compete in a globalized economy. Further, within the context of globalization, I strongly believe that this country's ability to achieve and maintain a high standard of living is dependent on the extent to which it can harness science and technology. Thus, in order to enhance the international competitiveness of the country, it is critical for us to promote and support students pursuing careers in meteorology, climatology and atmospheric research.

From Ben Franklin to NASA to Silicon Valley, America has a great history of scientific innovation. In recent years, however, we have diverged from this path and have endangered our reputation as a nation at the forefront of science and technology. In 2006 only 4.5 percent of college graduates in the United States received a diploma in engineering, compared with 25.4 percent in South Korea, 33.3 percent in China, and 39.1 percent in Singapore. Today, American students rank 21st out of 30 in scientific literacy among students from developed countries, and 25th out of 30 in math literacy.

If this trend continues, there are dire consequences for our children and our economy. As this bill notes, "In 2005 the National Academy of Sciences published a report entitled 'Rising Above the Gathering Storm', which estimated that in the United States innovations generated by the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields account for nearly half of the growth in gross domestic product."

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we invest in a workforce ready for global competition by creating a new generation of innovators and make a sustained commitment to federal research and development. We need to spur and expand affordable access to broadband, achieve energy independence, and provide small business with tools to encourage entrepreneurial innovation.

The establishment and maintenance of a capable science and technological workforce remains an important facet of U.S. efforts to maintain economic competitiveness. Pre-college instruction in mathematics and scientific fields is crucial to the development of U.S. science and technological personnel, as well as our overall scientific literacy as a nation. The value of education in science and mathematics is not limited to those students pursuing a degree in one of these fields, and even students pursuing nonscientific and non-mathematical fields are likely to require basic knowledge in these subjects.

In particular, there is a need to extend access to mathematics and scientific education to a number of specific groups. Even as certain minorities, including African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, comprise an increasingly large proportion of the U.S. population, they continue to be underrepresented in science and engineering disciplines. Together, these three groups comprise over 25 percent of the population, but earn only 16.2 percent of the bachelor degrees, 10.7 percent of the masters degrees, and 5.4 percent of the doctorate degrees in these fields.

Mr. Speaker, as we develop the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), we must fully integrate and fund STEM education programs. Such programs are vital to the future of our nation.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask that my colleagues support H. Res. 1213.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1213.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LASER

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1310) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the laser.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1310

Whereas the invention of the laser was one of the groundbreaking scientific achievements of the 20th century;

Whereas in 1953, Charles H. Townes, along with graduate students James Gordon and Herbert Zeiger produced the first master device, which was a precursor to the laser that relied on microwave radiation instead of visible or infrared radiation;

Whereas concurrent to Charles H. Townes' activities, Nikolay Basov and Aleksandr Prokhorov of the Soviet Union independently produced a maser with significant technical advances which allowed continuous output;

Whereas Charles H. Townes, Nikolay Basov, and Aleksandr Prokhorov shared the 1964 Nobel Prize in Physics for their "fundamental work in the field of quantum electronics", which led to the construction of masers, and subsequently lasers;

Whereas in 1960, Theodore H. Maiman constructed the first functioning laser at Hughes Research Laboratories in Malibu, California, and the laser was first operated on May 16, 1960;

Whereas Theodore H. Maiman was the recipient of the 1983/1984 Wolf Prize in Physics for his realization of the first operating laser;

Whereas since being created in 1960, lasers have become an integral and essential part of our daily lives. Lasers can be found in a wide range of applications including in compact disc players, laser printers, barcode scanners, digital video devices (DVDs), industrial welders, and surgical apparatus, amongst others;

Whereas total global sales of lasers in 2010 is expected to top 5.9 billion dollars;

Whereas innovations flowing from basic research such as the laser have made America into the world leader in technology development;

Whereas continued support of scientific research programs is indispensable to maintaining America's position as the global leader in technology and innovation; and

Whereas LaserFest is a year-long celebration of the 50th anniversary intended to bring public awareness to the story of the laser and scientific achievement generally, and was founded by the following partners: the Optical Society of America, the American Physical Society, the International Society for Optical Engineering, and IEEE: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the laser; and

(2) recognizes the need for continued support of scientific research to maintain America's future competitiveness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1310, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1310, which celebrates the 50th anniversary of the creation of the first laser.

The world's first laser was operated on May 16, 1960. It was constructed by Theodore Maiman at Hughes Research Laboratories in Malibu, California. This was a significant engineering and scientific feat.

Theodore Maiman's work was preceded by theoretical work by Charles Townes, James Gordon, Herbert Zeiger, Nikolay Basov, and Aleksandr Prokhorov. Townes, Basov, and Prokhorov won the 1964 Nobel Prize in Physics for their work.

One of the peculiarities of the achievement of the invention of the laser is that, for many years after its creation, the laser was an invention without many practical applications. However, as time went on, scientists and engineers recognized the incredible potential of the laser. Today, the laser is almost ubiquitous. It can be found in almost every home, office, and automobile in America. Lasers are also big business, with annual laser sales approaching \$6 billion per year, and growing.

The story of the laser is illustrative of how investments in basic R&D can have huge economic and scientific implications down the road. It is a story to remember well as this Congress prepares to take up the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act in the coming weeks.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the sponsor of this resolution, Dr. VERN EHLERS. It is my under-

standing that, in a prior life, Dr. EHLERS knew one of the persons cited in this resolution, Dr. Townes, so it is especially fitting that he is the sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1310 celebrates the 50th anniversary of the construction of the laser, marking a major milestone in scientific discovery.

In 1953, Charles Townes produced what would become a precursor to the laser—the first microwave amplifier. Townes and his colleagues teamed up with Bell Laboratories in 1957 to begin extensive research on the amplification devices. Their focus shifted only to those amplifiers which produced visible light. In 1958, Bell Laboratories submitted a patent for an optical laser. However, such a device had yet to be successfully created. It was not until Charles Townes and Gordon Gould met in 1958 that the fundamentals of the laser and of the open resonator design were first discussed. In 1960, Theodore Maiman constructed the first operational laser. He used theories and plans published by Bell Labs, Gould, and Townes to construct this remarkable device.

Charles Townes was later awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics, along with scientists Nikolay Basov and Aleksandr Prokhorov, for their work in quantum electronics, which laid the groundwork for the construction of lasers.

We rely on lasers in our daily lives, and they are found in everyday products, such as laser printers, barcode scanners, and numerous medical devices. The world sales of lasers are estimated at well over \$5 billion to date.

Today, in large part, we realize that great success stories, such as the construction of lasers, are due to American ingenuity, which stems directly from the investment in basic research and in our outstanding institutions of higher learning. The laser is a prime example of basic research that ended up having multiple applications well beyond what its creators could have ever conceived.

The construction of the laser is but one example that leaves me confident in America's place at the top of the scientific world. I applaud these great scientists for their contributions to our community, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that my colleagues support this resolution, H. Res. 1310, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1310.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. TELEVISION INFRARED OBSERVATION SATELLITE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1231) celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United States Television Infrared Observation Satellite, the world's first meteorological satellite, launched by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on April 1, 1960, and fulfilling the promise of President Eisenhower to all nations of the world to promote the peaceful use of space for the benefit of all mankind.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1231

Whereas, April 1, 2010, is the 50th anniversary of the launch by the United States of the Television Infrared Observation Satellite (TIROS I), the first weather observation satellite, that was capable of taking television images on command and remotely at locations around the world, and either recording the pictures as television signals for subsequent playback or transmitting the images to ground stations in real time;

Whereas TIROS resulted from the actions by President Eisenhower and Congress to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), a civilian space agency, which applied technology from several military programs that had been directed by the U.S. Army Signal Corps Development and Research Labs (USASCDRL) at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, and the United States Army Ballistic Missile Agency in Huntsville, Alabama;

Whereas TIROS I images offered meteorologists the ability to examine large-scale weather patterns to improve weather forecasting and enable early warning of approaching storms, thus saving lives and property around the world;

Whereas the TIROS I images led to a better understanding of global patterns and supported transmission of detailed local weather information to national weather agencies around the world;

Whereas the realization of TIROS I was made possible by years of development of computers, missile systems, television imaging, magnetic recording, semiconductor devices, and solar cell applications, all of which resulted from both Government and private sector investments;

Whereas Government investments in research and development made possible the deployment of satellite tracking networks, worldwide WWV receiver time base systems, tracking data reduction for orbit element determination, and other facilities essential to the satellite applications;

Whereas Government and contractor personnel collaborated to observe and analyze the motion of TIROS I in the Earth's magnetic field, and developed satellite magnetic attitude controls for later TIROS and other spacecraft to utilize the Earth's magnetic field to orient satellites in Earth orbit;

Whereas the success of TIROS I was a significant Cold War event that restored the na-

tional pride and confidence in the space program;

Whereas, since the launch of TIROS I, the United States has launched over 82 experimental and operational meteorological satellites;

Whereas NASA's Nimbus Satellites and Advanced Communications Technology Satellite continued to enhance understanding and performance by further testing and development of space power systems, sensor development, and other technologies;

Whereas the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) manages and operates fleets of satellites for the purposes of environmental and weather monitoring;

Whereas similar TIROS missions employed launch vehicles, spacecraft, and imaging equipment that was developed by NASA, the United States Air Force and their contractors and has performed in an outstanding manner;

Whereas the next 50 years of United States accomplishments in space, like other important fields, will rely on individuals possessing strong mathematics, science, and engineering skills and the educators who will train such individuals; and

Whereas the United States space program enables the development of advanced technologies, skills, and capabilities that support the competitiveness and economic growth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the achievement of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Television Infrared Observation Satellite (TIROS I) team who worked together to enable the successful launch and operation of TIROS I by the United States to establish applications of space systems and technology for the benefit of people worldwide;

(2) supports science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs which are critical for preparing the next generation of engineers and scientists to lead future United States space endeavors;

(3) recognizes the role of the United States space program in strengthening the scientific and engineering foundation that contributes to United States innovation and economic growth; and

(4) looks forward to the next 50 years of United States achievements in the peaceful use of space to benefit all mankind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1231, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1231, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United States Television Infrared Observation Satellite.

Launched by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on

April 1, 1960, the United States Television Infrared Observation Satellite, better known as TIROS I, demonstrated the beginning of a new American capability—the ability to examine weather patterns from space and to enable the early warnings of storms.

The TIROS I spacecraft gave the United States crucial experience related to satellite technology and applications. Over the past 50 years, NASA has continued to develop increasingly capable weather satellites for operation by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Because of the technology pioneered by TIROS I, meteorologists have access to information that helps to save lives and property around the world. Today, American Earth observation satellites track everything from the movements of volcanic ash over Europe to the spread of petroleum over the Gulf of Mexico.

TIROS I is a shining example of the peaceful use of outer space and of the benefits that our civil space program provides for the United States and for the world.

I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1231, marking the 50th anniversary of TIROS I.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1231, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United States Television Infrared Observation Satellite, which is the world's first meteorological satellite, launched by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on April 1, 1960.

The launching of Sputnik in 1957 signaled the Soviet Union's advances in the space race with the United States. This event caused the creation of NASA, and it precipitated the push by the U.S. to gain a technological advantage in space. It was during this time that NASA launched the Television Infrared Observation Satellite, or TIROS, to determine if satellites could be useful in the study of the Earth.

It was unknown whether or not satellite observations would be an effective means to determine the meteorological condition on the Earth's surface. Scientists postulated that space-based observations would be highly useful for weather forecasting.

TIROS was equipped with two television cameras, with a magnetic tape recorder and with antennas. This simple configuration relayed thousands of pictures of the Earth's cloud cover, giving scientists the first real insight into the complexity of the Earth's atmosphere. When the first accurate weather forecasts based on data collected from TIROS were completed, it became obvious that this technology would revolutionize meteorology and that it would have long-lasting impacts on society.

To demonstrate its usefulness to the world and to fulfill President Dwight

D. Eisenhower's pledge to promote the peaceful use of space for the benefit of all mankind, NASA and the U.S. Weather Bureau invited scientists from 21 different nations to participate in the analysis of weather data from successive satellites.

It was due to this information that the Weather Bureau issued its first advisories on air pollution potential over the eastern United States. Today, weather forecasting is used in every part of our society. It is used to help protect human welfare and to guard against property damage; it is used to enhance commerce, and it is used to inform officials of dangerous environmental conditions like hurricanes and blizzards.

The technological advances that we have made since then in satellite technology have been astronomical, and the commercialization of this technology has brought us even more clarity about the world we live in than has ever been known or appreciated before.

□ 1445

TIROS was only operational for 78 days, but those short weeks demonstrated the power and usefulness of space-based observations. It has been 50 years since the U.S. launched the first meteorological satellite into space, but as with other groundbreaking advances, it's appropriate to look back and appreciate the momentum that brought this Earth into the space age.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1231.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1231.

Let's review the technological, scientific, and political accomplishment that the TIROS I satellite represents.

In October of 1957, the launch by the Soviet Union of the Sputnik satellite struck fear in the hearts of Americans. Sputnik II went into space weighing over 1,000 pounds and carrying a dog. Meanwhile, the United States was developing far smaller satellites and experiencing troubles and public setbacks. On December 6, 1957, a Vanguard rocket failed to launch a U.S. satellite into space when it exploded on national television. In January 1958, the U.S. successfully launched a 31-pound Explorer I satellite, but even this victory was quickly followed by the loss of another Vanguard satellite in February. As the early space race continued through 1958 and 1959, the Soviet Union always seemed to be a step ahead of the United States.

The shock of Sputnik and the fear that the United States was losing its competitive edge inspired a national effort to prove and improve American leadership in the fields of science, math, and engineering. The U.S.

poured energy and resources into basic research and development as well as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. Less than 3 years after the launch of Sputnik, these investments were beginning to pay off. The usefulness of satellites to observe the Earth remained unproven, and by 1960, U.S. scientists and engineers had designed and built a new series of satellites to test the proposition and to demonstrate American dominance.

The first launch of TIROS in April of 1960 was a clear U.S. victory in the space race, and it was the world's first meteorological satellite and the first to relay video images of the Earth from above. TIROS represented a scientific milestone and a clear message to our rivals and to ourselves that we had an "eye in the sky" and we could watch the planet.

During the 78 days that it was in operation, TIROS I sent home almost 23,000 images, including those of a tropical storm, the cloud system of a large extratropical cyclone in the Gulf of Alaska, and the pack ice in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Meteorologists used the transmissions to make the first accurate weather forecasts based on data gathered from space. The TIROS I program initiated a revolution in meteorological science and was the first step in the establishment of satellite storm tracking and warning systems that subsequently have saved countless lives. It proved that satellites could be useful tools for studying the planet and acquiring information to be used immediately for predictions and decision-making.

The design, the construction, the launch, and the operation of the TIROS I was carried out by a team from NASA, the U.S. Army Signal Corps, Fort Monmouth, the U.S. Weather Bureau, the U.S. Naval Photographic Interpretation Center, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Lockheed, Douglas, Martin Marietta. I am proud that central New Jersey can rightly claim a large share of the credit for TIROS I, which was engineered and manufactured in central New Jersey by RCA Astro-Electronics. One of the two command and data acquisition centers was located at Camp Evans. Many of the scientists and technicians and engineers who worked on this have recently gathered to celebrate this accomplishment.

But five decades later, it's too easy to take for granted the U.S. victory in the space race and the technological developments that were pioneered by TIROS and its successors. Most of us give little thought to the satellites that bring us our daily weather images. There's the story, perhaps apocryphal, of the politician who said, "We don't need weather satellites when we have the Weather Channel. Well, we do. From solar cells and tape recorders to cell phone cameras and GPS systems, the contributions that derive from the TIROS program are not confined to outer space.

TIROS is a reminder of what we can achieve when we apply sufficient energy and resources to research and development in pursuit of a national goal. The story of TIROS should be a guide to rebuilding our economy. It's a blueprint for how we can create not just jobs but whole new industries. It's the story of how America remains competitive.

Let us honor this legacy by maintaining the urgent spirit of discovery and innovation embodied by the TIROS I team.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that my colleagues would support House Resolution 1231, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1231.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST USE OF THE TELESCOPE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1269) commemorating the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope for astronomical observation by the Italian scientist Galileo Galilei.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1269

Whereas 2009 is the 400th anniversary of the first use of the improved telescope capable of astronomical observations by its developer, the Italian Renaissance scientist Galileo Galilei;

Whereas Galileo, born in Pisa, Italy, in 1564, was educated at the University of Pisa where he became Professor of Mathematics;

Whereas he attained life tenure as Chair of Mathematics at University of Padua;

Whereas Galileo was appointed Chief Philosopher and Mathematician to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo de' Medici II, his patron;

Whereas Galileo had an integral role in the Scientific Revolution of the 17th Century due to his major contributions as a physicist, mathematician, astronomer, and philosopher;

Whereas Galileo is universally regarded as the "Father of Modern Astronomy", "Father of Modern Physics", and "Father of Modern Science";

Whereas his experiments on the laws of motion, falling bodies, and the parabolic paths of projectiles and his observations of astronomical bodies were scientific advances;

Whereas his inventions, the enhanced telescope; hydrostatic balance; geometric and military compass; thermoscope (thermometer); perfected compound microscope;

pulsilogium (pulsimeter), enabled practical applications in the fields of military and civil engineering, navigation, medicine, and astronomy;

Whereas his newly designed instruments of measurement, coupled with his theory that the natural world was written in the language of mathematics, laid the groundwork for modern scientific method and research;

Whereas Galileo's use of his telescope, the central instrument of the Scientific Revolution, enabled his discovery of certain features of the surface of the moon, the moons of Jupiter, the phases and motion of Venus, and sunspots;

Whereas these findings confirmed that the Copernican Sun Centered Solar System was plausible;

Whereas this changed human understanding of the cosmos;

Whereas Galileo published his theories and findings in several treatises, letters, and books, most importantly, *Siderius Nuncius* and the *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*;

Whereas Galileo's body of work enabled subsequent generations, in particular in the United States, to build on the tradition of scientific research, to be in the forefront of new scientific endeavors, specifically in medicine, technology, and space exploration, resulting in the betterment of mankind;

Whereas the United States of America has previously honored the scientist through naming a research aircraft, "Galileo", commissioned for the Eclipse Expedition in 1965, and naming one of its major interplanetary missions, the Galileo Expedition to Jupiter, launched in 1989 and ending its 14-year odyssey in 2003;

Whereas America also has built on the legacy of Galileo with NASA's most successful long-term science mission, the launch in 1990 of the Hubble Space Telescope, which contributes to our understanding of the universe;

Whereas as part of NASA's tribute to Galileo, a replica of Galileo's telescope, provided by the Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza, Florence, Italy, was carried into space by Italian American astronaut, Michael Massimino, on the May 2009 Atlantis mission to repair and update the orbiting Hubble telescope;

Whereas 2009 also marks the 40th anniversary of the moon landing by the Apollo 11 astronauts, which gave mankind first hand knowledge of the moon's surface, first observed in detail when Galileo turned his telescope to the sky in 1609;

Whereas the United Nations "The International Year of Astronomy 2009" is a global effort with over 140 countries participating, initiated by the International Astronomical Union (IAU) and UNESCO, at the request of Italy, Galileo's native country; and

Whereas organizations, educational institutions, government entities, most notably in Italy, Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza and in the United States, NASA, Smithsonian Institution, Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, Italian Embassy and Italian Consulates, National Italian American Foundation and Italian Heritage and Culture Committee of New York, Inc., are celebrating the genius of Galileo Galilei and "The International Year of Astronomy 2009" with numerous public programs, publications, symposia, proclamation ceremonies, and tributes to Galileo and his legacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America commemorates the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope by Galileo Galilei for astronomical observation and marks this discovery as one of the major events impacting mankind, and expresses its gratitude for Galileo's expansion

of the universe and mankind's understanding of his place in the cosmos, and that the Congress of the United States of America joins the world in celebration of "The International Year of Astronomy".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1269, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1269, a resolution commemorating the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope for astronomical observation by the Italian scientist Galileo Galilei. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for introducing this important resolution recognizing the work of a true Renaissance man, Galileo.

Galileo is known as the "father of science." His numerous contributions in the areas of astronomy, mathematics, and physics laid the foundation for modern science. In fact, Galileo was the first scientist to apply the use of mathematics to the study of motion. In 1609, within months of learning about the telescope, Galileo constructed his own more powerful version and began observing the night sky.

With his telescope Galileo discovered sunspots, examined the surface of the moon, observed a supernova, and disproved the prevailing theory that the Earth was the center of the universe, instead observing that the Earth revolved around the Sun.

Galileo's life and his many contributions to science have made his name synonymous with discovery. I want to once again commend Mr. TIBERI and his cosponsors for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the important astronomical observations made by Galileo by voting in support of House Resolution 1269.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1269, commemorating the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope by Galileo Galilei to peer into heavens.

Galileo's brilliant refinements of existing telescope designs allowed humans for the first time to discern the Earth's closest neighbors to a level of

detail that was breathtaking, such as valleys of the Moon, fellow planets in our solar system, and the moons of Jupiter.

Most importantly, unlike his peers who trained their telescopes to look across the Earth's terrain, Galileo instead aimed his telescopes to look out into the heavens.

Four hundred years later, who could have imagined the transformations unleashed by Galileo and his search of the night skies, both in terms of designs and capabilities of follow-on telescopes, as well as informing Earth's inhabitants of their genesis and their place in the universe.

Today, ground-based telescopes sitting high atop mountain peaks are collecting immense amounts of data, enabling astronomers to discover new details about our solar system, our galaxy, and our universe. Just as important, their findings raise new questions, leading to follow-on research campaigns all across the globe.

Space-based telescopes, which have only been launched in the last several decades, have been equally spectacular. Virtually every citizen on Earth has seen pictures produced by the Hubble, Chandra, Compton, and Spitzer space telescopes. And the future of space-based and ground-based astronomy promises to be just as exciting. To cite one example, NASA is hard at work completing construction of the James Webb space telescope, scheduled to be launched in 2014. It is designed to look at the infrared spectrum and will have a mirror that's 21 feet across, far larger than the mirror on Hubble. The potential discoveries that await are unknown.

