



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2009

No. 90

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 16, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PERLMUTTER 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.

WHERE ARE THE FISCAL CONSERVATIVES?

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we have now spent approximately \$200 billion, \$200 billion, on the war in Afghanistan against a foe that has almost no money and equipment, especially in comparison to ours. Now we are about to take up a supplemental appropriations bill later today to provide many billions more, all this in a place where even General Petraeus said we should remember has been known as the "graveyard of empires." This comes on top of

approximately \$800 billion on the war in Iraq and hundreds of billions more in indirect costs for these two wars.

Then, in the supplemental bill that we'll take up later today, we have \$5 billion for the International Monetary Fund, and in this bill, there is a guarantee for \$100 billion in loans made by the IMF, loans being made to other countries. All this money will have to be borrowed because we are so many trillions in debt already that it is not even humanly comprehensible.

The bill also contains \$7.7 billion for swine flu vaccines. I heard a reporting of a speech of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. PAUL, made recently, in which he said during his first stay in the House, in I think it was 1976, that there was another swine flu scare, and that only he and one other person, probably the only other medical doctor in the House at that time, voted against the money for the swine flu scare. And one person died from swine flu that year, and many more died from taking the vaccine than died from the flu. This is a great overreaction in this area as well. Many thousands are dying from other diseases that we're not paying attention to.

This supplemental appropriations bill started out at \$85 billion, then it went to \$91 billion, then \$95 billion, and now, today, \$106 billion. And I ask you, are there no fiscal conservatives around here?

We read last year that the Pentagon had \$295 billion in cost overruns on just their 72 largest weapons systems. Now, that didn't count all the cost overruns that they might have had in all their thousands of other large-, medium-, and small-sized contracts, and we're having a hearing right today—in fact, it's going on right now, I was there earlier—in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in which they said 74 percent of the private contracts that the Federal Government gives out are

given out by the Pentagon. Are there no fiscal conservatives at the Pentagon?

I know everybody is trying to prove how patriotic they are today, and everybody feels that we shouldn't question anything the Defense Department wants. But to allow \$295 billion in cost overruns on just these 72 largest weapons systems, in my opinion, it's unpatriotic not to question that. And I ask again, are there no fiscal conservatives at the Pentagon?

The fact is, we've turned the Defense Department primarily into the "Department of Foreign Aid" now, and I believe very strongly in national defense. But we cannot afford to run the whole world, and we cannot afford to have the Department of Defense be the "Department of Foreign Aid."

All of this comes not long after we have raised our national debt limit to over \$13 trillion. Nobody can comprehend a figure like that, no one. That is an astounding figure. And yet on top of this debt that we already have, the President's budget in this year and the next 2 years will add over \$4 trillion of debt to that debt, \$4 trillion in this year and the next two; three years' time, \$4 trillion added to our national debt.

And then this year, if I had told people 2 or 3 years ago that we would have a budget this year of \$3.6 trillion and that half of that, \$1.87 trillion, would be deficit, nobody would have believed that. They would have thought that I was ridiculous or that I was crazy in saying that.

I used to say to my colleagues that it was terrible what we were doing to our children and grandchildren. Now, I'm saying it's terrible what we're doing to ourselves because it's not going to be 5 or 10 years, if that long, before we're not able to pay all of our Social Security and veterans' pensions and all of the things that we have promised our own people.

□ 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.

H6815

We've got to stop trying to run the whole world. It's not isolationist to say that because I believe in trade and tourism, and cultural and educational exchanges, and I believe we should help during humanitarian crises. But we can't keep spending hundreds of billions of dollars in other countries, whether it's done by the Defense Department—and of course, it's also being done by every other department and agency in the entire Federal Government.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 1177, THE FIVE FIVE-STAR GENERAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, before I get my chart and bring it up, if they'd bring it up for this situation, I just might respond to the previous speaker. He forgot to mention that they handed this mess to this new administration just a matter of a few months ago and went through 8 years of borrow and spend. So I hope the people take that with a grain of salt.

What I, Madam Speaker, would like to speak to you a few moments about today is to highlight an institution of great importance to our national security and to myself, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Most Americans are probably unaware of the role that this fine institution plays in keeping our Nation safe by training future generations of military leaders. The Command General Staff College plays a vital role, giving our Nation's Army commanders the advanced technical and tactical education they need in order to effectively lead soldiers in battle. They have been doing so since its founding in 1881, and during the past 128 years, it has provided a first-rate military education to thousands of accomplished men and women who have defended our freedom. I'd like to commend the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College on its commitment to excellence, throughout history, in support of our military.