For men and women all across the globe, probably no field of science is more captivating and more exciting than astronomy. Galileo and his early telescopes provided the foundation, and this resolution rightly acknowledges his genius.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H. Res. 1269, commemorating the 400th anniversary of the first use of the telescope for astronomical observation by the Italian scientist Galileo Galilei.

Galileo, born in Pisa, Italy, in 1564, was educated at the University of Pisa where he became Professor of Mathematics; he later attained life tenure as Chair of Mathematics at University of Padua. Galileo was appointed Chief Philosopher and Mathematician to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo de' Medici II, his patron and had an integral role in the Scientific Revolution of the 17th Century due to his major contributions as a physicist, mathematician, astronomer, and philosopher.

Galileo Galilei is universally regarded as the 'Father of Modern Astronomy', 'Father of Modern Physics', and 'Father of Modern Science' due to all the advances he made in those fields. His experiments on the laws of motion, falling bodies, and the parabolic paths of projectiles and his observations of astronomical bodies were massive scientific advances. His

inventions, the enhanced telescope; hydrostatic balance; geometric and military compass; thermoscope (thermometer); perfected compound microscope; pulsilogium (pulsimeter), enabled practical applications in the fields of military and civil engineering, navigation, medicine, and astronomy.

His newly designed instruments of measurement, coupled with his theory that the natural world was written in the language of mathematics, laid the groundwork for modern scientific method and research; Galileo's use of his telescope, the central instrument of the Scientific Revolution, enabled his discovery of certain features of the surface of the moon, the moons of Jupiter, the phases and motion of Venus, and sunspots. These findings confirmed that the Copernican Sun Centered Solar System was plausible and changed human understanding of the cosmos.

Galileo published his theories and findings in several treatises, letters, and books, most importantly, *Siderius Nuncius* and the *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*. Galileo's body of work enabled subsequent generations, in particular in the United States, to build on the tradition of scientific research, to be in the forefront of new scientific endeavors, specifically in medicine, technology, and space exploration, resulting in the betterment of mankind. The United States of America has previously honored the scientist through naming a research aircraft, 'Galileo', commissioned for the Eclipse Expedition in 1965, and naming one of its major interplanetary missions, the Galileo Expedition to Jupiter, launched in 1989 and ending its 14-year odyssey in 2003.

America also has built on the legacy of Galileo with NASA's most successful long-term science mission, the launch in 1990 of the Hubble Space Telescope, which contributes to our understanding of the universe; as part of NASA's tribute to Galileo, a replica of Galileo's telescope, provided by the Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza, Florence, Italy, was carried into space by Italian American astronaut, Michael Massimino, on the May 2009 *Atlantis* mission to repair and update the orbiting Hubble telescope.

As the Co-Chair of the Italian American Congressional Caucus I am able to reinforce the deep and binding ties between the United States and Italy. I work to promote the strong relationship between our two nations and honor our shared heritage. I am proud to commemorate this anniversary and express my gratitude for Galileo's expansion of the universe through his use of the telescope and mankind's understanding of his place in the cosmos. The contributions of scientist like Galileo make the United States the great nation that it is today. His legacy is our shared American history.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H. Res. 1269, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1269.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 24) to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 24

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—The military department designated as the Department of the Navy is redesignated as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF SECRETARY AND OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—

(1) SECRETARY.—The position of the Secretary of the Navy is redesignated as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(2) OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—The positions of the Under Secretary of the Navy, the four Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy are redesignated as the Under Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, respectively.

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) DEFINITION OF "MILITARY DEPARTMENT".—Paragraph (8) of section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) The term 'military department' means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Department of the Air Force."

(b) ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT.—The text of section 5011 of such title is amended to read as follows: "The Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is separately organized under the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps."

(c) POSITION OF SECRETARY.—Section 5013(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking "There is a Secretary of the Navy" and inserting "There is a Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps".

(d) CHAPTER HEADINGS.—

(1) The heading of chapter 503 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 503—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS"

(2) The heading of chapter 507 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 507—COMPOSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS"

(e) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "Department of the Navy" and "Secretary of the Navy" each place they appear other than as specified in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) (including in section headings, subsection captions, tables of chapters, and tables of sections) and inserting "Department of the Navy and Marine Corps" and "Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps", respectively, in each case with the matter inserted to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter stricken.

(2)(A) Sections 5013(f), 5014(b)(2), 5016(a), 5017(2), 5032(a), and 5042(a) of such title are

amended by striking "Assistant Secretaries of the Navy" and inserting "Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps".

(B) The heading of section 5016 of such title, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 503 of such title, are each amended by inserting "and Marine Corps" after "of the Navy", with the matter inserted in each case to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter amended.

SEC. 3. OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW AND OTHER REFERENCES.

(a) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking "Department of the Navy" and "Secretary of the Navy" each place they appear and inserting "Department of the Navy and Marine Corps" and "Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps", respectively.

(b) OTHER REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law other than in title 10 or title 37, United States Code, or in any regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States, to the Department of the Navy shall be considered to be a reference to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Any such reference to an office specified in section 2(b) shall be considered to be a reference to that officer as redesignated by that section.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 24, to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this important measure before the House.

This bill has the cosponsorship of an overwhelming majority of this House. It has been part of the House-passed National Defense Authorization Acts for the last 8 years. It is time this change was made, and I want to thank Representative JONES for his tireless efforts in this regard.

The National Security Act of 1947 defines the Marine Corps, Army, Navy, and Air Force as the separate services, each with distinct statutory missions. By designating each service's commanding officer as an equal member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 reinforced the idea that we have four separate services. This bill supports that notion.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide the Marine Corps the

equal recognition among the services that it deserves, even while it preserves the historical relationship that the Navy and the Marine Corps have enjoyed for over 200 years.

□ 1500

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. HEINRICH for his kind words about this legislation. I also want to take time to thank Chairman IKE SKELTON and Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON, who have been very supportive of this legislation for the last 8 years. It is because of the leadership of both, and especially the chairman, that this bill is on the floor today, for which I am very grateful.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. HEINRICH said, it is kind of interesting that the Marine Corps, which has such a history, that is so revered by so many Americans, just like those who serve in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, yet it is a fact that the Marine Corps is somewhat like a child at the family reunion, meaning that they are part of the family, but they just aren't seen as the family.

I make that mention for this reason. A few years ago, this cap was given to me by the Secretary of the Navy, and the cap says, "Navy-Marine Corps, One Fighting Team," and yet this one fighting team doesn't carry the name of both services.

Again, I want to thank the 426 cosponsors. We turned in 11 names today so that for this debate they could be part of the effort that Mr. HEINRICH made reference to, so it is 426.

Many people would say, well, why do you and others want so badly to build that type of support? It is because, as Mr. HEINRICH said, the Senate has always been the downfall of this effort, and I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that in the past 8 years there have been so many comments by people who support this legislation and groups, that I would just like to name a few in the time that I have.

First of all, this year alone, H.R. 24 has these associations that support it: The Fleet Reserve Association; the Marine Corps League; the National Defense Political Action Committee; National Association of Uniformed Services; Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Marine Parents.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this, years ago in this effort that Mr. HEINRICH made reference to, 8 years, I want to read just one statement from the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs. This is what he said, and I read verbatim:

"As a combat veteran and former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy

and Marine Corps team is just that, a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, I would like to share with the debate today, it caught me by surprise back in 2005 from your home State, I was notified that the Chicago Tribune had editorially supported this bill in 2006. I just want to read a paragraph.

"Step up for the Marines. The Marines have not asked for complete autonomy. Nothing structurally needs to change in their relationship with the Navy, which has served both branches well. The Corps only asks for recognition. Having served their Nation proudly and courageously since colonial days, the leathernecks have earned a promotion."

I want to thank this House again. All we are saying is, the Marine Corps deserves recognition.

Mr. Speaker, if I could make a couple other points, and then I would reserve my time.

One of the opponents to this legislation is in the Senate. I looked up the history. He was a member of the class of 1958. In 1958, the football field at Annapolis was known as the Navy Memorial Football Stadium. After that distinguished gentleman graduated in 1959, they changed the name of the football stadium at Annapolis to the Navy-Marine Corps Memorial Football Stadium.

This year, when we were here on a weekend, I was watching the Notre Dame-Navy football game, and I noticed a jersey that Annapolis was wearing. I know you probably can't see this, but I can make my point.

Mr. Speaker, on the front it says "Navy." On the left sleeve is the Marine Corps anchor and globe. On the right sleeve is the Navy anchor. They understand teamwork, they understand one fighting team, and the House understands one fighting team. That is why it is so important today that we are having this debate.

Again, I thank each and every one that has been part of this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 24. The proud history of the United States Marine Corps began with the founding of the Continental Marines in 1775 to conduct ship-to-ship fighting, provide ship security and discipline, and assist in landing forces. Today, the Marine Corps is an elite, light, rapid deployment fighting force which includes over 203,000 active duty personnel and almost 40,000 reservists.

For almost 235 years, the men and women of the Marine Corps have served a vital role in protecting the United States and Americans around the world. These warriors deserve equality

with the other branches of our armed services.

After World War II, the War Department was designated as the Department of Defense as a means to update tradition. In 1947, the Army Air Corps separated from the Army and was established as the United States Air Force.

The Marines are not seeking separation from the Navy. The long and proud tradition of our Navy and Marine Corps working side by side would simply be codified by the passing of H.R. 24 and officially recognize the Marines Corps as equal partners in protecting our Nation.

In his speech at a recent news conference supporting this name change, retired Gunnery Sergeant and a familiar face to all of us who enjoy The History Channel, R. Lee Ermey, said: "We're not asking for a promotion. We're not asking for more money. We don't want a uniform change. The only thing we want is for future Marines who shed blood for their country to at least get respect and receive honorable mention in the department they fall under."

This name change does not increase military spending, increase the size of the military, create another department, or change the internal budget process for the Navy or the Marine Corps. Nor does the change diminish their proud traditions. This change strengthens their relationship and shows the world that they stand together through a formal recognition of this partnership.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 24.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SCHIFF for those excellent remarks about this bill and the need for this proper recognition. Again, it is no more, no less than just recognizing the Marine Corps as part of one fighting team, the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SCHIFF for also mentioning Gunnery Sergeant Lee Ermey, who has become the national spokesman. In fact, there is a Web site called MarineCause.Com that anybody that would like to see more about this issue and maybe join in on a petition, they could do that.

We did a news conference about 5 weeks ago with the Marine Corps League, and I want to thank Mike Blum and the League for hosting this news conference. It was in the Cannon Building. Lee Ermey came. He is quite an interesting American. He is quite a patriot as well.

At the news conference, the speakers that day, I made the opening remarks, and then Senator PAT ROBERTS, who has put a companion bill in on the Senate side, S. 504, and he himself is a retired Marine officer, he spoke.

Then we had this young man named Eddie Wright. I never will forget him. Eddie Wright lost both hands in Iraq for this country. He came, and at the news conference he told the story of how much he loved the Navy. He said,

“Here I am a Marine. I would have died without the corpsmen saving my life.” He said, “We are one family. That is why I think this legislation is so important.” Again, Eddie Wright has lost both hands.

In addition, there was a father, Dick Lynn, from Richmond, Virginia. He was telling the story about when he received the condolence letter when his son died in Iraq for this country. This is the condolence letter. We have taken the names out of it. It is not the one that Mr. Lynn received. But it is just so ironic that the Marine family, whose son died for this country, that they receive a letter that says “The Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C.,” with a Navy flag, and it says, “On behalf of the Department of Navy, please accept our very sincere condolences.”

A condolence letter certainly is important. But if this should become the law, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lynn and every other family would receive a condolence letter that would say, “The Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps,” with the Navy flag and the Marine flag. “On behalf of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, please accept my sincere condolences on the loss of your loved one.”

Mr. Lynn gave one example about the importance of “team.” He said, My father was a World War II Navy veteran. He is buried in Culpeper, Virginia. Next to my father is buried my son, who was in the United States Marine Corps. And on both headstones, the father, “United States Navy,” the son, “United States Marine Corps.”

As I begin to close, I want to thank Mr. HEINRICH for being on the floor today and Mr. SCHIFF for being on the floor today. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, IKE SKELTON, for being a supporter of this for over 8 years. I want to thank BUCK MCKEON for being a supporter of this for over 8 years.

It is time that the Senate, I hope, will look at the fairness of this issue that will be sent to the United States Senate. That is all it is, is recognition and fairness to the United States Marine Corps, who are loved and endeared by the American people.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 24, a bill which will redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and to recognize George Mulvaney and the Veterans of America’s Heartland role in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The Marine Corps is one of world’s most capable and premier fighting forces. Since 1775 they have fought in every major armed conflict that our country has been a part of.

Previously Congress has declared that there are four branches of the military, however today there are only three departments.

The perception that the Marine Corps is under the Navy rather than being equal is real and evident, and should be corrected.

The Navy and the Marine Corps are a team, and it is important that the American public be fully aware that these branches operate as partners and equals.

H.R. 24 will recognize the Corps and their overall importance to our country and our national security. The long and proud history of the Marine Corps more than justifies the recognition of equal status with our other service branches and making all Americans aware of this is long overdue.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 24.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE USS NEW MEXICO

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1132) honoring the USS *New Mexico* as the sixth *Virginia*-class submarine commissioned by the U.S. Navy to protect and defend the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1132

Whereas the mission statement of the United States Navy is to “maintain, train and equip combat-ready Naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression and maintaining freedom of the seas”;

Whereas the Virginia-class submarine is the first U.S. Navy attack submarine to be designed for post-Cold War missions and is capable of operating in the open ocean as well as close to shore;

Whereas the Virginia-class submarine is capable of submerged speeds of more than 25 knots and can stay submerged for extended periods at sea;

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has named the U.S. Navy’s sixth Virginia-class fast-attack nuclear powered submarine the USS *New Mexico* (SSN 779);

Whereas this submarine honors the legacy of the battleship USS *New Mexico* (BB-40), which served in both the Pacific and Atlantic theaters during World War II;

Whereas the USS *New Mexico* was constructed 4 months ahead of schedule, achieving the shortest construction period of any Virginia-class submarine;

Whereas the USS *New Mexico* is a state-of-the-art, nuclear powered submarine that will help fulfill the U.S. Navy’s mission to deter aggression and maintain freedom of the seas;

Whereas the State of New Mexico and its two national security laboratories, Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory, have made significant contributions to the Nation’s nuclear development, including the advancement of nuclear powered submarines;

Whereas the Commanding Officer of the USS *New Mexico* embraced the sense of New Mexican culture within the submarine including naming the ship’s galley “La Posta” after a restaurant in Mesilla, New Mexico;

Whereas Ms. Emilee Sena of Albuquerque, New Mexico, submitted the winning design

for the USS *New Mexico*’s crest, which symbolizes the beauty of New Mexico as well as the inscription “We Defend Our Land” in the Spanish language;

Whereas the USS *New Mexico* Commissioning Committee of the Navy League’s New Mexico Council led a dedicated 5-year statewide grassroots initiative to have the sixth Virginia-class submarine named New Mexico and has played a tremendous role in planning construction milestone ceremonies and supporting crew activities throughout the vessel’s development;

Whereas the USS *New Mexico* was commissioned by the U.S. Navy on March 27, 2010, at the Norfolk Naval Base in Norfolk, Virginia; and

Whereas New Mexico, “The Land of Enchantment”, is proud to be honored with the most modern and sophisticated attack submarine in the world, providing undersea supremacy well into the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the USS *New Mexico* (SSN 779) as one of the most advanced submarines in the history of the U.S. Navy;

(2) commends the diligence of the New Mexico Council, Navy League of the United States, and the USS *New Mexico* Commissioning Committee who contributed to the support of the USS *New Mexico*;

(3) commends the dedicated craftsman, designers, engineers, and support staff of the Navy-industry team who contributed so vitally to the construction, testing, and trials of USS *New Mexico*; and

(4) honors Commander Mark Prokopius, United States Navy, the ship’s first Commanding Officer, Senior Chief Petty Officer Eric Murphy, United States Navy, the ship’s first Chief of the Boat, the commissioning crew, and the sailors who will man this ship for the next three decades maintaining an ever present silent presence throughout the oceans of the world ensuring the peace and safety of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to support House Resolution 1132, honoring the USS *New Mexico* as the sixth *Virginia*-class submarine commissioned by the U.S. Navy to protect and defend the United States of America. I want to thank my colleagues from New Mexico, Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. LUJÁN, for their work in bringing this resolution to the floor.

The USS *New Mexico* was commissioned on March 27 of this year as the newest Virginia-class fast attack submarine in the United States Navy. I was incredibly proud to be at Norfolk Naval Base that day to commission the submarine and to salute the officers

and crew as they set out to protect our Nation at sea.

□ 1515

Constructed nearly 4 months ahead of schedule, this world-class platform contains some of the most advanced technologies in the entire force. Among its many capabilities, this nuclear submarine will be able to attack targets ashore with highly accurate Tomahawk missiles while conducting covert surveillance missions in both deep and littoral waters. This fast-attack sub will move at speeds of more than 25 knots while submerged and remain underwater for extended periods of time. Advances in technology have allowed the submarine to no longer require periscopes and instead use high-resolution cameras incorporated with light and infrared sensors to guide the ship. The *New Mexico* will provide important battle group and joint task force support, ensuring stealth, endurance, and agility under the sea.

As a proud New Mexican, I would like to personally thank the USS *New Mexico* Commissioning Committee of the Navy League's statewide council for leading a 5-year initiative to name the sixth *Virginia*-class submarine after the "Land of Enchantment." They have also played a tremendous role in preparing construction milestone ceremonies and supporting crew activities throughout the entire construction of this ship.

I would also wish to congratulate Ms. Emilee Sena of Albuquerque for submitting the winning design for the crest of the USS *New Mexico*. Finally, I would like to recognize Commander Mark Prokopius, commanding officer of the USS *New Mexico*, and his crew for working to incorporate a sense of New Mexican culture within the ship, including naming the ship's galley "La Posta" after a famous restaurant we all know in Mesilla, New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the U.S. Navy and the crew of the USS *New Mexico* on its commissioning and thanking the hardworking shipbuilders who constructed one of the most advanced ships to ever patrol the seas.

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

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

Today, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Representative MARTIN HEINRICH, honoring the USS *New Mexico* as the sixth submarine of the *Virginia* class. The *Virginia*-class submarine program is the first class of U.S. Navy attack submarines to be designed for the variety of post-Cold War missions faced by our sea service. These vessels are capable of operating in the open ocean as well as the littorals, can travel at speeds in excess of 25 knots, and stay submerged for extended periods at sea.

The Secretary of the Navy named the U.S. Navy's sixth *Virginia*-class fast-at-

tack, nuclear-powered submarine, designated SSN 779, the USS *New Mexico* in honor of the State of New Mexico. In addition, this name honors the legacy of the battleship USS *New Mexico*. The battleship *New Mexico* was the first turboelectric-driven battleship, serving both the Pacific and Atlantic theatres during World War II, and earning six battle stars.

Although the submarine USS *New Mexico* has only just been commissioned in March of this year, it is well on its way to living up to its namesake's legacy. She was built by Northrop Grumman Newport News in partnership with General Dynamics Electric Boat and constructed 4 months ahead of schedule, achieving the shortest construction period of any *Virginia*-class submarine to date.

The naming of this latest submarine is also appropriate because the State of New Mexico and its two national security laboratories, Sandia National Laboratories and Los Alamos National Laboratory, have made significant contributions to the Nation's nuclear development, including the advancement of nuclear-powered submarines. For its own part, the State of New Mexico and its residents have embraced this vessel. In fact, in response to a contest, Ms. Emilee Sena, of Albuquerque, designed a crest for the USS *New Mexico*, as a senior at St. Pius X High School in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague in honoring the USS *New Mexico* as one of the most advanced submarines in the history of the United States Navy and in commending all of the individuals and organizations who worked tirelessly to ensure that the latest *Virginia*-class submarine would bear the proud name of the State of New Mexico.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1132, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 1307 by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 1213, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 1132, by the yeas and nays.

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

HONORING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1307, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1307.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 2, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]
YEAS—370

Ackerman	Boren	Cleaver
Aderholt	Boswell	Clyburn
Adler (NJ)	Boucher	Coffman (CO)
Akin	Boustany	Cole
Alexander	Boyd	Connolly (VA)
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Andrews	Braley (IA)	Courtney
Arcuri	Bright	Crenshaw
Baca	Brown (SC)	Crowley
Bachmann	Brown, Corrine	Cuellar
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Baird	Ginny	Cummings
Baldwin	Buchanan	Dahlkemper
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Davis (CA)
Barrow	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Bartlett	Camp	Davis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Cao	DeFazio
Berkley	Capito	Delahunt
Berman	Capps	DeLauro
Berry	Capuano	Dent
Biggert	Carnahan	Deutch
Bilbray	Carney	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilirakis	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bishop (GA)	Cassidy	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Castle	Doggett
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)
Blumenauer	Chaffetz	Doyle
Bocchieri	Chandler	Dreier
Boehner	Childers	Driehaus
Bonner	Chu	Duncan
Bono Mack	Clarke	Edwards (MD)
Boozman	Clay	Ehlers

Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hincheey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette

Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes

Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Broun (GA)
Paul

NOT VOTING—58

Austria
Bean
Blackburn
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Dicks
Edwards (TX)
Fallin
Flake
Fortenberry
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Kirk
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lucas
Lummis
Markey (CO)
McCauley
McHenry
Melancon

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to record their vote.

□ 1859

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 243 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 243 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 243 I was detained on business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ANGELO RONCALLO OF NEW YORK

(Mr. KING of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Congress that former Congressman Angelo Roncallo of New York passed away this week.

Angelo Roncallo was a predecessor of mine in the Third Congressional District. He served from 1973 to 1975. He was Nassau County Comptroller from 1967 to 1972 and a member of the Oyster Bay Town Board from 1965 to 1967.

Madam Speaker, Angelo Roncallo was an outstanding New Yorker. Angelo Roncallo went through some very difficult times. He was a victim of a terrible miscarriage of justice, having been indicted and then acquitted—the jury was out for only a matter of minutes, but by then his political career as a Congressman was ruined. However, he made a strong comeback, being elected a Justice of the New York State Supreme Court, where he served for many years with great distinction.

Angelo Roncallo was very active in the Italian-American community, very

active in the neighborhoods in the communities, and certainly is a legend in New York State politics and government. Angelo Roncallo, again, was a true friend, a mentor of mine, a person for whom I have the greatest regard and affection.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you so much for yielding.

The entire delegation of New York would ask this body to join with us to pray for the family in hoping that his loss would be made up by the generosity of God in blessing his family for the good work done by the Congressman over the years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). All Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

SUPPORTING THE IDEALS OF NATIONAL LAB DAY

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1213, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1213.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 2, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—378

Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Crenshaw
Adler (NJ)	Brady (TX)	Crowley
Akin	Braley (IA)	Cuellar
Alexander	Bright	Culberson
Altmire	Brown (SC)	Cummings
Andrews	Brown, Corrine	Dahlkemper
Arcuri	Brown-Waite,	Davis (CA)
Baca	Ginny	Davis (IL)
Bachmann	Buchanan	Davis (KY)
Bachus	Burgess	Davis (TN)
Baird	Calvert	DeFazio
Baldwin	Camp	Delahunt
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	DeLauro
Barrow	Cao	Dent
Bartlett	Capito	Deutch
Barton (TX)	Capps	Diaz-Balart, L.
Becerra	Capuano	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berkley	Carnahan	Dingell
Berman	Carney	Doggett
Berry	Carter	Donnelly (IN)
Biggart	Cassidy	Doyle
Bilbray	Castle	Dreier
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Driehaus
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Duncan
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Edwards (MD)
Bishop (UT)	Childers	Edwards (TX)
Blumenauer	Chu	Ehlers
Bocchieri	Clarke	Ellison
Boehner	Clay	Ellsworth
Bonner	Cleaver	Emerson
Bono Mack	Clyburn	Engel
Boozman	Coffman (CO)	Eshoo
Boren	Cole	Etheridge
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Farr
Boucher	Cooper	Fattah
Boustany	Costa	Filner
Boyd	Courtney	Fleming

Forbes
Foster
Foss
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pollis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Broun (GA)

Paul
Blackburn
Butterfield
Blunt
Buyer
Burton (IN)
Campbell

NOT VOTING—50

Aderholt
Austria
Bean

Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell

Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Dicks
Fallin
Flake
Fortenberry
Grijalva

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 1 minute to record their vote.

□ 1909

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE USS NEW MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1132, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1132, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]
YEAS—378

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Duncan
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Bonner
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Guthrie
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Kirk
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lucas
Lummis
Markey (CO)
McHenry
McKeon
Melancon

Payne
Pence
Peterson
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Scott (VA)
Smith (NE)
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Wilson (OH)
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack

NAYS—1

Markey (MA)
Blackburn
Blunt
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell
Cardoza
Carson (IN)

NOT VOTING—51

Coble	Hinojosa	Pence
Cohen	Hodes	Peterson
Conaway	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Conyers	Kirk	Rohrabacher
Costello	Lamborn	Roskam
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Royal-Allard
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Rush
Dicks	Lucas	Scott (VA)
Fallin	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Flake	Markey (CO)	Taylor
Fortenberry	McHenry	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Melancon	Towns
Guthrie	Payne	Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1916

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

MAY 3, 2010.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, May 3, 2010 at 3:23 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits to the Congress a copy of a notice continuing the national emergency with respect to the Syrian Government.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-105)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

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

Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, and Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2010.

While the Syrian government has made some progress in suppressing foreign fighter networks infiltrating suicide bombers into Iraq, its actions and policies, including continuing support for terrorist organizations and pursuit of weapons of mass destruction and missile programs, pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency. As we have communicated to the Syrian government directly, Syrian actions will determine whether this national emergency is renewed or terminated in the future.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 2010.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2927

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2927.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2927

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2927.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2927

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2927.

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

There was no objection.

KEY WEST WOMEN'S CLUB CELEBRATES 95TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize one of the oldest women's organizations in Florida, the Key West Women's Club, which celebrated its 95th anniversary

on Monday. I have the great pleasure of representing this club, which has had a long and storied role improving the historic city of Key West.

On May 13, 1915, Ms. Marie Cappick, with the help of a few friends, organized the Women's Club of Key West. The club operated the only public library in the city as its foremost project for the next 44 years, when it was transformed into a major county facility in 1959.

Among its many civic projects were everything from recognition of the area's fabled history to providing personal care for the area's AIDS victims. In recent years, with the leadership of President Eileen Kawaler, the club has set even higher records in fundraising for the less fortunate as well as many arts projects.

So it is my honor and privilege to recognize today the many dedicated grassroots volunteers who have helped to make this a wonderful organization of rich history and award-winning women's club of Florida.

NAVY SEAL MATTHEW MCCABE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the court-martial of Navy SEAL Matthew McCabe for assault started yesterday in Norfolk, Virginia. This relentless American caught one of the worst terrorists in the world, Ahmed Abed, a terrorist who massacred and mutilated four Americans in Fallujah. However, Abed accused Petty Officer McCabe of poking him in the tummy once he was captured. Two other Navy SEALs were acquitted in trials last month of these false charges.

It's not like we don't know the terrorists are going to lie about being roughed up when they are caught. You see, the al-Qaeda training manual instructs terrorists to allege brutality when captured because it is the U.S. policy to take warriors off the battlefield until such accusations are resolved.

So we have three Navy SEALs sitting on the sidelines for over 6 months waiting. Meanwhile, news reports say Abed is set to be executed by the Iraqi Government for crimes committed against his own people.

Madam Speaker, our priorities are backwards. Abed needs to be tried and executed for his crimes rather than our government paying attention to his whining about his capture.

And that's just the way it is.

TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, revered scientist Albert Einstein once said, "It is the supreme art of the teacher to awaken joy

in creative expression and knowledge." I believe when we look back on our lives, certain people come to mind who have inspired us and given us the joy of which Einstein speaks. There are teachers who have touched our lives in remarkable ways and led us to a career path or opened us to the thrill of discovery and research.

The Chinese proverb reads, "Tell me and I'll forget; show me and I may remember; involve me and I'll understand." It is the rare teacher who is never bored or boring and takes his or her students on a creative adventure each day.

We ask much of our teachers today. They must be babysitters and counselors, surrogate parents, dieticians, and police. We ask them to teach our children what they need to know to do well on SATs and other tests; and, in between, we ask that they inspire our children to learn, to create, and to invent.

Teachers have one of the hardest jobs around. So today, on Teacher Appreciation Day during Teacher Appreciation Week, I salute and appreciate our teachers.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF V-E DAY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, Saturday marks the 65th anniversary of V-E Day, Victory in Europe Day, one of the most truly seminal days in history.

On May 8, 1945, the World War II allies formally accepted the unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany, marking the end of Hitler's Third Reich and the years of tyranny and war it brought to the continent. The members of the Greatest Generation who made this victory possible are 65 years removed from this V-E Day, yet their commitment to remembering the sacrifices that made it possible are as fresh as ever.

In fact, one of my constituents, Freemont Gruss, will be in the Czech Republic this Saturday to mark the anniversary with members of his former division, which was credited with firing the last shot against the Germans before V-E Day.

Today I honor each and every one of the soldiers who made V-E Day possible. I know that in another 65 years their accomplishment will still be one of the most important that our world has ever seen.

THANKING THOSE INVOLVED IN STOPPING THE TIMES SQUARE BOMBER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a member of the House Homeland Security Committee, I rise today to thank all of the brave individ-

uals who were able to quickly capture the Times Square alleged bomber who was attempting to kill many in the United States—from the vendor who noticed and said that his motto is, for the American people, "If you see, tell someone"; to the law enforcement officers, the mounties on horses; to the SWAT team and the fire department that was part of making sure it did not go off; and certainly to the people of New York.

I also want to thank the Obama administration, the Attorney General, and Homeland Security, and, in particular, before we start asking questions about the no-fly list and the TSA, let's get the facts. But we do know that we are going to have more homegrown terrorists. America now has to look very seriously, as we have done, at securing America. All of us are now involved.

STIMULATE JOB GROWTH

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

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, Florida has a record 12.3 percent unemployment rate, with counties in my district hovering closer to 15 percent. This is unacceptable. My neighbors have waited as the failed stimulus bill sent us further into debt and didn't produce the promised jobs. They waited while the House passed job-killing bills like cap-and-trade and the new health care mandated by the government. And they have waited long enough.

Congress must act now to stimulate job growth in the private sector. I recently cosponsored the Economic Freedom Act, a bill that would help businesses grow and create jobs. It would permanently eliminate the capital gains tax and eliminate the death tax. It would cut the payroll tax in half for 2010 for employers and employees and reduce the corporate income tax rate to 12.5 percent. It would repeal spending in the stimulus bill and terminate the TARP program.

The time to act is now. We can do better for the people of Florida and for all Americans. They have waited long enough.

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.

□ 1930

RECOGNIZING MAJOR SPEROS KOUMPARAKIS' SERVICE AS DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS LIAISON OFFICE

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has served his country and this institution with distinction as an officer of the United States Marine Corps. I will be joined in this tribute by my friend and colleague from the House Democracy Partnership, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Major Speros Koumparakis joined the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs in October 2006. He was hired immediately for a yearlong fellowship by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN). After completing his fellowship, Major Koumparakis joined the House Liaison Office as a legislative liaison officer, and was promoted subsequently to deputy director of this office.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had the distinct honor and pleasure of getting to know Major Koumparakis over the past 2½ years as he served as the interface between the Marine Corps and the U.S. House of Representatives on matters large and small. Throughout this time, I have been deeply and consistently impressed by his dedication, his professionalism, his ethnic of service, and above all his integrity—qualities which exemplify the ideals promoted by the United States Marine Corps.

Major Koumparakis has displayed a unique ability to develop relationships of trust and confidence with many Members and staff of the House, combined with an uncanny ability to deliver results. Anybody who has ever interacted with him on a policy matter of importance to the Marine Corps, an issue affecting a constituent service-member, or a logistical challenge arising in the course of an overseas delegation can't help but be struck by his equanimity in the face of crisis and his infectious confidence that everything will be resolved as expeditiously as possible. If anybody can pull it off, one is led to conclude, certainly it must be Major Speros Koumparakis.

I have witnessed these traits personally in my capacity as chairman of the House Democracy Partnership, a bipartisan commission that works to strengthen legislative institutions in 15 developing democracies around the world. Along with my distinguished colleague and friend, DAVID DREIER, the commission's founding chairman and now its ranking member, I have led or traveled on numerous congressional delegations which Major Koumparakis has planned, coordinated and escorted. By our count, House-wide he has escorted no less than a dozen HDP congressional and staff delegations over the last 2 years, and he has contributed in various ways to our programming right up until the very end of his tour. House-wide, Major Koumparakis has organized more than 50 congressional and staff delegations during his tour in the House Liaison Office, including trips for high-ranking Members such as the House minority leader and the leadership of the House Armed Services Committee. But we like to think that

he reserves a special place in his heart for the House Democracy Partnership, often forgoing travel to more glamorous destinations in order to escort our commission to countries such as Liberia, Afghanistan and Timor Leste, where the need for the kind of institutional support we can provide is the greatest.

On these trips, Major Koumparakis has not only excelled as an expert travel coordinator, diplomat and logistician, he has also established himself as an adviser to HDP's work, and an integral part of our programming with partner legislatures. And, of course, he has demonstrated his legendary ability to solve problems and deliver results in the most difficult circumstances.

Let me give one striking example. On one occasion last year, we had a particularly ambitious around-the-world itinerary that included a stop in Hungary to commemorate the fall of the Iron Curtain followed by working visits with the legislatures of Mongolia, Indonesia and Timor Leste. But, unfortunately, our arrival in Budapest was delayed twice by a vote on a major bill here and then weather. By the time we were finally bound for Mongolia, we had nearly exhausted our window to pass through Chinese air space. We faced the prospect of having to divert our mission and forgo the opportunity to make progress with the Mongolian parliament. Well, Major Koumparakis came to the rescue. Working literally through the night, he somehow managed to persuade an official of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing to rouse a Chinese official at his personal residence, on a weekend, no less, and call in a favor to get us the clearance we needed. That is an anecdote that says a lot about the major. It is a small example of his dedication and creativity and good humor. He has just been an indispensable member of the House Liaison Office, and he leaves some very large shoes to fill.

Now in recognition of his service and leadership potential, he has been assigned to what can only be assigned as a hardship billet in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where he will attend a command and staff program at the Argentine Naval War College. As he departs Capitol Hill for this next step in his career, we bid him farewell with heartfelt respect and admiration.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR SPEROS KOUMPARAKIS

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield for him to conclude his remarks to the very distinguished chairman of the House Democracy Partnership and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I will be very brief, but I do want to add a word.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. I would say that the gentleman has used all of my talking points, so the challenge for me will be following the completion of his remarks.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman is never at a loss for talking points. I am assured of that. We do need to say something, and I want to do it, acknowledging Major Koumparakis's wife Bree, who also deserves our gratitude and our respect for supporting her husband through 3 long years of early hours and frequent travels and an uncertain schedule. She shows a lot of the same dedication and selflessness that the major himself does. And we are just hopeful that this new assignment in Buenos Aires is going to offer her some light at the end of the tunnel, just as it will the major.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and let me just say at the outset that it is very important to note that Major Koumparakis is going to be going to Buenos Aires by way of California. He is going to be going for language training to Monterey, California.

Let me say that my very good friend, Mr. PRICE, has talked about the importance of Speros' work in dealing with the missions that have been put forth by this House, and specifically the House Democracy Partnership. And I would just like to say that when we look at the work of our partnership, Madam Speaker, one of the very important things to note is the fact that we have gone to, as Mr. PRICE indicated, some of the most troubled spots in the world. When I think about trips to Ulan Bator, Mongolia; Monrovia, Liberia; Nairobi, Kenya; and clearly Kabul, Afghanistan, the notion of congressional travel is one where I think the perception is that most travel takes place in other spots, when in fact this House Democracy Partnership has been focused on a very important mission.

Four years ago this spring when I had the privilege of beginning with Mr. PRICE this partnership and took on the task of putting together the countries with which we were going to partner in working to build the parliaments, I at the very outset looked to the United States Marine Corps. Now for full disclosure, I have to say I am very partial. My father, sometimes I regretted this, Madam Speaker, but my father was a drill instructor in the United States Marine Corps. I regretted it the first 18 years of my life especially, but I survived it. One of the things that happened when I first had the opportunity to chair the House Democracy Partnership, I made the decision that we wanted to have the United States Marine Corps play the important role of orchestrating and leading with the assistance that only they could provide these efforts.

Frankly, as we looked, Madam Speaker, at the task that was before us, it was very appropriate for the United States Marine Corps, and up until now with the departure of Deputy

Director Koumparakis, among other great people who have served in the past, to take this task on because the United States Marine Corps are in fact on duty in embassies throughout the world. They are on the frontline in those embassies and play a very important role. And I happen to believe—well, I will say this. Many of the other branches, with all due respect to every single one of them, approached me and said that they wanted to play a role in doing this. And I said the answer was yes, they could, as long as they enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

So I can't say enough about Speros Koumparakis and the work he has done and the effort that the United States Marine Corps has put into especially the House Democracy Partnership.

What we have done, Madam Speaker, as Mr. PRICE said, 15 countries, 15 countries around the world, new and re-emerging democracies, where we have had the task of trying to help them take these fragile democracies and build their parliaments. When we think about it, it is very important to recognize that our relationship is so often simply with the head of state. But if we are going to build up democratic institutions, there is none more important than parliaments that have independence and a very, very good grasp and an opportunity for oversight at the executive branch. And Speros regularly understood that and played a key role in making sure that the House Democracy Partnership could complete its mission.

And so, Madam Speaker, I simply want to join with my colleague, Mr. PRICE, in extending congratulations to Speros and to Bree. I know they are going to continue that very fine service to the United States of America in their work both in California and in Buenos Aires, and we look forward to getting great reports on him.

SOBERING REPORT ON AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, last week the Pentagon released its 6-month status update on the war in Afghanistan. It is a sobering report indeed, one that should make all of us question the very legitimacy of this mission.

There has been a huge uptick in violence, including a 240 percent increase in roadside bomb attacks. The Karzai government's support has sunk to embarrassing lows as more than 80 percent of Afghan citizens say government corruption has an impact on their lives and barely one in four Afghans rate U.S. and NATO forces as "good" or "very good."

This isn't LYNN WOOLSEY or the Congressional Progressive Caucus talking at this moment, this is a report from

the very people responsible for the strategy. And yet at the same time contrary to all apparent evidence, we continue to get the same spin and happy talk from the Pentagon.

After the report was delivered to Congress last week, one senior defense official said: "We have the beginning of the potential for real change."

Madam Speaker, it is long past the moment when we should be talking about the "beginning of the potential for real change." I think 8½ years is plenty of time for real change and not just the beginning of its potential.

We have been patient. We have seen more than a thousand of our fellow Americans killed. We have seen about \$270 billion in taxpayer money fly out of the Treasury. And after all that, Afghanistan is still a terrifyingly dangerous place that can't stand on its own two feet, unable to handle its own security, with an incompetent government that enjoys little confidence or credibility.

The whole point of our counterinsurgency strategy was to get the people on the side of the government and our military forces. But, Madam Speaker, continued instability is instead driving the civilian population straight into the arms of the Taliban. Again, don't take it from me. The Pentagon report notes a "ready supply of recruits is drawn from the frustrated population, where insurgents exploit poverty, tribal friction and lack of governance to grow their ranks."

Mr. Speaker, with the Kandahar offensive about to begin, the situation figures to get even worse, especially given that more than 80 percent of the Kandahar population embraces the Taliban as "Afghan brothers" while 94 percent oppose U.S. troop presence. That is according to the Army's own research, as cited by defense scholar Michael Cohen. The security situation in Kandahar is already bad enough that the U.N. has pulled its people out.

Madam Speaker, we need a complete reorientation of U.S. policy towards Afghanistan. We need a smart security approach that rebuilds the country instead of tearing it apart. We need to send legal scholars who can help establish rule of law and a functional judicial system. We need to send agricultural experts who can give Afghan farmers an alternative to the poppy trade which is controlled by the Taliban. Most of all, Madam Speaker, we need an immediate military redeployment. It is time to bring our troops home.

WHAT IS THE PLAN?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, our homeland security today is paralyzed by denial, ignorance and political correctness. Systematic dependence on luck is not a national security plan; it is a disaster waiting to happen.

From the borders to the big cities, America's national security is always in critical, or seems to be in critical disarray. In 1998, Osama bin Laden declared war on America, but we didn't pay attention to it. What is it going to take for our leaders to understand that radical Islamic terrorists want to murder our people?

□ 1945

Law enforcement in New York—Federal, State, and city—has done an incredible job in a short amount of time to apprehend the Times Square terrorist despite dangerous political games being played by some officials. In spite of politics, our lawmen acted swiftly, efficiently, and effectively in the capture of this terrorist.

But New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg told the media, "If I had to guess 25 cents, this would be . . . home-grown, maybe a mentally deranged person or someone with a political agenda that doesn't like the health care bill or something."

Now, isn't that helpful?

The Times Square terrorist, Faisal Shahzad, was not a Tea Party-going taxpayer opposed to ObamaCare. There is no excuse for this reckless smear of the majority of Americans who opposes the government takeover of health care. It is irresponsible to play political games with national security; and even though Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano won't use the word "terrorist," all of the indications are that this was an act of terror.

The terrorist, Faisal Shahzad, was captured last night on an airplane bound for Dubai. Reports say the airline contacted the authorities to say that he made a last-minute reservation for the flight and that he got on the plane after paying cash. He is from Pakistan. Somehow, this radical terrorist was granted American citizenship in 2009. Shahzad told the FBI he went through a terror training camp in Pakistan in the region of Waziristan.

He sounds like a terrorist to me.

This is where the Taliban operates—the same Pakistani Taliban that immediately claimed responsibility for the Times Square foiled attack. Reports say Shahzad had been in Pakistan for the past several months. Eight people have now been arrested in Pakistan. Two of them are related to Shahzad.

Over the past year, we have had a surge of attacks from radical Islamic jihadists who murder in the name of hate. For example, the Fort Hood shooter killed 14 Americans and injured 30 more. That was an act of terror. The attack on the Arkansas military recruiting station by a radical jihadist who killed an American soldier was an act of terror. Then there was the Christmas Day underwear bomber. That was an act of terror.

In that case, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said "the system worked" when we caught the underwear bomber. That means the gov-

ernment plan in that case is for passengers on the plane to tackle terrorists who are trying to explode bombs that are hidden in their underwear. That's a plan? That's our national system?

Combating terrorism takes vision. It takes moral clarity. There is no room for playing politics or politically correct games.

Ronald Reagan once explained it this way:

"Above all, we must realize that no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women.

"It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have.

"Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors."

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

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

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

HONORING THE WOMEN'S FUND OF MIAMI-DADE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, in 1993, a group of south Florida women established the Women's Fund of Miami-Dade, a nonprofit dedicated to funding innovative community programs geared toward girls and young women.

At the time of the fund's creation, gender-specific, community-based initiatives were nearly nonexistent. According to a survey undertaken by the Women's Fund in 1996, only five out of 142 local agencies had implemented programs exclusively for women. Absent from our community were programs to assist young women who were seeking to advance their educations, to secure their economic futures, or to engage in professional leadership training.

The Women's Fund of Miami-Dade took this cause to our south Florida community, and it has since generated enough support to provide more than 350 gender-specific programs with the funding they so desperately require.

Last Friday, on April 30, more than 800 women gathered together at the Women's Fund annual Power of the

Purse Luncheon to highlight the tremendous success of past and current programs supported by the fund. These programs support women of all backgrounds and circumstances.

The Women's Fund provides financial assistance to Lotus House, for example, which is a shelter for homeless women and infants in Overtown, an area of Miami which is suffering from extreme poverty. Thanks to the generous assistance by the Women's Fund, the Lotus House is now providing career training for women who are seeking entry-level positions in the restaurant and hospitality industry. Programs such as these have changed the lives of thousands of young girls and women in our community.

One such woman is Tamara Brizard, a former Lotus House resident. Tamara was a single mother of three when she was referred to the Lotus House. During her time at the Lotus House, Tamara completed a course in food preparation. The training soon led to a job in the food service industry. With new skills and with a new job, Tamara has a place of her own, and she is now better able to provide for her three children. Of course, Tamara's story is just one of many successes achieved by the Women's Fund.

The Women's Fund of Miami-Dade is also a powerful voice for social change. Together with Miami-Dade County, the Women's Fund has launched a campaign to increase public awareness of local services that are available to victims of domestic violence. Termed "Voices Against Violence," this initiative implores abused victims to speak up, to get help, and to be safe. Domestic violence is a plague on our society that demands our constant attention at the Federal, State, and local levels.

As an outspoken advocate of Federal initiatives to protect the victims of domestic violence and abuse, I am so proud of the efforts undertaken by the Women's Fund on this important issue.

The involvement of the Women's Fund in their relief work of Haiti is another inspiring story. In helping to rebuild this island nation, the Women's Fund and its supporters have shown their unwavering commitment to service and have shown their generosity of spirit.

According to Amnesty International, nearly half of all Haitian households are headed by women. Experience has shown that these women and girls will be the key in helping to rebuild Haiti and in helping to create a safe, stable, and prosperous nation. The Women's Fund is in a unique position to highlight this reality and to make sure that Haiti's future growth and transformation will touch all sectors of its society.

Since I have come to Congress, Madam Speaker, it has been one of my foremost objectives to ensure that women have equal opportunity to a higher education, that they are protected from harassment and intimidation in the workplace, and that they

have access to life-saving health screening for heart disease and for breast cancer.

I am so grateful for the tremendous leadership of local organizations such as the Women's Fund in working toward these important and obtainable goals, and I look forward to collaborating with the Women's Fund of Miami-Dade in the years to come.

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. CALVERT 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 Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona 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 Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE IMPACT OF THE GREAT 2008 FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, tonight, it is really important that America comes to understand how the great collapse of 2008 occurred and what its impact has been. I think they have a pretty good idea as to what the impact is. We see it back home. We see it from our constituents and from our own families as they face layoffs and as they face losing their homes and their mortgages that they are no longer able to afford.

How did all of this happen?

We want to discuss this tonight, and we want to discuss the effect that it is

having on our constituents. At the same time, we want to talk about what we are going to do about it. How are we going to set straight the financial institutions of America?

We know that the collapse was largely caused by some extraordinary shenanigans on Wall Street. Shenanigans never should have been allowed to be played, but they were due to a lack of regulation on the part of the SEC and of others and due to an attitude that occurred during the 2000–2008 period of "anything goes." The free market would somehow regulate itself. Well, it didn't. It actually put this Nation and the entire world on the edge of total collapse.

Joining me tonight are my colleagues from California and from Ohio. I would like to start with Congresswoman SPEIER. I was going to introduce Congresswoman SPEIER as the senate chairman of the California legislature's committee on banking and financial matters where she has gained extraordinary knowledge about the banking industry. She is going to share with us tonight her new position on the House Financial Services Committee.

Congresswoman SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you to my very good friend and colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

You know, as you were talking about the shenanigans, what we heard last week from the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations was deeply troubling to all of us, and the chairman, Senator LEVIN, did an outstanding job in focusing in on what was really going on at Goldman Sachs. So we started last week here on our House floor looking at Goldman Sachs' principles that they have espoused and that are on their Web site. We started ticking off what some of their principles were and then what some of their emails from some of their employees suggested they were really up to.

Tonight, I thought that we would just focus on one principle, at least for my part. One of their principles is: We stress creativity and imagination in everything we do. This is the top one up here.

While recognizing that the old ways may still be the best way, we constantly strive to find a better solution to a client's problems. We pride ourselves on having pioneered many of the practices and techniques that have become standard in the industry.

Now, an email from the vice president of Goldman Sachs, Fabrice Tourre, said: Standing in the middle of all of these complex, highly leveraged exotic trades he created without necessarily understanding all of the implications of those monstrosities, it's like a little Frankenstein turning against his own inventor.

Mr. Tourre called his Frankenstein creation a product of pure intellectual masturbation—the type of thing which you invent telling yourself, Well, what if we created a thing which had no purpose, which is absolutely conceptual

and highly theoretical and which nobody knows how to price?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Is that the creativity that Goldman Sachs so prided itself on, creating something that was unpriceable, that nobody could figure out what it was and, therefore, it could not price it? But what did they do with this Frankenstein that was created?

Ms. SPEIER. Well, this is what is kind of interesting about it. These are some of the Frankensteins that they were creating.

Here is a tower, as they refer to it—the Soundview Home Loan Trust. If you look at the bottom there, at that little yellow tranche as they refer to it, there was, you know, some pretty bad stuff. These were mortgages that were poorly rated.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So, this was the packaging of the mortgages that were being sold to people who couldn't afford to pay their mortgages?

Ms. SPEIER. These were the mortgages that were then packaged and then sold to investors because, of course, they were grade A, and they would make them a lot of money. What happened here is they took this one tranche, and then they brought it over here. Now they are B grade.

So how do you take something that is a B grade and make it investment quality?

Mr. GARAMENDI. By lying? By defrauding somebody?

Ms. SPEIER. By being creative.

This is what Goldman Sachs did, and it was really well-described in a book by Michael Lewis, called "The Big Short," in which he writes: In the process, Goldman Sachs created a security so opaque and complex that it would remain forever misunderstood by investors and rating agencies—the synthetic subprime mortgage bond-backed CDOs, or collateralized debt obligations.

He goes on to write: Triple B-rated bonds were harder to sell than triple A—no surprise—but there were huge sums of money to be made if you could somehow get them rereated as triple A, thereby lowering their perceived risk, however dishonestly or artificially.

So what did they do?

Goldman Sachs then went to the rating agency and said, Now, how is it that you rate these particular tranches? They found out. It was really a rating that went on by just looking at FICO scores. So the mortgages were not looked at based on whether they were no-doc loans or whether there was adequate income. They were rated based on a homeowner's mortgage FICO score.

□ 2000

So if you could somehow bump up the FICO score on these mortgages, you could turn a BBB into a AAA. And that's what they did. So then they went out and they sold the Abacus one that we heard about last week where John Paulson said he wanted to short all of them; so he put together the worst of the worst, and then Goldman

made \$15 million for actually servicing that particular instrument. Then Goldman went out and sold garbage to an unsuspecting American public. Oh, but they were sophisticated buyers, so therefore they knew what they were getting into. And that's the creativity of Goldman Sachs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So what Goldman Sachs was doing was essentially a very dishonest, disreputable, and quite possibly fraudulent scheme to rip off some investors somewhere. They may have been sophisticated, they may not have. But they were told that this was not a B-rated product but rather an A-rated product because Standard and Poor's, perhaps playing a game, and part of the game with Goldman, had reevaluated that particular tranche, that package of mortgages, and said now they are an A because we've taken a look at the FICO score of some of the underlying mortgage people who had taken out the loan.

So from the whole thing, where is the honesty in the business? Where is the element of good faith to the customer? Was Paulson the customer on one side of the deal, or was it the investor on the other side of the deal? And where is the good faith obligation that Goldman surely must have had?

Ms. SPEIER. And you know who bought a lot of Abacus, who was on the other side of the trade with Paulson who shorted them, so who was buying Abacus? You won't be surprised to hear AIG, will you?

Mr. GARAMENDI. AIG. Now, they received almost \$200 billion of taxpayer money?

Ms. SPEIER. One hundred and eighty billion dollars, yes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Now, when AIG got that money from the taxpayers in the TARP bailout, the Wall Street bailout, what did they do with that money? Did they give it to the homeowner that was going to lose their home, or did they give it to Goldman?

Ms. SPEIER. Well, interestingly enough, Goldman had purchased credit default swaps from AIG, and, of course, they were repaid in full by the taxpayers of this country, \$12 billion worth, the highest recipient of money from those CDS's.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think that book is misnamed, "The Great Short." I think probably "The Great Fraud" would be a better name for the whole thing.

Ms. SPEIER. I just want to show you one last chart.

So this is the creativity of Goldman Sachs, creating these products, knowing they were bad, selling them off. And many of them were what are called synthetic CDOs. So they didn't actually have the mortgages on them. They were like a side bet on that tower we had seen in that earlier chart. But look at what happened to all of them. They were all, at one point or another, a percent of the tower that was, in fact, AAA—71 percent, 77 percent, 72 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent. But

look what happened to them in the end. They all turned to junk. So they were rated improperly, so you can ding the rating agencies. They were manipulated by Goldman Sachs. And this is the kind of creativity on Wall Street that makes us proud.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, there certainly ought to be a law. And we're going to spend a few moments talking about the law. But first I would like to turn to our colleague from the great State of Ohio.

Please.

Ms. KILROY. Thank you very much for yielding.

I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor this evening. And, of course, I work with Congresswoman SPEIER on the Financial Services Committee. And she very aptly talked about what was going on at Goldman and the effect that it has had on our economy. But this is not a case of just one bad company. We, unfortunately, had a culture all across Wall Street that allowed things like this to happen. And recently I asked Chairman FRANK if we could take a look at some of the practices of Lehman Brothers. And we did. We had a hearing on Lehman Brothers. We both participated in that hearing. Because Lehman Brothers gambled with the hard-earned money, the pension funds of countless Americans. Certainly people from Ohio, people from California's pensions, people from Colorado's pensions had been invested in Lehman products, and Lehman Brothers did not tell those investors or other investors that they were so over-leveraged that their financial picture was pretty bleak. Instead, they tried to disguise what was really going on at Lehman by this tricky accounting practice where they moved some of the problems off the balance sheet at the time when their quarterly report was due.

If you look at the quarterly report, you would not get the real story from Lehman because of this practice called Repo 105. They did this very deliberately. And they had become, like Goldman, very leveraged into the subprime mortgage market, the Alt-A mortgage market, and even came up with this product called an Alt-B. And Lehman Brothers, which is an investment house, did not have the same level of regulation that, say, a community bank in one of our localities would have if they were engaging in mortgage practices. Nobody was watching them. The SEC wasn't watching enough, and investors and advisors who maybe would be sophisticated investors who could look at a balance sheet, they weren't getting the right picture either because of this on- and off-balance sheet practice of disguising the true financial picture. When Lehman did this, when they gambled in the subprime market, when they increased, bought more, bought more, bought more to try to make up for the losses and tried to hide what was really going on, they hurt not just the sophisticated investor; they hurt hardworking Americans.

I asked for some public records. One of our pension funds told us that they took an actual loss of over \$100 million as a result of this between December of 2007 and September of 2008. Over \$100 million. That's just one. I'm getting information from the other public pension funds in Ohio. And this isn't right that they are allowed to gamble and not listen to the alarms that were sounded in their own company by the risk managers or the fixed asset manager. Instead, those people who were trying to tell the truth were forced out. And it's that same story: Everything's just fine, don't look over here at what's on the off-balance sheet accounting tricks and give a different picture to the world.

We need to hold the Lehman Brothers and the Goldmans to account, and it is time to really talk about real financial reform, real Wall Street reform so that they are not allowed to hurt hardworking Americans and put their life savings in jeopardy again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I know that the two of you both on the Financial Services Committee spent most of last year, 2009, working on a major reform that actually passed the House in December. Now, I had the good fortune of being elected in November, arriving here just in time to vote for the health care bill and to take some credit by voting for the reform that the two of you and the other members of the committee brought to the House floor. It was a very, very significant reform and dealt with many of the underlying issues that both of you have discussed.

Let's spend just a few moments talking about some of the critical elements of that reform bill. As I recall, there was a Consumer Protection Agency in the reform bill, and there were also some definitions about the kinds of things that the banks could engage in. And in most recent days, we've seen the Senate wrestling with this issue. We saw the Republicans trying to stop the Senate from enacting a reform bill by Senator DODD. Well, they tried for a few days, for a couple of weeks, and ultimately the American public following the Goldman Sachs hearing in the Senate said enough, and the Republican effort to stop the bill collapsed, and now that's moving along. So we're in the final stages, I believe, of passing a very significant reform of Wall Street so that we can focus on Main Street rather than on the excesses of Wall Street, bringing the money back to Main Street, to local banks making loans, and Wall Street getting its comeuppance.

So would you share with us some of your thoughts about the reforms.

Ms. SPEIER. The interesting thing is the Consumer Financial Protection Agency, which now on the Senate side is being billed as a bureau within the Fed, was really the brainchild of Professor Elizabeth Warren from Harvard Law School. And she likened it to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, which we have. I mean you buy a toast-

er. It's warranted to operate, not to electrocute you. And yet we have nothing of the same nature to protect us as consumers from fraudulent techniques that are being used by credit card companies, by mortgage brokers.

This one chart that showed this CDO, this was \$38 million. It was actually sold and resold 30 times, 30 times, and created losses of over \$280 million.

Now, derivatives haven't been regulated in this country because Congress passed a law in 2000 prohibiting Congress from regulating derivatives. It was part of the financial services industry wish list, and none of us were there at the time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The three of us will not take credit for that bill.

Ms. SPEIER. No, we won't.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We were not in Congress when they passed that terrible piece of legislation.

Ms. SPEIER. But imagine to allow these kinds of complex instrumentalities to be in the marketplace and not be regulated. That's what will be regulated as we move forward with financial reform. There will be a protection agency for consumers that will help us understand, hopefully—as I understand it, a credit card statement form contract was 1 page and 700 words in 1985. Today it's something like 30 pages. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau will provide greater assistance to Main Street.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well—

Ms. KILROY. I think it's really important when you take a look at what went on in Wall Street after Bear Stearns collapsed. The SEC and the New York Fed went into these major Wall Street investment houses and were there trying to look things over but either didn't have the statutory authority or the expertise to really take a look at these mortgage instruments or really take the kind of action that would have protected consumers, and even not waited until you got to a situation with Bear Stearns but had gone in there much earlier and looked at it from the eyes of the consumer. Not how it's doing for Wall Street traders but what is its impact on consumers, the subprime mortgage solicitations and all the things that went on around this. It's so important, I think, that we do have a Consumer Protection Agency as part of Wall Street reform.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And part of that Consumer Protection Agency focuses directly on the mortgage market out there and deals with those mortgage companies that were selling subprime mortgage opportunities to people that had really no ability to pay it back. So those people may have invested whatever money they had in a home, and when it came time for the resetting of the interest rates, they couldn't afford it. They lost their investment. They lost their home. They may have also lost their job because of the collapse of the mortgage industry and the housing industry, and so 8 million Americans were out of work. And as both of you

have very, very well described, the situation in which those Americans that may still have their job may very well have lost a good portion of their pension either directly through Lehman Brothers' collapse or through the crash of the stock market.

□ 2015

The combination wiped out 401(k)s. The word around was they no longer were 401(k)s, they had become 201(k)s.

So we really need to have that consumer protection agency in place to monitor Wall Street, to monitor the mortgage lending markets out there, to make sure those products are appropriate for individuals. Without it, we are going to go right back into the same kind of problem that nearly took down this country's economy and the world economy.

Ms. SPEIER, it looks as though you want to add another element to this discussion about what the law should be.

Ms. SPEIER. The interesting element of the subprime market was that those who were selling the product, the originators of the loans, weren't holding on to any of the instrument. They had no skin in the game. It was sold off to Wall Street, where they put them in these tranches and then sold them off again and again.

One of the things that is required in this new bill is that you will have to have some skin in the game, that you will have to have reserves, that you cannot leverage, like we have seen happen over the last couple of years.

But the interesting thing about the subprime market that just came to light, the industry also realized these people weren't equipped. If you were a \$14,000 a year gardener in East L.A., you couldn't afford a \$700,000 home. But since there was no documentation, since it was going to be sold, and after the teaser rate was no longer available to you, you were going to come back and refinance that loan again, so the fees to the originator, to the bank, would be generated again. So there was this huge churning that was going on in the industry as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So ultimately we wound up with a situation in which the financial industry had set up a scheme to sell mortgages to people who couldn't possibly pay those mortgages over time. They were often sold with teaser rates, low interest rates for a year or two, and then it reset to a much higher rate so the payments would be impossible to make at that point.

Then they took those products, those individual mortgages, put them all together and repackaged them into this magnificent tower of—

Ms. SPEIER. Tower of shame.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have to find a good adjective, but the tower of shame. Then they took individual pieces of those products, took them out and repackaged them—

Ms. SPEIER. As a side bet. As a side bet. So they stayed in this tower, but

they took them out in a manner that allowed you to just bet for and against them, and as long as there was someone on the sell side and someone on the buy side, it was fine with Wall Street.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So on the buy side, they would be giving information that was inaccurate, that Standard & Poor's, the rating industries of the world would go out and use some, I don't know, gimmick to re-rate this tranche, this piece of that tower, re-rate it as though it was more valuable and more secure than it really was. So we really had a cabal here, and that is why the regulation of Wall Street is so critically important to us as individuals, in our homes, in our ordinary life, in our ability to keep a job.

It is also important for the financial system of America. Banking is crucial to the economy, and when you get a banking industry that is playing financial games rather than simply making loans, we are going to find ourselves in trouble. The creativity of Goldman Sachs, we now know from the hearings. We also know that other major banks and mortgage lending companies were playing similar games.

So what is what we are trying to do as Democrats, is to rein in Wall Street, to set new rules in place that will force the banks to be banks; not to play risky financial games, but rather to do the everyday lending, taking deposits, making a loan that is sound, and making those loans on Wall Street.

What is happening in Ohio? What do you see from your constituents in Ohio about Main Street? Is Main Street a place where the banks are making loans?

Ms. KILROY. I hear from so many of my constituents, people in business, people who are developers, that the ability to obtain capital and then to expand their business, to hire more people, just isn't there. They are not being able to get the loans. It is really important to get that moving again so we can get our Main Street economy, our real economy, going again.

Too much of the money is somewhere else in the pipeline. We need to get it out there to Main Street. I know several of us are working on a number of bills and issues to help expand Small Business Administration loans and others, but we need to get the banks in a position where they are doing the kind of lending that helps small business and mortgages that make sense, because there is the right kind of documentation, down payment, and other finances are in order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The statistics are really frightening in what has happened with Wall Street. If you take a look, what is really happening is Wall Street is not making loans, and many of the small banks, the community banks, don't have the capital to make the loans, so the capital is being tied up in these huge banks. So what we are really looking to do as part of this reform is to push the capital down to the local banks, down to the Main Street

banks, so that they can make loans to people.

However, if you take a look at the large banks, the leading United States banks in 2009, they reduced the number of loans that they made by 7.4 percent. It was the steepest drop in lending by the large banks since 1942, and that was the beginning of World War II.

The 22 firms that received the most bailout money, this is the Wall Street bailout money, cut small business loans by \$12 billion in 2009. Meanwhile, and this was the point you were making a moment ago, the top 38 largest financial firms gave out \$145 billion in record pay to their employees in 2009. That was an 18 percent increase from 2008, which was also a very high year.

So what is happening here is that Wall Street's philosophy seems to be all about greed for them and poverty for the rest of the Nation. That has got to end. What we need is this reform of Wall Street. We need to put in place very clear rules: No more games with derivatives. If you are a banker, you are a banker. You are not a loan shark on the street selling a bad loan. You are a banker. You are to take deposits. You are to make loans that are sound and secure, and make those loans on Main Street, not to another Wall Street shark.

So what we want to do is take the derivatives out of the banking business. If somebody wants to play the games of a gambler, they are not going to gamble with taxpayers money. They are not going to gamble with depositors money. They are going to have to do that separate and apart from banking.

Fortunately, the Senate bill seems to be moving in that direction. So when it passes the Senate and comes back to the House in a conference committee, I really want to see derivatives out of the banking business. Let them be handled by Wall Street firms that are not banks. If they want to play the game, let them play the game there. I think that will make a difference back in Main Street, back in Concord and Walnut Creek in my district.

Ms. KILROY. If the gentleman will yield, I agree that we really need to have strong regulation of derivatives and, of course, make them much more transparent. But the point you have made just now about the Wall Street pay is interesting. One of the things that I think infuriates people is when they see they are being hurt, jobs have been lost, shops have closed up, and yet they see the people that are responsible for taking our economy to the brink of disaster are getting that kind of a reward.

Also we need to see the corporate boards and the corporate shareholders take some more responsibility for what their corporations are doing. I think some of them want to do that. One of the things I would like to see happen is that shareholders get some kind of a say, some kind of an up-or-down vote on this kind of compensation. And not only do they get to vote, but I think

when you have shareholders that may be hedge funds or pension funds or mutual funds, that they need to disclose also how their proxies are being exercised in these decisions about pay.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You mentioned the issue of Wall Street pay. The numbers are really astounding. In 2007, before the collapse, Wall Street paid out \$137 billion to its employees. In 2008, in the midst of the great collapse, they actually reduced it. They went down to \$123 billion. But in 2009, while unemployment in America was hovering well over 10 percent, and in California 12 percent, in 2009, the Wall Street fat cats paid themselves \$145 billion.

I believe a lot of that money was our taxpayer money that we put in Wall Street to shore up the banks, and instead of making loans to Main Street, to the contractor, to the fellow that wanted to manufacture more ladders, that wanted to improve his business and hire people, instead of making loans to them, it appears to me that they took the money that was used to bail out Wall Street, to stabilize the economy and stabilize the banks, they took that money and they put it in their own pockets. That is reprehensible.

There was a bill here circulating, it hasn't passed, but I think it ought to pass, where these Wall Street bonuses, of which this \$145 billion is part of, I think it ought to be taxed. I think about an 80 or 90 percent tax on those bonuses in which they used our taxpayer money, that we ought to get that money back, and we ought to take that money back and put it into the local banks so that their financial situation is shored up so that they can make loans to the businesses in our communities, and tell Wall Street, folks, the big ripoff is over. The big short is over. The big fraud is over. There is going to be a law. There is going to be a tough law regulating Wall Street, reining in the excesses of those fat cats on Wall Street who came to the U.S. Senate with such arrogance that somehow they were the kings of the world, that they were the financial managers of the world and they could create out of nothing.

Wasn't there an Aesop's fable about spinning gold from wool? Maybe that is what those characters were doing. They were creating something that had the appearance of value, but actually had no value, and it nearly cost us the American and the world economy. It also cost some 10 percent, almost 11 percent of every working man and woman in this country, their job.

That is reprehensible. And it is time for Congress, it is time for the Senate—excuse me, Congress did its thing back in December—it is time for the Senate to pass a strong bill, send it back, let's get this thing done, and let's rein in Wall Street.

Ms. KILROY. I absolutely agree with you. I voted for the House bill. I supported the House bill. I would welcome an even stronger bill in the Senate if

they would pass something along those lines to make sure that the excesses of Wall Street are reined in, that there is appropriate regulation, that these exotic products don't bring our economy down again, that there is accountability, and if somebody, some big house gets in economic difficulty, that it is not in the position where the government and the taxpayers have to rush in and bail them out.

We need to make very clear that there is not going to be a taxpayer-funded bailout, and that there needs to be the kind of resolution authority or some kind of orderly method to protect the rest of the economy from a company that has gotten into trouble.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There is something I learned long ago at the University of California when I was taking an economics class, and that was the American private system of the economy was dependent upon competition, and that laws were put in place more than a century ago to eliminate concentration so that there are many, many players in the marketplace.

It seems as though we have forgotten, or at least the Republican administration in 2000 to 2008, forgot that one of the key ingredients in a free market system is many, many competitors.

□ 2030

But what happened during the decade of the nineties and 2000–2008 was a concentration in the banking industry so that now just a handful of companies, huge megabanks, control an enormous proportion of the American economy. And there's a proposal that has now been made by the Senator from, I believe, Delaware to limit all financial institutions to no more than 10 percent of the financial market, so that when they get to 10 percent, they can no longer grow. They would have to shed the business and, in that way, keep many, many players in the business. So there would be good competition and, simultaneously, create a situation in which no one bank would be too big to fail, thereby eliminating the need for a taxpayer bailout.

I kind of like that idea. It goes back to something I learned many, many years ago in an economics class about the role of competition and the need for many, many players in the marketplace. We'll see what happens with that, but financial regulation law in its final form has to deal with this issue of too big to fail. I don't want, you don't want, I don't believe the American public want to see another financial bailout with our taxpayer money going to Wall Street so they can fatten their wallets on our hard-earned money. So we'll see what happens here. We know things are coming back.

But let's not end this discussion in a down mood. If we take a look at where the American economy is going, these lines here in the red are the Bush years, and this is the unemployment rate actually growing during the final years of the Bush period so that we

were losing about 800,000 jobs a quarter in the final quarter of the Bush period. Now, when Obama came in, we see the beginning of the turnaround with the unemployment—monthly unemployment statistics changing so that, yes, the first month of the Obama administration, in January, February, it was the same as the last month of the Bush administration. But now we see a steady decrease in the number of people losing their jobs.

This is a result of three things happening. The first is the Wall Street turnaround, the Obama administration getting control of Wall Street in the early months of 2009, followed by a very courageous action taken by Congress, which was called the American Recovery Act. The stimulus bill. That began to put people back to work or keep people employed. I know that in California it was an extremely important piece of the puzzle of keeping our schools open, keeping teachers in place, and then preventing further erosion of the economy. So as that began to take hold, we began to see the number of people losing their jobs on a month-to-month basis declining so that now, in the last month, we are actually seeing the number of people employed rising—getting jobs, rising.

We still have an extraordinarily high unemployment rate. We are not even close to being home yet. So we've got a lot of work to do. Part of that work is to make sure that Wall Street doesn't ever again put at risk the job of a family, put at risk home mortgages, put at risk the American economy and, indeed, the international economy. So that's where we are headed. We've got some more work to do.

Ms. KILROY. We do have more work to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If you would like to wrap this up from the perspective of Ohio, one of the States hardest hit for many, many years now, but a State that's coming back with leadership such as yours.

Ms. KILROY. You're correct that things are improving and also correct that we're not out of the woods yet. The Recovery Act in Ohio, as in your State, helped keep teachers; police cadets were able to get another class going in the city of Columbus, Ohio; keep firefighters on the job, keep teachers teaching in schools.

We also put money in the pockets of hardworking Americans with the biggest tax cut in our history to make sure that middle-class families benefited from that Recovery Act. People who were unemployed or on food stamps also got a raise—not the kind of raise that Wall Street gets, but they got a raise. We know that that money goes directly back into the local economies. That helps build that path to economic recovery.

We'll continue to focus on jobs, on our economy, and on holding Wall Street accountable, and passing a strong Wall Street regulation bill. I look forward to working with you on that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, there's been some very good work done, but the job is not finished. We're seeing a stabilization of the American economy. We've got a long, long way to go. One major piece of that is the work that is now going on in the U.S. Senate. I beg them to send us back here to Congress a very strong regulatory bill on Wall Street. Rein in the excesses. Provide the transparency so that everyone can see exactly what the product is and how the game is being played. Push the derivatives out of the bank business so that that's all separate; the collateralized debt obligations, transparent. Regulate it. Regulate the derivatives, and make sure that we never get back into this again.

Maybe in the next month or so we will finish this critical piece of work. It's, hopefully, going to be done with the support of the Republicans. We know that for a long time they tried to stall it here in Congress, but, fortunately, the Democrats were able to put our bill out, send it over to the Senate. Now, with the Republicans in the Senate backing away from their support of Wall Street, hopefully, we'll get that bill over here; we'll finish this job and do what is absolutely necessary for the American economy and, indeed, for the world's economy.

So, with that, let's let this night pass and we'll get back to work tomorrow morning.

HEALTH CARE BILL REVISITED

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

Mr. BURGESS. I come to the floor tonight for the leadership hour on our side to talk more about this health care bill that we passed 6 weeks ago, because it was a pretty sweeping piece of legislation. We passed it kind of quickly. A lot of people may not have understood everything that was contained therein or the implications of the things contained therein. So from time to time it is worthwhile to study a little bit about what we did and how we got there and maybe why it was done, and, if anything, a look at what is ahead over the horizon for the people of this country as they begin to adjust to life with this bill.

Let me just say at the outset that I did not vote for this bill. I do not approve of this bill. The process was flawed. In fact, the process was absolutely toxic to this House, to the United States Congress—in fact, to the country at large. Never before has a piece of legislation this sweeping and with this sweeping in scope and its impact on the daily lives of the American people, never before has a bill this large passed with only the support of one side of the aisle. In fact, never has a bill like this passed that did not at least have some measure of popular

support. But the bill passed with a great deal of difficulty because it did lack popular support from the American people.

Now, 6 weeks after the passage of this bill and the bill signing ceremony down in the East Wing of the White House, now 6 weeks later, if anything, opposition to this bill has hardened. For that reason, I believe this bill ultimately will have to be repealed, ripped out root and branch, and then get on about doing the things that people told us they wanted us to do. Had we bothered to listen during the summer town halls of August of 2009, perhaps we could have delivered something meaningful for the American people. Instead, we decided to push again with a very partisan agenda.

And let's be honest, Madam Speaker, the only thing that was bipartisan about this bill was the opposition, because, indeed, at the end of the evening, when we passed this bill, you had some 35 or 36 Democrats join 178 Republicans in voting against this bill. There was no bipartisan support for this bill either in the House or over in the other body. In fact, the bipartisan nature of this bill was the opposition. The American people are now subscribed to that notion as well.

What is ahead for us? Well, there are some court challenges that attorneys general in various States—I think the last count, it was 20 or 21 States—have said that they are going to register challenges to this bill. That is a significant number. I suspect there will be more over time. The concept of negating the bill through a Supreme Court challenge is one that is far from certain, but it is certainly worth the effort that the attorneys general across the country are putting forward because, again, the bill, at its very heart, is so flawed and so toxic.

If you go back and look at the things that led up to the passage of this bill 6 weeks ago, you really have to go into last year and deep into last year to find where the roots of the problem lay. It almost goes back to a year ago last February, with the passage of the stimulus bill.

The stimulus bill famously passed without any Republican support. All of the pundits and commentators around the town were absolutely astounded that not a single Republican would vote for the stimulus package. But it was in those negotiations, such as they were, the meetings that occurred down in the Cabinet Room at the White House, where the Minority Whip, ERIC CANTOR, tried to bring some ideas to the table about what this stimulus ought to look like and what the Republican position was on the stimulus bill. And it was, Wait, not so fast. We won. We won the election. What you all say here doesn't matter. It was really that comment that set the tone for balance of 2009.

Now, there were opportunities where both sides could have come together on some aspects of what ultimately was

included in the health care reform bill. I will admit those opportunities were few and far between, but they did exist. Indeed, even individuals such as myself, so-called backbenchers, reached out to the other side, both to the transition team and to the Democratic leadership of my committee, and said, Look, health care is important to me. I didn't give up a 25-year medical career to sit on the sidelines while you guys did this. Let's talk about the areas where there perhaps can be some common ground. But those offers were never seriously entertained by the other side. They knew what they wanted in their health care bill and they wrote them exactly as they wanted them.

Now, we finally got a chance to see the health care bill about the middle of July last year. It came over the transom late one night with a note attached to it that said, Read fast. We're going to mark it up in committee in a day or two. Indeed, that's just exactly what happened.

Now, Madam Speaker, I ask you to think back to a piece of legislation not that many years ago, the Clean Air Act, which passed in the early 1990s; sweeping legislation that changed things for a lot of people in this country. Arguably, there were good things in the bill. Arguably, there were things that were contentious in the bill. But there was, I'm told, in our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, an 8-month markup on this bill. Legitimately, members of the committee hated each other at the end of that markup, but it was important. It was important for people to see the process. It was important for people to understand that both sides did play a role in crafting this very, very complex piece of legislation, and the proof has been that, over time, the bill has delivered on what it was intended to do. Indeed, arguably, the Clean Air Act has improved the quality of air in many locations around the country, and the effects were significant as far as businesses were concerned, but not crippling, and people were able to make adjustments to the legislation after it was passed. And, arguably, it has been a difficult but good process for the American people.

Now, that is an example of how things can work. It wasn't easy. It took months and months and months to do it, but ultimately it did have support from both sides of the aisle. Contrast that to the health care bill. The three committees that worked on this bill—my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, also the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and Labor, those three House committees worked on this bill. We actually had, by comparison, a lengthy markup in Energy and Commerce. We had 8 days of markup. Now, 4 of those days we were in recess subject to the call of the chair because the chairman of the committee was trying to get his Blue Dogs in line

after he lost an amendment vote early in the process. But, nevertheless, we did have 8 days in committee to work on the bill.

□ 2045

The other two committees had 24 hours, 24 hours to work on this bill. At the time it seemed like a big bill—it was 1,000 pages long. That's a big bill. It got bigger when it came back to the House in the fall and then got bigger still after it left the Senate. But, nevertheless, last July, the bill was 1,000 pages long. And to work through and mark up a 1,000-page bill probably was going to take longer than 4 working days—which is what we got in our committee—but it darn sure was going to take longer than 24 hours, which was the length of time that it was allotted in Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill was amended in the committee work this summer by all three committees. Interestingly enough, some of those amendments were Republican amendments. Interestingly enough, after the bill was wrapped up, after the work was wrapped up in the committee process, the bill left the committee and went over to the Speaker's office. There it grew from 1,000 pages to 2,000 pages.

But significantly, while the bill was doubling in size, it was shedding pages that were the past amendments that were bipartisan at the committee level. Most of the amendments that were passed in the committee never saw the light of day when the bill came to the full House floor last fall, even though the bill was substantially larger, largely because of input from folks down at the White House who worked hard with the Speaker's office for several months to get a compromise package that they could bring to the floor to get passed. But most of those Republican amendments were, in fact, deemed to be excessive and expendable and, indeed, they somehow lost out along the way.

Now, one of the things that was really striking during the course of the year and several months that we worked on this bill was just about 1 year ago. There were six groups that met down at the White House along with members of the administration to talk about things that they might do to get a health care bill passed. So in an effort to show good will toward the new administration, America's Health Insurance Plans, the Pharmaceutical Management Association, PhRMA, my AMA, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, Medical Device Manufacturers, and the Service Employees International Union all met down at the White House and decided that there were things that they could bring to the table and give up as far as financing of this complex health care bill.

I will never forget: They went into the Rose Garden and had a huge press conference where they described \$2 trillion in savings that had been agreed to

by these different six groups, \$2 trillion in savings over 10 years in things that were going to be given up, and this was going to allow the House to pass or the Congress to pass a health care bill because now everyone's on the same page and everyone's working together. There's just one problem: No one from the administration ever communicated to at least those of us in the rank-and-file on the legislative end what was contained within those bargains, what was contained within those deals. In fact, beginning in September, when I began to question and ask, can we see what those deals were? Can we see the copies of the emails that were exchanged? Can we see the notes or the minutes that were transcribed during those meetings when all of these agreements were made to produce those \$2 trillion in savings? And we didn't write anything down. Now, Madam Speaker, I ask you, \$2 trillion in savings, which was on the table—at least according to the President and the White House in May and June of last year—and no one wrote down a single word as to what those deals were?

And the problem is, it kept surfacing. As we would deal with the bill in our committee and while they would deal with the bill over in the Senate, from time to time something would come up and they would say, oh, no, wait, you can't tax the hospitals for this because that wasn't part of the deal. Well, what was part of the deal? And why can't we know what was agreed to down at the White House so we can at least, if nothing else, even if we don't agree with what happened, but so we can at least work around the deals that were crafted down at the White House?

One night it was particularly stunning. Senator MCCAIN, over in the Senate, wanted to introduce an amendment that would have allowed for reimportation of prescription drugs. Now, that is not a concept that I support. I think there are real safety issues surrounding reimportation, but the Senator should have the right to offer his amendment and argue the merits of his amendment. People on the other side should have the ability to argue the merits of their case and then have the vote and make the decision. But to stop Senator MCCAIN in the middle of his discussion and say, wait a minute, you can't do that because we had a deal, well, people recognize that's just not right, that's not the way things should be done.

It was particularly galling because the President, when he was running, when he was campaigning for the highest office in the land, repeatedly said that this was going to be a different process, his would be a different presidency, he would bring people together. It was going to be the age of postpartisanship and people with good ideas would be welcomed and everyone would be around a table. And it would be transparent. It would be covered on C-SPAN so everyone would be aware of who was on the side of the American

people and who was on the side of the special interests. This was the promise that was made to the American people during the course of a presidential campaign. And I recognize that sometimes things are said on the campaign trail, and I recognize that sometimes a promise is made that becomes very, very problematic or difficult to deliver, but this was such a central part of the argument.

Let me quote to you from what the President said when he was a candidate for office. He said, quoting now, "That's what I'll do, bringing all parties together, not negotiating behind closed doors, but bringing all parties together and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process." Well, that's exactly right.

Remember a few minutes ago I said that part of the difficulty in passing this bill was it never enjoyed popular support. It's a big bill, there's some tough concepts contained within this bill. It's not something that people are just going to embrace unless you bring them along and educate them as part of the process. But although it was promised that that would happen, that, unfortunately, never came into being. In fact, after getting frustrated with being stonewalled by the White House in September and through the fall, in December I introduced in our committee what's called a Resolution of Inquiry. A Resolution of Inquiry means that after it's filed, the committee, after a certain number of days, is required to bring it up and have a legislative hearing on the resolution. If it passes, obviously the requests go down to the White House.

Now, Chairman WAXMAN felt that, in fairness, some of the things for which I was asking would be protected by executive privilege, and not wanting to be in a protracted fight that might well have resulted in an affirmation of executive privilege, he still recognized that as a member of the committee, as a member of the legislative branch of government I should have access, that other committee members should have access to some of the things we were requesting. So about 6 of the 11 things I requested, the chairman said that's reasonable, you should have those things. And he and Ranking Member JOE BARTON sent a letter down to the White House counsel and said we would like for you to produce this information for the committee and for the Congressman who's filed the Resolution of Inquiry because we feel this is information that should be available.

Now, unfortunately, while the White House may argue that they complied with that request, all we have ever gotten have been press releases and reprints of Web pages, never the depth of the documents that was asked for in the Resolution of Inquiry. We are continuing to push that, but here we are now in the early part of May—again,

the meetings were held 1 year ago in May and June of 2009, the initial request went out in September, the Resolution of Inquiry was filed in December, it was brought up in committee at the end of January, and clearly this thing has moved with glacial speed. But tonight, Madam Speaker, I want to reassure you and Members of the House of Representatives—and, in fact, the White House—that I am going to be tenacious on this, I'm going to be relentless. We do need to see that information; it should be made available to the legislative body.

And please understand, my beef here is not with the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, PhRMA, the insurance companies, or anyone else. Certainly, they have the right and the obligation to go down and negotiate and make arguments in favor of their position and the clients that they represent. I have no problem with that. Where I have the problem is this all being done in secret, all being done behind closed doors, no paper trail to trace and hold anyone accountable. And yet, when we get to the work of writing the legislation, not so fast, we have a deal, you can't do that, we have a deal. Members of the legislative body should have access to the same information that members of the administration had access.

Now, this bill passed in March, but it was the bill that passed the Senate on Christmas Eve, not the bill we passed out of committee in July, not the bill that doubled in size and came back to the House in late October and then was passed in early November. Those aren't the bills that we now talk about. There were some interesting things in those bills—a lot of bad, a little bit of good—but those aren't the bills that are actually the point of discussion because when the Senate took up its health care bill, it decided to do something different from what the House had done. And that's okay, the Senate is a legislative body in its own right, and they certainly have the obligation and it is correct for them to do their work the way they see fit. And under normal circumstances, the House bill and the Senate bill—if in fact they're different—would be joined together in some type of conference process, and I'm sure that's what everyone over on the Senate side thought would happen, but in reality what occurred was the Senate picked up a bill that had already been passed by the House, H.R. 3590. If you'll remember, famously, that was the health care bill number.

Now, that was a bill that the House passed 1 year ago in the late summer or early fall of 2009. It was a housing bill when we passed it on this side. We passed it and sent it over to the Senate to await further work on a housing bill. But it was picked up on the Senate side, the housing language was all stripped out of the bill, and the empty shell then became the vehicle for inserting the health care language. And that's exactly what occurred between Thanksgiving and Christmas of 2009.

But the important part of this is, it was a bill that had already passed the House. And when it passed the Senate, all that was necessary to do, it didn't have to come back to a conference committee, you didn't have to iron out any differences, you simply could bring it back to the floor of the House of Representatives, ask the question as was asked here late in the night of March 20th, ask the question, Will the House now concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590? And that amendment of course switched it from a housing bill to a major sweeping piece of health care legislation over 2,700 pages long. But the House did agree to the Senate amendment, and as a consequence, that bill left the House of Representatives late that Sunday night, zipped the quick trip down Pennsylvania Avenue and was signed into law on Tuesday, and could move just that quickly because of the nature of how the bill was constructed and how the bill came to be in the Senate and how it was passed in the Senate.

This became important because, deep down inside, I don't think Members of the other body, as they put this health care bill together on Christmas Eve, I don't know that they had in the uppermost part of their mind, how do we get the very best health care policy written and included in this bill? They were more thinking about an arithmetic problem that faced them: How do we get a bill that will get a "yes" vote from 60 Senators so that we can cut off debate and pass this bill and get out of town before Christmas? And oh, by the way, a big snowstorm was bearing down on Washington on Christmas Eve and there was a lot of anxiety in the other body, a lot of reason to want to get things done and get things wrapped up for the end of the year and then come back and smooth out any rough edges and put things together because, after all, we always go to conference on these things. And even if we decided not to go to conference, we would what's called "preconference," where things would just be decided and the two bills put together and a finished product could then be passed by both bodies.

But when Massachusetts held a special election and the Senate seat that had been held for years and years and years by a Democrat was now suddenly won by a Republican, the whole 60-vote majority thing was kind of called into question and it was not certain that the Senate would have the 60 votes necessary to cut off debate because the person who won that race on the Republican side in the special Senate election had campaigned on the notion that he would not be the 60th vote to push this health care bill across the finish line, this health care bill that many Americans had looked at and rejected. So a Senate race was held and won by someone who said don't count on me to be your 60th vote to get this thing passed.

So now we've got an entirely different equation and an entirely dif-

ferent arithmetic problem here on Capitol Hill. You've got a Senate-passed bill, you've got a House-passed bill.

□ 2100

They are vastly different. But the leaders on both sides said, you know, I just don't know that we can get this done in a conference committee.

Now, it was also a big uphill climb to get Democrats on the House side to agree to vote in favor of the Senate health care bill. And with good reason. The House had worked long and hard on its health care product. And although I didn't agree with the policy and I didn't agree with the legislation as written, it was still a far better product. It had nowhere near the number of drafting errors, outright mistakes, and earmarks in it that the Senate bill did.

So the Senate bill was thrown together quickly. And on top of that, it was just riddled with errors. Who wants to put their name next to a "yes" vote for a product like that when we got a health care bill on the House side that while it might not be perfect, and certainly I didn't support it, still the product itself you could argue was a much more evolved product than what had come out of the other body.

But the arithmetic problem was what it was. And it was felt that the only way to get a health care bill passed in this first session of the first term of President Obama was to pick up and pass the Senate bill. I will always remember being on a radio show the Wednesday morning after that special election in Massachusetts, where the question was posed, "Do you think that the Democrats have enough votes on their side to simply pass the Senate bill?" And I said, "No, I do not." And someone broke into the radio show and said the Speaker of the House has just asserted that she does not have the votes to pass this bill on the House side. And I concurred. I said I think that's exactly right. This bill contains so many errors that no one is going to be willing to put their name to it.

But over the 6 weeks that ensued since that time, there were multiple discussions that resulted in a number of people on the Democratic side of the aisle who had originally been a firm "no" on the Senate bill beginning to waver and then saying, "well, maybe," and then ultimately they ended up being a "yes" vote for the bill. And just by the barest of margins they did get an affirmative answer to the question, "Will the House now concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590?"

Now, drafting errors. The bill H.R. 3590 is replete with drafting errors. We are likely going to be encountering problems in the drafting of this new law for years and years and years to come. Members of Congress were surprised to find in some of the published reports in the little newspapers that circulate up here in the Hill that in the days following the passage of the bill we had actually canceled our own

health insurance and the health insurance for our staff because the way the bill was drawn, the way the bill was drafted was that Members of Congress and their staff will be required to buy their insurance in one of the State exchanges.

The problem is that the State exchanges are not actually set up until 2014. So as it stands right now, although a health insurance premium is still deducted every month, right now it's not clear, if indeed with the bill having been signed into law and that being one of the things that was going to take effect immediately, just what the practical effect of that is. And oh, by the way, and just a little ironic twist to that, members of the committee staff are exempt from that, members of leadership staff are exempt from that requirement that they buy insurance on the State exchanges, members and staff of the administration down at the White House are exempt from that requirement, as are the political appointees at the Federal agencies.

So, again, it does seem somewhat ironic that the principal people involved in drafting this legislation, that would be committee staff, leadership staff, staff from the White House, and staff from the political appointee side of the Federal agencies, all of those groups, which were essentially the ones that wrote this legislation, exempted themselves from this requirement that they buy insurance in the State exchanges. Members of Congress and their personal staff are going to be required to do that.

Again, this is something that is certainly fixable at some point. It is simply going to require the will to do so. You do hope that no one gets into trouble before that fix can occur. And of course it's very difficult to generate much sympathy with the American people, who feel that Congress probably shouldn't be covered by insurance when so many people are uninsured in the country anyway. And as a consequence, that now is a talking point that Members of Congress do have because we did say, "If it's good enough for the American people, it's good enough for us as well."

Another part of the bill that's not widely known, but it is significant, there has been a phenomenon in recent years of what are known as physician-owned hospitals. And there are some Members of Congress who do not like the concept of a physician-owned hospital because they feel it is an inherent conflict of interest. On the other hand, I will tell you that no one knows better how a hospital ought to run and what a well-run hospital looks like than the physician who uses the hospital every day of his or her working life. And I will also tell you there is nothing quite like the pride of ownership in wanting to deliver a first class product for your patients.

Physicians who are in an ownership position of facilities, as long as there

are some parameters that are followed, physicians who are owners of those facilities want their facilities to be the best in the area because that's the way doctors generally are. We are intensely competitive, and we always want to be first, and we always want to do things for our patients that are first class.

But written into the bill is language that although it will allow the continued existence of physician-owned hospitals that were in existence on the day the bill was signed into law, it does not allow for the expansion of these facilities. So no new beds after March 20.

But you have some situations, and I have one back in the district that I represent in north Texas, in fact I just went to the ribbon cutting on Friday for this beautiful new medical facility for the people in Flower Mound, Texas, and they are justifiably proud of this new facility that was inaugurated at the end of last week, but here is the problem. Although the hospital, because it was far enough along in the development process at the beginning of the year when all the bills were being written and passed, because it was far enough along, it is allowed to be licensed. But because of the very explicit language in the bill, it can be licensed for no more beds than those that were in operation on March 20, the day the bill was signed into law.

Well, as the hospital was still just shy of completion on that date and had no operating beds, they are now stuck with a situation where they have a hospital which has a license and a Medicare number, but is licensed for zero beds because no beds were in operation on the day the bill was signed into law. Again, that is one of those problems that can be fixed. It is a technical correction. But it does require recognition by the Federal agency, Health and Human Services, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, as well as tying up a good deal of staff time and a good deal of time on the staff of the medical company that operates the hospital to try to get everyone on the same page with this and get this problem ironed out. Because at least for right now they feel like they have been left with a fairly difficult position in that they are open and generating bills to pay, but they have no way of generating the income to pay those bills.

□ 2110

The actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services produced a report just after the health care bill was signed into law. We are all familiar with the arguments that were going on as the bill was being debated. The Congressional Budget Office said that the bill was going to cost just under \$1 trillion over 10 years' time. In fact, there was the very often repeated line that the bill was going to save over \$100 billion in the first 10 years of its existence because of savings that were going to occur from Medicare.

Now, the Congressional Budget Office does work for the Congress of the

United States. The actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services actually works for the Federal agency. The actuary over at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services actually had a different read on the cost of this bill and on the likely savings generated from this bill.

According to some news accounts, the health care report generated by the actuary at Health and Human Services was given to Secretary Sebelius more than a week before the health care vote. If that is true, then officials within the Obama administration, perhaps even the President, himself, continued to sell their plan as a cost reducer when they knew that costs would actually rise under the plan.

According to the report: The reason we were given was that they did not want to influence the vote, said an HHS source, which is actually the point of having a review like this, wouldn't you think?

Well, that is exactly right. If you've got information that significantly impacts the cost or the savings of a piece of legislation like this, yes, it does seem reasonable to make that information available prior to the vote because it might influence whether or not the vote actually was in favor or opposed. Many people were concerned about the cost of this bill, but they were reassured by statements by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, by the President, and by the majority leader that the bill's costs were under control and, in fact, that the bill was delivering a cost savings.

Imagine the surprise when the actuary produced a report that said, in actuality, the bill will cost significantly more than what the Congressional Budget Office outlined and that, in fact, the purported savings in the bill will not materialize.

Now, we have had a lot of discussion on the effect of this bill on both large and small businesses. Small businesses are, obviously, concerned about the effects of the fines that they might be required to pay if they either do not provide health insurance or if too many of their employees seek subsidies in the State exchanges, because then the Federal Government will come in with a fine for those businesses.

I think of entry-level-type positions that may be affected by the additional cost burden put in place by putting these fines on these relatively small employers. I have heard from a number of small employers in my district. Primarily, these are people who employ individuals at small restaurants and at fast-food franchises. Again, we are talking about entry-level-type jobs that may now be reduced in number because of the overall increased cost that is going to come about as a result of the fines that might be levied if too many of their employees seek subsidies under the State exchanges.

Additionally, you have the effect on large businesses. Large businesses may, in fact, look at this through an en-

tirely different lens: Okay. We are providing health benefits to our employees now. It costs a lot. The costs are going up every year. The Senate and House of Representatives just passed this large health care bill, but it did nothing to contain costs. Rather, it added additional requirements to what type of insurance I am to provide my employees. So, in looking on the balance sheet at the cost of insurance, it is many, many millions or, perhaps, billions of dollars for a large employer, and the cost of the fines is significantly, significantly less than that cost of insurance.

You hope that employers will do the right thing and will say, Well, it's still important for my employees to have this employer-sponsored insurance; but in order to maintain whatever sort of competitive edge or margin a business is required to maintain, not every employer may feel that way.

One company may say, Look, I can offload a lot of cost by just simply paying the fine for not having insurance for my employees, which is a significant shift in dollars and, in fairness, a significant savings to the employer's bottom line. An employer can offload the cost of relatively expensive employer-sponsored insurance and can now just pay the fine and let the company's employees compete for insurance policies in the State exchanges as those are set up.

This is not going to happen overnight. A lot of these things won't be occurring until 2013 or 2014, but it is important for people to be aware of the types of changes that are pending out there. Perhaps there will be some room for modifying some of these things. Perhaps there will be a way to remove some of the more onerous things that are facing us in this bill. Perhaps there will even be a way to remove the bill, itself, and to get back to fixing those things that need to be fixed in the first place.

You also had members of the business community—the large employers—telling Members of Congress and leadership on my committee, Look, be careful because we are going to incur some significant costs from what you're doing in this bill. It may be necessary, and it may affect our bottom line.

You did have companies restate projected earnings shortly after the bill was passed. The chairman of my committee was upset by this and said these companies are just doing this to embarrass the President at the time of the bill signing, so he sent out the word that all of these CEOs from these companies who had restated their earnings would get the opportunity to come to our committee and to tell us all about why they thought it was necessary to restate earnings on what should have been a national day of exultation when the President signed the health care bill. Instead, they were putting out press releases about the fact that they were going to have to restate earnings.

It turns out that the restatement of earnings was because of requirements from the Securities and Exchange Commission, requirements which primarily said, if a company is going to have a significant change from what it had previously published as its earnings projections, it is obligated to be public with those and to tell people what the restated earnings are and why they are restated. So, in fact, the heads of these companies were just simply doing what they were required to do under Federal law with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

As a consequence, when that was explained to the committee, this hearing that was to occur on April 21 was postponed, and it was postponed indefinitely but not before the word sort of went out: Don't you dare cross this administration because, if you do, you may get to come to our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Committee of Energy and Commerce and explain your actions to members of the committee and to the American people at large because, of course, these proceedings are transparent and are covered by C-SPAN.

The health care costs are likely to go up significantly for large employers. Remember, there is a separate new tax on medical devices. Medtronic warned that new taxes on its products could result in layoffs of 1,000 workers. Their accounting also estimated there would be thousands of other layoffs and consumer cost increases in the ancillary businesses—perhaps in the hospitals, perhaps in the centers that provide those types of devices.

Those taxes are going to be levied, but it's not likely that those taxes are going to come out of the CEOs' salaries. It is not likely they are going to come out of the lobbyists' salaries. It is more likely that they are going to come out of the costs to the consumers of those medical devices, and many of those costs will just simply have to be borne by the hospital or doctor's office. The way things work in the medical world is, if you have a contract with an insurance company to provide a type of service, you will not be able to go back and append, Oh, by the way, I've been asked to pay this 2.8 percent tax on every syringe I use and on every class 2 or class 3 medical device that I use in my office, surgery center, or hospital. That tax will likely, just simply, come out of the bottom line of that physician's office, of that hospital, or of that surgery center.

There are a couple of things which I think are just worth talking about. There have been some statements, some affirmations, that have been made about the health care law that was signed in March of this year. Over and over again, we heard the assertion, If you like your plan, you can keep it.

Well, I think, every day, as more and more is found out about what this bill actually means as it is implemented, that statement becomes less and less true. I rather suspect, by 2014, when the

full implementation of this bill is occurring, that statement will be nothing more than a distant memory. Over and over again, we hear, To avoid additional costs and regulations, employers may consider exiting the employer health market and consider sending employees to the exchange, which is just as I was discussing a few minutes ago.

□ 2120

Larger companies are looking at this and saying there are going to be significant costs with continuing to provide this insurance. When Congress passed the law, they did nothing to hold down the cost of health care, nothing to hold down the cost of insurance, and what they have done instead is complicate things, and we can now get out of it by paying a fine, which in the long run may be a great deal cheaper to pay that fine or tax or whatever you want to call it and let our employees find their insurance in the State exchanges.

The other affirmation that's been made that again is being found to be less and less accurate is that this health care law will lower costs. And I think we have already talked about this and I think we see it over and over again that employers are already likely to pass new costs on to their employees. Health care coverage may go up in cost due to shifting of increased taxes and fees from the provider and insurance industries to the employers' employees. So that is, again, another one of the cost shifts that are likely to occur under this law and gives lie to the statement that this law will lower health care costs. In fact, the only place where this law lowers costs is by rationing care in Medicare, and as a consequence, people are going to be less satisfied with the cost containment measures that have been put forth.

There is an unelected, unaccountable body, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was created in this law, that is going to be convened to give recommendations to Congress as to how to hold down the costs of Medicare. And again these are likely to come in the form of pure cuts to Medicare. Congress will then have the responsibility to vote those packages of cuts up or down. We will not be able to modify, amend, or append those discussions. It will simply be an up-or-down vote. Historically, Congress, when given those opportunities, has declined to cut costs in those areas. Witness the physician fee schedule that comes up every—it used to be every year or two; now it comes up every few months. And Congress invariably stays those cuts that were to be enacted, and as a consequence, there is no holding down of health care costs. Nothing was intrinsically built into the bill itself or the law itself that would intrinsically work to lower costs other than cuts that will be forthcoming through this Independent Payment Advisory Board. And it's ex-

tremely problematic, number one, if any of those cuts will ever be, in fact, ratified by Congress, and if they are, I think people will find that that is something that they really didn't count on and really didn't plan on. And then the third area where the information that was put forward as the bill was being discussed, that this health care law would improve coverage, in fact, the increased taxes and regulation will lead to dropped coverage and benefits, and, again, we've already discussed that in some detail.

But those are some of the things that were marketed as truths. And I don't remember how many times I heard, "If you like what you have, you can keep it." But, again, I think that phrase will be found to be inoperative as the effects of this bill become more and more apparent.

What's ahead? What's down the road? This was a very long bill, a very complicated bill. Is the work finished now that Congress has taken its final vote and sent it down to the White House for the signing ceremony? Is the work finished on this bill or are there still parts that have to be worked out? And the answer is the work is just beginning on the second chapter of this bill. And I would encourage people who have an interest in this, a Web site that I maintain that just simply deals with health care policy, healthcaucus.org. We had a forum today talking about what's ahead with some of the rule-making and the proposed rules that are going to be coming forward out of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and although today we were talking about those rules as it affects the health information technology sector, the same concepts are important as we begin to get further and further down the road at the agency level with this health care bill. Over a year ago when we passed the stimulus bill, the information technology language was included in the stimulus bill. They spent the last year writing the policy and the rules and regulations that will cover the rollout of the health information technology funding as it becomes available, and what we found in January was the rule that was proposed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in many ways was so inflexible. All 23 benchmarks had to be met simultaneously, and it's just not the way the world works, and very few people were going to be able to do that. So for the bill to function as intended, that is, provide additional funding for hospitals and doctors' offices to get this newer technology up and running sooner, to sort of jump-start it, if you will, the net effect of the rulemaking that was released by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in January was that, in fact, it was so draconian that very few hospitals and providers were actually going to be able to take advantage of it. So the intent of the bill that was passed as part of the stimulus bill to get this information technology up and running and reward

early adopters and encourage people to come along and get these things set up in their offices, it's going to be so difficult to comply with the rule that many people will look at that and say it's just not worth the effort. You can keep the additional funding that you were offering, but I simply cannot go there with my practice or my business.

Well, we are getting some—at least the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is willing to listen to what we have to say. Two hundred and forty-eight Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, signed a letter to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that said, please, let's try to work on this and get a more flexible and workable product out there into the hands of people. And the reason this is important is because this is one simple little rule and perhaps the first one to come out of—really not the health care bill, because it came out of the stimulus bill, but it's kind of a harbinger of things to come. There is a flood of regulations, I mean a flood of regulations and rulemaking that is going to happen over at the levels of the Federal agencies. Health and Human Services to be sure. Its subset, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, which only just recently announced their designated head of that agency, has been without a political appointee at its head since Inauguration Day. So now we have a name that has been offered up by the administration, but that individual still has to go through the Senate confirmation process, and it's anyone's guess as to how soon Dr. Berwick will be seated as the new head, the new administrator, over at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. In the meantime deadlines are coming literally at the speed of light over at the Federal agency. Let me just give you an example of that.

Part of the bill, part of the law, that was signed by the President was that the Secretary of Health and Human Services was required to publish on its Web site by last Friday a list of all of the authorities provided to the Secretary under the overhaul of the law, and that is section 1552. And what the agency did, rather than go through the bill and compile that list, as they were required to do by law, what it appears that they have done is just simply reprinted the table of contents from the bill, H.R. 3590. They just simply reprinted the table of contents from the bill. Now, you can go to the Web site of Health and Human Services and look at this document for yourself. It's 18 pages of relatively small type of all of the requirements of the Secretary that are to be performed under this law.

□ 2130

Although at this point it does appear to be simply a reprint of the table of contents, it does give you a sense of how daunting this task is ahead for the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Section 1003, ensuring that consumers get values for their dollars; sec-

tion 1002, health insurance consumer information; section 1004, the effective dates; section 1102, reinsurance for early retirees; section 1103, immediate information that allows consumers to identify affordable coverage options; section 1105, the effective date of same.

This thing goes on and on for 17 or 18 pages, and if anyone is interested, I do encourage you to go to the Web site for the Department of Health and Human Services and have a look at this for yourself. Don't just take my word for it.

Now, an even larger and more daunting document is that prepared by the minority staff on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and this is available at the Committee on Energy and Commerce, up on the Web site. You do have to click on the minority side to see this, but it is the health law implementation timeline.

This document, again, relatively small font, but it is 53 pages in length and goes through in painstaking detail what is going to happen sequentially as a consequence of passing this bill and signing it into law 6 weeks ago.

They start out in 2009, the events that were to occur prior to the date of enactment, things that affect Medicaid, Medicare, Indian Health Service, and then concludes way down the road in 2020, January 1, 2020, the Medicaid start date for States to pay 10 percent of the cost for providing health care coverage through Medicaid to people made newly eligible under the bill. The Federal taxpayer pays the remainder of the cost.

A lot of information is contained therein, and for people who have an interest in what the implementation of this bill is going to look like, people who have an interest of what the timeline looks like, people who have special concerns about, hey, I think there is something in that bill to help me, but I'm not sure when it kicks in or when it starts, I encourage you to go to the Web site and look at the bill. If you decide to print it out, do bear in mind there are over 50 pages that are going to churn out of your printer after you click the print selection on the file. But I think it is important that people become familiar with this.

Again, we passed that bill 6 weeks ago. That does not end our participation, the agency's participation, the White House's participation, and certainly doesn't end the impact on literally every American alive today and those who will be born in the generation to come. They will all be affected by things that are going to be happening, particularly things that are going to be happening at the agency level, Health and Human Services, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

The Office of Personnel Management, a very small Federal agency that most people have never heard about, but the Office of Personnel Management is essentially going to set up the public insurance, which is going to become the de facto public option, which many

people thought was not even included in the Senate bill, except it turns out that it probably was. And it won't be called a public option, it will be called a nonprofit under the exchange set up at the Federal level. But, nevertheless, the intent and the effect is identical to what was being talked about last summer as the public option. Well, that is going to be administered through a small Federal agency, most people have never heard of it, the Office of Personnel Management.

And the Internal Revenue Service, for crying out loud, is going to have a role to play in the implementation of this legislation. How are people going to be made to buy insurance? How is a mandate going to be enforced? Well, it will be up to the tender mercies of the Internal Revenue Service to figure that out.

Now, it may not be as draconian as putting someone in jail for non-payment of taxes, but it certainly could be garnishment of a refund check that someone thought that they were getting because they had overpaid their Federal income taxes during the year. But if they don't have proof of insurance, that may be something that the IRS will not be returning to them, but will be using to offset the cost of providing them insurance in the exchange, because we will have the individual mandate, unless the Supreme Court agrees with the 20 or 21 Attorneys General across the country and says that provision is unconstitutional.

I think one of the big travesties in the passage of this bill, we do have a problem already in Medicare. We have a problem with funding Medicare. We do have unfunded liabilities.

One of the big problems we have in Medicare is that patients arriving into Medicare, patients who are on Medicare and change location and try to find a physician who takes Medicare, are finding it increasingly difficult to get a physician to take on their care or their case.

The problem has been historically over the years we have decided that one of the ways that we can save money in the Medicare system is to ratchet down reimbursement rates for providers. That has happened, and there is an automatic formula that requires that to happen every year.

Right now, doctors are facing what is called a funding cliff of a little over 20 percent reduction in their reimbursement rates. That will kick in the end of May. We have done some stopgap things. We go right up to the edge and a little bit beyond, and then we do something at the last minute to keep them from going over the falls into the abyss. But right now the abyss does exist, and it is very real, and it is the end of May.

There is another bill that would fix things for a little bit longer, to the end of October. But that is right before election day, and who wants their doctor to take a 20 percent reduction right before election day?

These are things that we have historically punted, and we did when our side was in control as well. There was a real opportunity to fix this in this bill, and for whatever reason, for whatever reason, the Democratic leadership and indeed the American Medical Association decided to take a pass on that.

There is a lot more that is contained in this bill. I will be back to the floor from time to time to talk about it over the coming year or two or three or four or five, however long it takes.

Again, remember, the principle behind this is to kill this bill, root it out, rip it out, repeal the bill, and then get on to fixing the things we should have fixed in the first place.

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas' previous hour and his discussion on health care.

By the way, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman/Dr. BURGESS' contribution on this health care debate that has gone on now for months and months and months, his intensity doesn't let up. He understands the issue. He is here on a cause, and this cause is to do what we can to salvage the system that America has had and improve that system and not capitulate to this system of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I will take us to that, and I will cross a number of lines into different subjects here this evening. But with regard to the ObamaCare that we have heard about for the last hour and for the last 9 or so months, we have seen a Congress that has passed legislation that on the day it passed the House, it couldn't have passed the Senate. On the day it passed the House, we don't know what kind of bargains came in that brought about just barely the votes to get it passed, but we knew the President would sign it. He wanted anything that he could put his name on.

By the way, the President of the United States is the one who gave the moniker to this legislation, "ObamaCare." He called it ObamaCare February 25 at the Blair House at that conference on health care that seemed to have given the ObamaCare its legs.

I am for 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. There isn't any part of that that I want to keep, that I want to hold, that I want to sustain or expand or continue into the next year or generation.

Most of it is not enacted until the year 2014. There are some small pieces that are enacted right away, and then slowly over time. The tax increases, by the way, are enacted pretty soon so

they can collect this money for the first 4 or more years and then charge only 6 years of expenses against 10 years of revenue and argue that it saves \$132 billion.

Now we find out that high-ranking people within the administration and possibly the President himself understood that the numbers that came in were not accurate, that ObamaCare is going to cost a lot more than they represented it to cost on the day that the legislation was passed.

Now, I don't think that is the reason to repeal ObamaCare. I have always thought it was going to cost a lot more than they said it would. The reasons to repeal ObamaCare are great in number and more varied than that.

□ 2140

But we're not going to get down to a financial calculation. In the end, there are enough people in America that think somehow they're going to get a free lunch, that they're not going to support the repeal of ObamaCare for that. But they understand this. They understand when the government runs things, there are lines. There are lines at TSA to get into the airport. There are lines to get your driver's license. There are lines outside of Federal buildings. There are lines outside the Cannon, the Longworth, and the Rayburn Building of just citizens that want to come in and watch their government function.

Free people don't stand in line. Free people, Madam Speaker, will go to the next place of business. If the line is too long at McDonald's, they will go to Burger King. But when they're dealing with government, it's a monopoly. That's why the line is there. The government doesn't have any incentive to expedite the passage of people through that service, except to turn down the noise of the squeaky wheel, because government doesn't have to compete for its customers. The government has a monopoly. So free people, they don't stand in line. They go someplace else. But our freedom is diminished every time the government takes up a task that the private sector can do, and health care is certainly one of those.

So, Madam Speaker, here's what I'm watching happen. This has taken place over the last year and a half. A little bit of it began under the Bush administration. But I'd start with this: \$700 billion in TARP spending, half of that approved under the Bush administration, essentially down the lame duck era of his term. The other half of it—that was right before the election, if I remember right. The other half of it was approved by a Congress that was elected in November of 2008 and signed in by a President who was elected in November of 2008. That was President Obama. At the direction of Speaker PELOSI and the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, \$700 billion in TARP spending, most of it, in my view, wasted.

And while this is going on, we had three large investment banks that were

nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. That means Federal ownership or control, management influence and control, three large investments banks. AIG, to the tune of about \$180 billion. Then we watched Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac swallow up billions of taxpayer dollars to recapitalize them for their losses. Then we saw, right before Christmas, the President issue an Executive order that takes on all the contingent liabilities of Fannie and Freddie and completely nationalizes Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, all of the markets that are the secondary loan market of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac taken over by the Federal Government.

Then we saw General Motors and Chrysler taken over by the Federal Government. At General Motors, the Federal Government stepping in with 61 percent of the shares, bought up the share value of 61 percent; the Canadian Government, 12.5 percent; and the unions got handed 17.5 percent, even though the secured bondholders got iced out. They had the secured collateral and they still were iced out in the leveraged negotiations that took place.

And so we've seen one-third of the private sector activity taken over by the Federal Government, and along came a \$787 billion economic stimulus plan, and then a along came the resurrection of the dead ObamaCare. The dead ObamaCare was brought to life, barely squeezed out of it, on life support, limped out of this Congress, put on the President's desk in a fashion that it could not have passed this Congress on the day because the Senate would not have approved it, Madam Speaker.

And so we saw one-third of the private sector profits swallowed up in the banks, the AIG, Fannie, Freddie, General Motors, and Chrysler, and another sixth of the economy swallowed up in ObamaCare, where the most sovereign and private thing that we have, which is our own bodies, our skin and everything inside it, taken over by the Federal Government, called ObamaCare. Our skin and everything inside it, the most sovereign thing that we have. We manage our lives, we manage our bodies, and now the Federal Government tells us what we can and can't have for tests, what we can and can't have for insurance policies, what insurance policies will be approved and what insurance policies are not approved.

Every single insurance policy in America under ObamaCare will be cancelled by 2014. Yes, many will be reissued. Some will be similar to the ones they have. But there isn't a single policy that the President of the United States can point to and say, This one will be a live, viable policy in 2015, and it won't have to change. Every one gets cancelled.

They've nationalized our bodies. And they've done so, the very people that stood here and—before 1973, but at least 1973—said that, because of *Roe v. Wade*, they said that government has

no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. Remember when you said that? Remember that debate? Remember those arguments? You'll make them again. You'll make them again to the end of the Earth because that's the bumper sticker discussion. But it's not rational thought. It doesn't substitute for thinking people. A woman should have an unlimited right to elective abortion because government has no business telling her what she can or can't do with her body, while at the same time, now the very same people, men and women who have argued since 1973 that the government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body, now are arguing that the Federal Government has every business and every right to tell everyone in America what we can and can't do with our bodies and have taken over and nationalized the most sovereign thing that we have—our own personhood.

Our skin and everything inside it managed now by the Federal Government, by the people who said that government had no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. The men and women, most of you sitting on this side of the aisle, have made the argument, and you don't have a rebuttal for this argument. Not one of you has risen to rebut this argument that I've made. I've put up the contradictions here. I pointed out the hypocrisy. I made it clear on the dichotomy. If you've got an argument to rebut the one that I've made, please stand up. I'll recognize you. I'll yield time to you. But you don't. You will sit there and you won't respond because you know you're wrong.

It reminds me of the statement made by Art Laffer on economics when he said, They are rebutting arguments that they know to be wrong in order to curry favor with their political benefactors. Well, Madam Speaker, that's what's going on. You have people here that realize where their power base is in order to curry favor with their political benefactors. They're making arguments that are completely irrational. And when they're caught in those irrational arguments, they slink away out of the Chamber with their hands in their pockets, afraid to face the rationality of it, afraid to face the debate, knowing all the while I'm happy to yield to, but no, you're gone. You won't stick around this Chamber. You won't come to a microphone because you're rebutting arguments that you know to be wrong, because that's what gravitates towards your political power base, and it's disingenuous to make those illegitimate arguments in that fashion.

So here we are now. We have come all through this continuum jump of the nationalization of one-third of the private sector activities and you add about 17 or 18 percent of health care on top of that. Now we've gone over 50 percent of our private sector economy taken over by the Federal Government,

including 100 percent of the student loans. And where are we next? Well, the financial services industry. Why didn't I see that coming?

If someone had given me the job to, in an Orwellian way, write the screenplay to a movie of how America could be taken over by a socialist agenda, I could not have imagined some of the things that have happened so far. I might have gotten half of these things. I don't think I could have gotten the scenario down. I might have been able to envision that the banks could be taken over. That was kind of an obvious one. I'd have been able to envision the takeover of the car companies because that's actually on the socialist Web site. It's actually supported by the Progressives, 77 of whom serve in the United States Congress. They are the arm and the voice of the socialists in America.

If you just Google Socialists in America, you will go to the Web site called DSAUSA.org, the Democratic Socialists of America, Madam Speaker. They're proud to be Socialists. They start out and they say, We're not Communists. There's a difference. Well, to start out with your advertisement that you're not a Communist, and there's a difference—Socialists aren't as bad as Communists is what they're saying. So they'll argue they don't want to nationalize all the real estate, all the real property in America. They don't really even have to nationalize real estate in America. They just want to take over the Fortune 500 companies. That's on the Web site. It's not a manufactured thing. It's there. It's on the Web site. Then they say, We don't have to do this all at once. We can do it incrementally. We can take over the Fortune 500 companies and these other companies that are profitable. We can take them over incrementally. We don't have to do it all at once.

Well, look what's happened. Bank of America, Citigroup. All together, three large investments banks—AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler. All of them at one time were all private sector entities, all now swallowed up and managed by the Federal Government. Fannie and Freddie, \$5.5 trillion in contingent liability. Swallow all that up.

□ 2150

Well, they can control them, a large sector of the economy. And I wondered, why would you want to take over Fortune 500 companies and manage them for the benefit of the people affected by them? What would be the motive to do that? What would this be? Well, it's power for one thing, and it creates a dependency class for another, and it expands the dependency class. The Democrats in this Congress believe that if they expand the dependency class, they will also at the same time be expanding the constituent base that will get them reelected over and over and over again. Never mind that it's a direct assault on our Constitution, a direct assault on

our liberty, but it diminishes the vitality of Americans, it saps us as a people and makes us more dependent, European socialism, something worse than that.

The argument that comes from the progressives in this Congress that want to nationalize the oil refinery industry in America—MAURICE HINCHEY—who wants to nationalize the petroleum industry in America—MAXINE WATERS—75 other progressives, the socialists and their website say, we don't run people on the socialist ticket; we don't have socialist candidates on the ballot, we have Democrats on the ballot who are progressives. They are our legislative arm, Madam Speaker.

So I continue to read through the socialist Web site, the Progressive Web site. And we will see the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) come to this floor pretty regularly—maybe not every week, at least every other week—and he puts up a blue poster that says “Progressives”—grijalva.com, or whatever that particular Web site might be—and he's proud of the progressive agenda. But the progressive agenda, if you go read it, you find it on the socialist Web site; they're proud of it, too. And they're proud of the progressives claiming the agenda that the socialists drive. Those are facts. They're not refutable. And I can flip the pages out here and put them on posters on the floor of the House without too much difficulty.

Now, BERNIE SANDERS, who served in this House, a self-evolved socialist, argued many times at these microphones—and I debated with him occasionally, although it was nothing particularly memorable that I can think of—was elected to the United States Senate a few years ago and became the first socialist in the United States Senate. BERNIE SANDERS, progressive. He's the only progressive in the United States Senate—that's listed at least on the Progressive's Web site. He's proud of that. He's proud of being a socialist.

And the argument about where the President stands is not an argument about whether the President is a socialist because the President voted to the left of BERNIE SANDERS, the self-avowed socialist. The argument, if it was going to be made, should have been made by the President. He should have made the argument that BERNIE SANDERS isn't a socialist; he's just masquerading as a socialist.

Maybe a true socialist does something different. Maybe a true socialist nationalizes even fewer businesses. When I see the President do his glad-handed, double-armed handshake with Hugo Chavez, and I see that that same week Hugo Chavez had nationalized a rice processing plant that belonged to Cargill, a proud Minnesota company that was taken over by Hugo Chavez, while that was going on, General Motors and Chrysler were being taken over by President Obama. And I thought, when I saw those two together with the big grins on their face, that

Hugo Chavez is a piker when it comes to the nationalization of business. And the question isn't, is the President a socialist? The question is, he votes to the left of BERNIE SANDERS, so what's a better description than the one that some are using? What's a better description than the one that BERNIE SANDERS, the one he uses on himself, the socialist?

The President votes to the left of a self-evolved socialist in the United States Senate; I think that's a matter worth note. It's a matter of fact; it's not a matter for debate. It is a matter for consideration, Madam Speaker. And I think it tells us something about America and about where America is being dragged and about where America will go if we don't turn back around and take this country up to the heights that are destined for us, that are based upon individual liberties, rights that come from God—free enterprise capitalism, the religious foundation and our religious faith—not just the freedom to worship freely, but the core of our faith that gives us the moral values that diminish the need for law enforcement to be looking over our shoulder and sapping our energy.

I have seen a lot of energy sapped out of this country in the last year and a half of this Obama Presidency, Madam Speaker, and I don't know how much more this country can sustain. But I do believe that we have a chance, and we're going to step forward on that chance to turn this around and take this country back to the heights where she was intended to be. That's going to mean an election result in November that's entirely different than the one we had the last couple of Novembers. And it's going to mean that this Republican party in this Congress, by golly, better get the planks down on where we want to go. We had better be unified behind them. And we better step this Nation forward so that when the election comes people will know what they're voting for, and they will be able to get behind those things that we say we're going to do.

I will submit, Madam Speaker, the number one plank in the Republican agenda has got to be 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare, not 99.9 percent or 99.8 or 98 percent; 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. And if there are Republicans that equivocate on that, if they're afraid that they don't want to take on the debate, that they don't want to put a Federal mandate in to provide for and require all insurance to be extended to age 26 for college kids, for example—I want my kids to grow up; I don't want to keep them dependent. I don't want to make their bed when they're 26. I want them on their own well before they're 26.

The law has dealt with it this way: That you are responsible for a child until they're 18 years old unless you've been divorced, in which case you might be responsible for that child until they graduate from college. I think that's a bit of an inequity. But to go to age 26

and put a Federal mandate in, I'd turn this question back the other way: Where in the Constitution does it grant the authority for the Federal Government to establish a mandate that would require that insurance companies offer health insurance to age 26 as part of every policy, which certainly raises the premium and means that health insurance is less affordable rather than more affordable?

Many of these things will take place and unfold in the upcoming next 2 to 3 years, but here's the timing in the sequence in the repeal of ObamaCare. First, a maximum number of co-signatures on my legislation, on that of MICHELE BACHMANN's, and others. We are somewhere around 63 or 64 cosponsors, Madam Speaker. And there isn't a good reason why anybody that voted "no" on ObamaCare can't step up and cosponsor legislation for repeal of ObamaCare. When we net enough signatures on that, we'll put a discharge petition down here at the well. A discharge petition with 218 signatures on it requires a bill to come to the floor for debate and vote without amendments. If we could do that, we could pass out of the House, and if the Senate could do that we could pass out of the Senate a repeal of ObamaCare that could then go to the President's desk. And President Obama would certainly—well, almost certainly—veto the bill.

Some will argue it's an exercise in futility, but I put on my Web site—the kingforcongress.com Web site—a polling question that asks this question: Do you believe that 100 percent of ObamaCare is more likely to be repealed, or do you think that the Cubs are more likely to win the World Series? And do you know, we were 2-1, 2-1 of people answering the poll for predicting that it was more likely that ObamaCare would be repealed than the Cubs would win the World Series.

Now, I'd be happy to see the Cubs win the World Series. I'm not coming here, Madam Speaker, to stir up any Cubs fans. I'm just pointing out that the Cubs went to spring training this year. They're playing ball. They're throwing, catching, hitting, running; they're practicing, they're in shape, they're getting their pitching up. They're focused. And why? Because they believe that they're positioned to win the World Series this year. They didn't go out with their dobber down. They didn't think it didn't pay to practice. They didn't skip spring training; they went to the field. Even though now they know that most Americans think it's more likely we will repeal ObamaCare than the Cubs will win the World Series, they're still playing ball. And they're not out of this at all. It's early. They're not even out of it when it's late. Until it's mathematically impossible, the Cubs are always in it. But it tells you the degree of difficulty here. If the Cubs are only one out of three likely to win the World Series, we can do this, it's not that hard. It's

not as hard as winning the World Series. We can accomplish this. We can repeal ObamaCare.

By the way, if the President vetoes a discharge petition or we come back after the elections and Republicans have the majority, we can perhaps then pass a repeal of ObamaCare, and maybe the Senate will get that done too—and Senator DEMINT is working on this mission over on the Senate side. And so we set it on the President's desk, and he vetoes it, and we wouldn't likely have the votes to override a presidential veto. Fair enough, that's reality. But here's how the function of this goes: All spending bills start in the House. A Republican majority in the House with a deep conviction to repeal ObamaCare in its entirety can shut off all funding to ObamaCare so that it cannot be implemented.

□ 2200

No part of it could be implemented or enforced if we say so in appropriations bills here in the House. And if we do that in 2011 and 2012, we will elect a President in 2012 whose number one plank in the platform needs to be that the first bill he will sign as President is full repeal of ObamaCare.

So I just envision this: the inauguration of the President of the United States out here on the west portico of the Capitol building, standing there taking the oath of office. And once he is sworn in as President of the United States by the Chief Justice John Roberts, he can take his hand down. And the first act as President of the United States, he can get out his pen, because we will gavel in January 3 of 2013, we can pass the repeal in the House and the Senate. We can set it up not on the President's desk, let's put it on the podium on the west portico so when he swears in he can have the pen in his hand for all of me, put it down, sign the repeal of ObamaCare, and it's gone from history. Pulled out root and branch, lock, stock and barrel, with no vestige, not one particle of DNA of ObamaCare left behind. Because that toxic stew has now become a malignant tumor, and we need to pull it out by the roots before it metastasizes.

That's our duty to the American people and one of the things that I came here to do and one of the things that I will work on. And I will challenge anybody that can make a cogent argument that we have got to repeal ObamaCare before we can move forward because it is an agenda that you can find at dsausa.org. That is Democratic Socialists of America. You can also find that agenda at the progressive Web site that is advertised so many times by those 77 that are the ones that are run on the ticket that the Socialists say they support.

That's what's up, Madam Speaker. I wanted to get that out and lay it out and get it off my chest before I asked my friend, the judge from Texas, if he had anything on his mind. And if he does, and he has never been without

anything on his mind, he was born with things on his mind, but I am very happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Judge LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend for yielding. Steve Forbes was up here on the Hill a couple of weeks ago. One of his comments was that we could do a complete repeal, and at the same time we could put some fixes in there that Republicans had been proposing, that we have had out there as alternatives at the same time, just one fell swoop, so that people would realize that we have not been the Party of No, we have some fantastic ideas that would have revolutionized health care and gotten it back to where it had transparency, where it was affordable, and gotten insurance companies out of the health care management business and into the health care insurance business, where you insure against an unforeseeable illness or catastrophe down the road and put patients back in charge of their health care.

I certainly had a proposal along that line that we never could get CBO to score nearly a year later, I guess about 9 months to be fair, that they have sat on that to try to help kill—help work for the Democrats to help make sure that any of the good alternative plans could not get scored so that we couldn't come in and say here is the plan that saves money, gives more freedom, and does all these things. Anyway, it's been a bit of a tough year.

But the problems didn't just start with this President. My friend from Iowa knows as well. We have been heading in the wrong path for some time. Of course Republicans lost the majority, rightfully, in November 2006 because Republicans had gotten giddy after 2001 and had started spending too much money. And voters held them accountable. And we hope they will continue that trend this November.

But I recall my favorite President, from Texas that is, George W. Bush, I think the world of him, he is smarter than most people give him credit for, but he got sold a bill of goods by a bad Secretary of the Treasury, and he was told a good way to stimulate the economy in January 2008 was to have a stimulus bill and have \$160 billion, \$40 billion of which would just be given to people as a rebate who didn't pay income tax. They would get an income tax rebate even though they didn't pay income tax.

And my friend from Iowa may remember as President Bush came down the aisle here he shook hands with everybody, and made his speech, and then on the way back up I didn't realize there was a mic open that picked me up asking him, "Mr. President, I wanted to ask you how do you give a rebate to people that didn't put any bate in?" And that's still a problem.

And then you come up, and bless his heart, Hank Paulson saved his firm Goldman Sachs, saved the people that he had worked with and chaired over

and had great personal interest in. He was able to save them at great cost to the American way of life, to the free market system. Just created a real disaster. You can't set aside free market principles to save the free market.

But it all led up to desensitizing people to just how much \$700 or \$787 billion is. It is an enormous amount of money. And so here we came into January of 2009, and right off the bat have a \$787 billion stimulus, most of which has not been spent. Even though we were told that people didn't have time to read it, you got to just pass it, \$787 billion dollars will be thrown out there and we will get the economy going. Had to be passed so fast, before people could read it.

And then yet the President took several days, kind of like he has getting fired up to do anything about the gulf coast. So he takes his time, waits for a photo op to sign the stimulus bill into effect. But the problem is you can't raise taxes the way this health care bill did and think you are going to help the economy in the long run. It's not going to happen.

And then we find out we have moved from the overly high 39 percent of Americans not paying Federal income tax to now the projection that 53 percent of American adults will be paying all of the income tax. I think historians all pretty well acknowledge that in a democracy, including this republican form of government where people can vote for candidates based upon what they promise to give them in the way of benefits, once you get past one more than 50 percent of those who are voting receive benefits and not pay income tax, or not pay the Federal taxes, you've lost it. You head to the dustbin of history. You're done. There is no recovery from that, absent a miracle from God.

And of course some of the people that are creating the problem don't believe in God, so they are really in trouble because they can't even expect a miracle from God like some of us could.

But 53 percent of Americans to pay all of the income tax. And then I have heard great disparagement, as my friend from Iowa has, as we have been to the tea parties and been asked to speak at various tea parties, including the one down Pennsylvania Avenue a few weeks ago, the one at the Washington Monument, and you see all these wonderful, peaceful, law-abiding people, and you talk to them and you find out these are people paying income tax.

And we also have seen the latest survey that indicated that 28 percent of Americans, up from 20 percent, 28 percent of Americans identify with the tea party. Well, what that means is since those 28 percent pay income tax, it means that over half of the 53 percent projected to pay all the income tax this year, those that are really carrying the load for the country, pulling the wagon for everybody else, over half of them are tea party members, identify with the tea party.

□ 2210

Quite interesting. It's not the marginal group that some would have Americans believe. We are talking about rank-and-file Americans who are pulling the weight with income tax.

Now, one of the things that would help a lot is if all of the President's promises about jobs were to come true. Then we would have more people able to pay income taxes. I know an awful lot of folks who would welcome the chance to get back to paying income taxes, but they can't find jobs. This health care bill is a real jobs killer.

I have had, as I'm sure my friend from Iowa has had as well, people who've come up and who've said, I lost my job. My sister lost her job. These folks lost their jobs. After the health care bill passed, they had to be let go. Others are saying, We've had our salaries cut. We've been told it's coming.

These are economy killers, and these things in the health care bill are robbing America of people who would be able to help with that income tax burden. So it has been tragic, and it just breaks my heart to hear from these people who have lost their jobs because they had to ram through this health care reform bill instead of doing what was really right for America. We didn't have to have people lose their jobs just to pass a health care bill, but they didn't care about what America thought.

I want to mention one other thing about the Tea Party folks before I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

We've heard that people were rowdy at the Tea Party on that weekend that health care got rammed down America's throat. Some of us went out and walked and saw the folks. We walked down the street. People were lining the sidewalks pretty thick. They were yelling and cheering when some of us came out because they were so vocally opposed to health care.

On that weekend, as I was going back to my office from a vote over here and as people had crowded onto the sidewalks and as most of my friends in Congress were walking through the streets, I decided to get up on the sidewalk and walk through the middle of the crowd and thank them. This was not a group for which the SEIU, ACORN, or the Federal Government paid their way. These were people who had come on their own money—nobody else's. They'd had to come up with their own money. Some of them had taken time off from work and from family. They'd made sacrifices to get here in order to let their voices be heard. So I wanted to personally make sure I went through the crowd. I shook as many hands as I could, and I thanked as many people as I could.

As I was going down the sidewalk, people were patting me on the back and were speaking encouragement to me. I was just saying, Thank you for coming. Thank you for letting your voice be heard.

About 10 people into the sidewalk, I started to reach for this lady's hand.

She probably was 40 to 50 years old. She was pleasant-looking enough.

She said, I'm for health care.

I thought I misunderstood, so I said, Well, I am, too—just not for this disaster.

But she said, No. I support this bill. She wouldn't shake my hand, and I thought, well, that's kind of strange. That's kind of a party killer person right here in the middle of the crowd; but, oh, well. That's fine. That's America. So I moved on.

I was shaking hands and was thanking people. They were so wonderful and encouraging. They were saying "thank you" for my thanking them. It was really very moving at times. Those were some of the expressions we got.

About 15 feet down the sidewalk, I met a guy who said, I'm not shaking your hand.

I realized this was another one like the lady. Every 10 to 15 people, as I shook hands with people on both sides, I ran into people who wouldn't shake my hand because they were for the health care bill.

When I got to Independence, I had a guy yell, Are you LOUIE GOHMERT?

I said, Yes.

He wanted to know why I hated homosexuals, and I explained I don't. You know, as a Christian, I am supposed to love everyone, and I try very much to do that, but it doesn't mean I have to embrace lifestyles that the Bible says are inappropriate.

Anyway, he used the "S" word and some things that I won't use. I mean I know it's appropriate for Senators like Senator LEVIN, but I'm not going to use those words down here. I don't think they're appropriate here, but I had them used on me out there on the sidewalk. He was, obviously, also not a supporter of the Tea Party, of me, or of those who were walking through.

After I got back to my office, I realized, you know, those people were placed about every 10 or 15 feet in the middle of the crowd. I don't know what they did after they refused to shake my hand, but there were certainly people placed regularly throughout the crowd who were just that—they were placements. They were people who were put in there. They were observers. Hopefully, they weren't the people who yelled epithets or things to try to make their conservative folks around them look bad; but I can verify and I can testify that those people were out there and that they were amidst the Tea Party folks. Most assuredly, they were not Tea Party people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If I could temporarily reclaim my time, I would just appreciate an opportunity to comment on what you said, Mr. GOHMERT. This phrase comes to mind: Birds of a feather flock together.

That's why it's unusual to see some of those birds that are not of a feather there in the flock of the Tea Party faithful. Why would that be?

I think we've seen it here, occasionally, on the floor of the House of Rep-

resentatives when we generally sit in a segregated fashion—Democrats on one side and Republicans on the other side. Yes, we walk through and we talk to each other and we do business; but generally speaking, it's Democrats there and Republicans here. Yet on occasion—and especially on the occasions of the State of the Union addresses and of addresses of the joint sessions of Congress by President Obama—we have Democrats who will come over to this side of the aisle and who will sit in a scattered fashion throughout over here so that, when the standing ovations begin or when they don't happen, they're blended and integrated in a different way.

That's by order of the Speaker of the House. It isn't infiltration—it's public—but it is clearly by order of the Speaker of the House. They didn't just spontaneously decide to come over and sit here and try to start standing ovations and, more or less, change the image of the State of the Union address.

Also, we know that the left has infiltrated or has at least announced that they were seeking to infiltrate the Tea Party groups. Some of those subversive tactics come to mind especially in the times that we've had these rallies—they're really press conferences—over on the West Lawn of the Capitol. We went out and took pictures of the lawn. I know on one occasion I asked people to be careful and to pick up their litter, but I don't know of anybody else who has ever made that request. I'm thinking of three occasions when the lawn was spotless. We took pictures. We were trying to find some litter. We were trying to find a cigarette butt—anything out there on the grass. It was all picked up and carried away.

The cleanest group of people is the Tea Party group that comes here. They have the Constitution in their shirt pockets or on their hearts. They love this country, and they wouldn't desecrate any of the symbols of our liberty or any of the symbols of our freedom.

Though, if you looked at the other folks, at the people on the other side of the aisle, at the people who make common cause with the folks who generally sit over here, on the same day of that major gathering of opponents to ObamaCare, there was a pro-amnesty rally. The differences were they were wearing the same T-shirts; they were carrying signs that came off the printing press one after another, and they left litter all over this city.

While the Tea Party groups and the anti-ObamaCare groups were here, they had homegrown signs. They didn't have any commonality of dress. They wore what they had of their own. There was some red, white, and blue out there and plenty of yellow hats and flags, but they were not at all an army that was uniformed, coached, or bussed in. They came in by their own transportation. They made their own signs. They wore a whole variety of different clothes. They made up chants on the way, and

they were making signs on the fly. When it was all over, it was as clean as a whistle. It was as if it were a park that they owned because they believed—and they do—that they owned that park.

I am proud of the peaceful people who came here. I don't have respect for the folks who tried to infiltrate that and who caused trouble. When I saw the rallies against the Arizona immigration law, when I saw the bottle bouncing off the head of a police officer, when I heard the stories about refried beans being smeared on the State buildings in Arizona, and when I heard about a swastika that was, perhaps, painted there, those are the kinds of activities you would never see happen on the other side with the Tea Party groups. There is no violence there. The violence is perpetrated by people on the other side.

The allegation that the "N" word, that the "F" word, or that spitting took place could not be substantiated, and I am coming close to the conclusion that it was fabricated, not substantiated.

As I feel a little better having vented myself on that subject, I would yield back now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, thank you.

One of the other things that comes to mind is we talk about our freedoms—about the ability to assemble and about the freedom of speech, which is the ability to say what is in your heart.

□ 2220

We come to what happened last week in England, where a man who was not intentionally out being a nuisance, but he was asked by an officer, according to the article I read, who looks for violations of this type of law, ethics type of law—and this person apparently was homosexual in practice, and he asked the individual about the Bible, about sin. He mentioned drunkenness and a number of things that would be sins as addressed in the Bible and was asked about homosexuality, and he said, yes, under the Bible it's a sin. It's hard to look at Romans 1 and think otherwise. But anyway, this man was arrested. He was put in jail and now is out awaiting trial on his charges. And it was one of the things that concerned us greatly about the Hate Crimes Act because we knew that bill was based on two lies. And there were publications like Texas Monthly that didn't bother to look into the facts, many publications around the country that just ran off and jumped on the train of those who refused to read it, laws to read the facts, to look at facts that were being cited as basis and find that they were lies. But the two things on which that bill were based were both lies. Number one, that there was an epidemic of hate crimes in America. Number two, that it would somehow have changed for the better the outcome in the James Byrd case in Texas, the Matthew Shepard case. And the fact is that those are lies.

The James Byrd case had two of the three—the two most culpable defendants got the death penalty. The only effect the hate crimes bill would have had if it had been in place back then would be that those guys that got the death penalty would have gotten life in prison instead of death. I felt like from the evidence that I read and heard about that they deserved the death penalty. And in the Matthew Shepard case, they got multiple life sentences; so it wouldn't have affected those cases.

The FBI statistics show there has been no surge, uptick in hate crimes, alleged hate crimes, and those include willing of things inappropriate.

I don't think my friend from Iowa or any of our friends, and those that I met at TEA parties would condone nasty name calling. None of the people I met. But we get into a very dangerous area. There were Founders that fought and died for this country and for that thing that would later become the First Amendment. It didn't exist during the Revolution, but they believed the concept of freedom of speech. And they often cited Voltaire as the source. Some disagree, but Voltaire is usually given as the source for the saying "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." That helped form a basis for this country. Yet now we have evolved in this country to where the thought police have a slogan that is more apt to be, I disagree with what you say, and I'm going to destroy your life because of it. I'm going to see you're fired. I'm going to see that you lose as much of your assets, hopefully all of them, as I can. I am going to destroy your life.

So we have come a long way from those days when the Founders were willing to fight and die so people could say things they thought reprehensible but at least they had the liberty to say them.

One of the things that gets very dangerous is when you start putting a lid on people's freedom of speech, as the PC police around here, as the thought police have begun to do. When you prevent people from being able to say what's in their heart and vent a bit, then you build up steam. If you don't allow people to vent, they build up steam, and then you have an explosion. So I know there are those that say, well, talk radio is hateful and whatnot. And actually talk radio, most of it, is not hateful at all.

But you go back to the President's own statement that we're not a Christian Nation. Well, I am not going to debate that. I know that we were founded by people who professed to be, although history is often rewritten nowadays, including in the early 1800s an early biography of Washington that was a complete fraud.

But if my gentleman friend from Iowa would allow me, this has just been on my heart because I go up from time to time to the Lincoln Memorial, and I stand there and read those pro-

found words from that selfless man. And on the north inside wall is his second inaugural speech. And it brings me to tears every time I read it because this is a man who is wrestling with how a just God could allow the pain and suffering to go on that he did. And it is a beautiful theological discussion. If it would be all right with the gentleman from Iowa, these are Abraham Lincoln's words in his second inaugural. It's there carved into the marble, and he was talking about the North and the South, trying to make sense of how you could have friends and family fighting on two sides of an issue. He said:

"Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has his own purposes."

Then he quotes Scripture, and he says: "Woe unto the world because of offenses; for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh."

"If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him?"

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Powerful, powerful words. And having lost my brother a couple of weeks ago, sometimes it is a struggle when you believe in God to know the kind of hurt and suffering that goes on.

□ 2230

But as Lincoln said, and so it must still be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." And I do believe, and I don't

try to push my religious beliefs on anyone else, that God normally allows us to suffer the consequences of terrible decisions. If you follow the rules, you do what we are told allows your nation to be blessed, and your nation gets blessed. If you follow the things that cause your nation to be cursed, it just seems throughout history, that is usually what happens.

This is such an important time in our history. We have got people who would gladly destroy everything we believe in, all the liberties we have, and yet we have people who are at the same time striking at our freedoms of speech, striking at our liberties to assemble as we wish. Those things need to stop. We need to stop those who by terror and by warfare would try to take away those things that the Founders and all those who have fought and died since have put at our feet and given to us as a gift, and we need to fight those from within who attempt to take them away through misrepresentations of what are truly the facts in order to pass bills that actually are based on lies and hurt the country.

I appreciate my friend so much yielding to me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I was deeply engaged in that presentation, and much of it I reflect upon, having stood there many times at the Lincoln Memorial and read the second inaugural address. It has been too long since I have been back down there. I need to go back.

As the gentleman from Texas talked about Voltaire, another statement of his, even though he was a bit of a Utopianist and not necessarily one whose teachings would fit the beliefs that I follow, there is one of his quotes that stands in mind for me, and I think it is appropriate here in the United States.

I've watched us turn from a nation of rugged, can-do, highly spirited people to a nation that is slowly, and I shouldn't say slowly, dramatically turning into a nanny state.

I grew up in a society where we understood we had freedom, and we exercised that freedom, and the prohibitions were there a law that prohibited us. The gentleman from Texas and I have exercised that American freedom, that American freedom, pretty interestingly, in the country of Tibet, when it was the idea of Judge GOHMERT that we should climb a mountain in the Himalayas.

So we set about from Lhasa, Tibet, to go do that. But we had Chinese minders. The Chinese minders' job was to mind us, to make sure we minded them; that we didn't get out of line; we didn't go do things they didn't want us to do; that we didn't see things that they didn't want us to see; and we didn't hear Tibetans or Chinese tell us things that they didn't want us to hear. So they presented themselves often as the interpreters, the protectors.

So when we said, we are going to go climb a mountain in the Himalayas

here, they said, well, no, you can't. You are not authorized to go up there, and so you can't.

Well, China and Tibet is a society where it has to be permissive for you to act. America has been a society where you have got permission to do everything that is not prohibited. We don't ask the question, do we have permission? We ask the question, is there a law against it?

So we told the Chinese minders, well, you may say we are not going, but we are Americans. We are going to go climb this mountain in the Himalayas. And that is what we did, because we didn't realize, I don't think, we were in a country where you had to have permission, because we have got the American spirit.

We went to the top of that mountain. And it is something that I will never forget, that experience going up, being there, looking at that vista of snow-capped peaks all the way around the horizon, the huge glacial lake down below, that spot on the globe. I am so glad we stepped forward and did that.

I don't know if there are any other people on the planet that would have just gone up to the top of the mountain, because that is what we do. We don't wait for permission. If there is not a law against it and we think it fits within our moral standards, we go.

Well, this can-do America that we are has been an America that came in, and by the sweat of our brows we built a nation for hundreds of years, that can-do entrepreneurial spirit with free enterprise and freedom and the liberties that are laid out that come from God, that are in the Declaration, most of them, not all of them.

Voltaire said back during that period of time, History is the sound of hobnailed boots storming up the stairs, and silver slippers coming down.

That describes a lot of what goes on. The ascendancy of history are the people that work hard, that are industrious, that produce, that are competitive, and sometimes, Madam Speaker, combative. And when people get a little too soft and they are sitting on the silken pillows and they have the waiters bringing the grapes to them and popping the grape in their mouth while they fan them a little bit, like Ahab the Arab, the sheik of the burning sand, that is kind of the image of what happens when a person lays back on the silk.

What has happened with the Voltaire statement was hobnailed boots storming up the stairs, silver slippers coming down. And a lot of the French elite, the aristocracy, were the silver slippers, and they came down the stairs, because they got too lazy and they got too laid back without being competitive. They lost their sense of where they were going or why.

I don't want to do that as a nation. I don't want to watch the hobnailed boots come up the stairs. I don't want us to be the silver slippers coming down. I want us to step forward and

compete. I want free enterprise. I want freedom, I want liberty, I want a strong national defense. I want to have a tax policy that stops punishing productivity, and it can tax consumption, because that is an incentive for more consumption. I want that strong national defense, as I said. I want school choice, so kids can be raised at the will and the wishes of their parents with real American history and real American values.

If we can do all of those things, we can take this Nation to the next level of our destiny. And should we fail, we will trail in the dust the golden hopes of men.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the Indiana primary.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indian, for 5 minutes, May 5 and 6.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and May 5.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today, May 5 and 6.

Mr. KING of New York, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and May 5.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, May 5.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the fol-

lowing titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3714. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information about freedom of the press in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5146. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 29, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5147. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 3, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5146. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7306. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2009 on the STARBASE Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2193b(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7307. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting report on future research and development of man-portable and vehicle mounted guided missile systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7308. A letter from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices (RIN: 1219-AB61) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7309. A letter from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — High-Voltage Continuous Mining Machine Standard for Underground Coal Mines (RIN: 1219-AB34) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7310. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-04, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of

the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7311. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-14, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7312. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-016 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-023, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7314. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-026 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7315. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-015, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-019, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7317. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, reports prepared by the Department of State on a weekly basis for the December 15 — February 15, 2010 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7318. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Salt Creek Tiger Beetle [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2007-0014] (RIN: 1018-AT79) received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7319. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV34) received April 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7320. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra-

tion, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV51) received April 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7321. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Invista Inc Facility Docks, Victoria Barge Canal, Victoria, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0797] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7322. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Congress Street Bridge, Pequonnock River, Bridgeport, Connecticut [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1072] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7323. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Todd Pacific Shipyards Vessel Launch, West Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1073] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7324. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Escorted U.S. Navy Submarines in Sector Seattle Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1057] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7325. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Great Egg Harbor Bay, between Beesleys Point and Somers Point, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0453] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7326. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Havasu Landing Annual Regatta; Colorado River, Lake Havasu Landing, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1060] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7327. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; AICW Closure Safety Zone for Ben Sawyer Bridge Replacement Project, Sullivan's Island, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0878] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7328. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Baltimore Captain of Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1130] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7329. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; U.S. Navy Submarines, Hood Canal, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1058] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received April 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7330. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bullards Ferry Bridge, Coquille River, Bandon, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0839] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7331. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "25th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008", pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47131; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7332. A letter from the Director, National Intelligence, transmitting annual report on acquisition by foreign countries "dual-use and other technology useful for the development or production of weapons of mass destruction (including nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons) and advanced conventional munitions" covering January 1, to December 31, 2009; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

7333. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority, pursuant to Public Law 111-8, section 7040(d); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

7334. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting an estimate of the direct spending and revenue effects of an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4872, the Reconciliation Act of 2010; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

7335. A letter from the Chairman, U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's record of the public hearing on "U.S. Debt to China: Implications and Repercussions"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 263. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 111-470). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 247. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 111-471). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 1301. Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day (Rept. 111-472). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 1278. Resolution in support and recognition of National Safe Digging Month, April, 2010; with amendments (Rept. 111-473 Pt. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOWNS: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1722. A bill to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows

employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 111-474). 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 Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. House Resolution 1278 referred to the House Calendar.

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. PAULSEN (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 5198. A bill to express the sense of Congress that the Federal Pell Grant program should be a high funding priority; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5199. A bill to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to promulgate regulations regarding interchange transaction fees and to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit certain restrictions put in place by credit card networks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER):

H.R. 5200. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend eligibility for coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program with respect to certain adult dependents of Federal employees and annuitants, in conformance with amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 5201. A bill to improve the energy efficiency of outdoor lighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5202. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue guidance to school food authorities on indirect costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 5203. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a center of excellence for the study of tinnitus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5204. A bill to establish the National Full Employment Trust Fund to create employment opportunities for the unemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 5205. A bill to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution expressing the Sense of Congress that the escalating level of violence on the United States-Mexico border is a serious threat to the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1320. A resolution expressing support for the vigilance and prompt response of the citizens of New York City, the New York Police Department, the New York Police Department Bomb Squad, the Fire Department of New York, other first responders, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Customs and Border Protection, the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the New York Joint Terrorism Task Force, the Bridgeport Police Department, Detective Bureau, Patrol Division, and other law enforcement agencies in Connecticut to the attempted terrorist attack in Times Square on May 1, 2010, their exceptional professionalism and investigative work following the attempted attack, and their consistent commitment to preparedness for and collective response to terrorism; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H. Res. 1321. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the political situation in Thailand be solved peacefully and through democratic means; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 1322. A resolution celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program and recognizing the significant contributions of Albert Einstein Fellows; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 1323. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the Katyn massacre; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1324. A resolution expressing condolences and sympathies for the people of China following the tragic earthquake in the Qinghai province of the Peoples Republic of China on April 14, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Res. 1325. A resolution recognizing National Missing Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 24: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SPACE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 40: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 43: Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. COLE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 197: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 275: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. REBERG, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 422: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 442: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 476: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 564: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 658: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 997: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1020: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1021: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1036: Mr. BOYD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1067: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1175: Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 1177: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1191: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1210: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1215: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1220: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1240: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1255: Mr. COBLE and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.

H.R. 1326: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1340: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1392: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1410: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1529: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1547: Mr. WALZ and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 1615: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1693: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1806: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1829: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1873: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1884: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1894: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. WHITFIELD.

- H.R. 1972: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2002: Mr. UPTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. MELANCON.
- H.R. 2109: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. MCCAUL.
- H.R. 2112: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 2142: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 2149: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2417: Mr. McDERMOTT.
- H.R. 2441: Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 2478: Mr. COLE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 2672: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 2732: Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 2835: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 3012: Mr. MELANCON.
- H.R. 3162: Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 3185: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 3225: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3333: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3383: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
- H.R. 3441: Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 3463: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 3464: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3486: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 3487: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3531: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 3564: Mr. McNERNEY.
- H.R. 3615: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
- H.R. 3781: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3790: Mrs. BIGGERT.
- H.R. 3851: Ms. KOSMAS.
- H.R. 3856: Mr. CHANDLER.
- H.R. 3974: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. HIRONO.
- H.R. 4090: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 4116: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 4128: Ms. NORTON and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 4195: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 4202: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIREN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 4241: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 4278: Mr. CAMP, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 4306: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H.R. 4309: Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 4318: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
- H.R. 4321: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 4322: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 4376: Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 4400: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 4402: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 4491: Mrs. CAPPS.
- H.R. 4494: Mr. COSTELLO.
- H.R. 4502: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 4509: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 4517: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 4530: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 4542: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 4544: Mr. SPACE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 4552: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 4638: Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 4662: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 4678: Mr. WEINER.
- H.R. 4684: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WU, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 4693: Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 4710: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. CLARKE.
- H.R. 4734: Mr. CLAY and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 4745: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 4755: Mr. HALL of New York.
- H.R. 4756: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 4780: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 4785: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
- H.R. 4812: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 4819: Mr. BACA and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 4830: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 4844: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 4850: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 4859: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
- H.R. 4860: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 4868: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 4870: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 4886: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. FALDOMA VAEGA.
- H.R. 4914: Mr. HODES, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 4943: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
- H.R. 4959: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 4961: Ms. WATSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 4971: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H.R. 4999: Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 5008: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. TAYLOR.
- H.R. 5015: Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 5027: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 5029: Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 5034: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. REYES, Mr. KRATOVL, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. NYE.
- H.R. 5040: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 5044: Mr. HODES and Mrs. HALVORSON.
- H.R. 5054: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 5078: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H.R. 5092: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
- H.R. 5095: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H.R. 5121: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MCMAHON.
- H.R. 5125: Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 5126: Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 5128: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OBEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. OLVER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 5131: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 5138: Mr. INGLIS.
- H.R. 5141: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DENT, and Mr. McCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 5142: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WU, and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 5144: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 5160: Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 5163: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 5164: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 5173: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 5174: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 5177: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H. Con. Res. 137: Mrs. MALONEY.
- H. Con. Res. 240: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. BOREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BARTLETT.
- H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. BOYD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
- H. Con. Res. 267: Ms. BERKLEY.
- H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H. Res. 173: Mr. WU, Mr. ROSS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HONDA.
- H. Res. 278: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H. Res. 287: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H. Res. 407: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. WU, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
- H. Res. 904: Mr. ANDREWS, and Mrs. MALONEY.
- H. Res. 1006: Mr. CONAWAY.
- H. Res. 1149: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H. Res. 1152: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H. Res. 1213: Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H. Res. 1226: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAUL, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. PITTS.
- H. Res. 1231: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H. Res. 1232: Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TURNER.
- H. Res. 1241: Mr. PENCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H. Res. 1245: Mr. RADANOVICH.
- H. Res. 1247: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PETRI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 1251: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 1264: Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 1273: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 1277: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 1285: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 1290: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 1291: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BOCCIERI, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 1294: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. FARR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H. Res. 1295: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 1297: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 1299: Mr. GRAVES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BOSWELL,

Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H. Res. 1302: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WU, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 1307: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. EHLERS.

H. Res. 1308: Mr. DICKS.

H. Res. 1310: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 1312: Mr. HARE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. REYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BRIGHT.

H. Res. 1317: Mr. PENCE and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative WAXMAN, or a designee, to H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act of 2010, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2927: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.