I'd like now to draw your attention, if I may, to a particularly distinguished group of alumni. The five war heroes you see beside me, Generals George Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Dwight Eisenhower, Henry Arnold, and Omar Bradley, served our country with valor and distinction during the Second World War and became household names through their renowned accomplishments.

It is a little-known fact, of which we are all proud, that these great men all were graduates of the Command General Staff College where they received their unique training and education needed to excel in leading our brave servicemembers into battle.

Since then, the college has continued to improve and adapt its training in re-

sponse to the ever-evolving challenges of war. Though the specifics of the instruction may have changed, the honorable mission has not. I, too, am a graduate of, and a former instructor, at the U.S. Army Command General Staff College. Madam Speaker, I speak from personal experience of the pride and the satisfaction that comes from knowing that I received the best military leadership education our Nation has to offer and stood in the footsteps of these great men.

General George Marshall was the Army Chief of Staff under President Roosevelt and one of the chief architects of victory for our Greatest Generation and later served as the third Secretary of Defense.

General Douglas MacArthur bravely led our forces to victory in the Pacific theater.

General Dwight Eisenhower, our past President, was the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and directed the D-day operation, whose anniversary was just celebrated, before going on to lead our Nation through some of the most trying times during the Cold War.

General Henry Arnold commanded the Army Air Corps in Europe and remains the only person ever to hold the title of General of the Air Force.

Last, but certainly not least, General Omar Bradley commanded the Allied forces on their march to victory in North Africa and became the first to hold the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

At this point, I'd like to make mention of an organization that provides invaluable support to the U.S. Army Command General Staff College, which is the U.S. Army Command General Staff College Foundation. This organization is funded by private donations, and its mission is to enrich the academic experience of the college by providing resources in areas not covered by appropriations.

Since its inception, this foundation has established a number of awards for academic excellence for students of the college in recognition of their achievements in the fields of tactics, logistics, and military arts. It has supported professional development at the Harvard Business School for college faculty members. The Foundation has also sponsored the Colin Powell Academic Lecture Series, which began in April of 2008. General Powell is also an alumni of the college. Indeed, it is hard to overstate the degree to which the Foundation has enriched the experience of both students and staff at the college.

Its board of directors comprises retired officers, business and community leaders, all of whom have a keen interest in improving the quality of the education provided by the college. I would like to commend the Foundation's board and, in particular, its CEO, Colonel Robert Ulin—who is in the gallery I do believe—U.S. Army-Retired, for the invaluable work that he does to enhance the college and its future mili-

tary leaders. Colonel Ulin is also a graduate and instructor of the college.

It is with this Foundation and the Command and General Staff College in mind today that I would like to mention H.R. 1177, the Five Five-Star General Commemorative Coin Act. This bill would authorize the U.S. Treasury to mint a series of commemorative \$5, \$1 and half-dollar coins bearing the likeness of these distinguished five generals. These coins would honor the historic contributions these men have made in defense of justice and freedom. Americans young and old could admire and collect them, and the stories of these great men might be reinforced in the popular imagination, perhaps even inspiring some to follow their lead.

This bill will honor the great soldiers of the past. Please sponsor H.R. 1177.

CAP-AND-TAX IS GOING TO BE NOTHING MORE THAN A NATIONAL ENERGY TAX

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

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, one of the issues that we've been talking a lot about on this floor and across this country has been about cap-and-tax, and cap-and-tax is nothing more than it is going to be a national energy tax.

Now, I have a very unique district in the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio. It's interesting in that I represent not only the largest manufacturing district in the State of Ohio, but I also represent the largest agricultural district in the State of Ohio.

I know we've been talking about this and there's been a lot of information that's being put out there by a lot of different groups. But I think it's interesting to point out that the Heritage Foundation and just last week the Brookings Institution has also put out how many jobs are going to be lost by this. The Heritage Foundation is estimating that you're looking at anywhere from over 1.5 million jobs being lost; carry out to the end date with the Brookings Institution, about 2.5 percent. We can't afford to have this happening in the United States.

When you look at what the Heritage Foundation did, they did a very interesting study. They did what they call a manufacturing vulnerability index. They took all 435 districts across the Congress. They said, What was the amount of energy that you use and what type of energy it was? In my case in the State of Ohio, 87 percent of our energy is coal-generated. Next door to my west is Indiana. They get 94 percent.

So they ranked all these districts together. The question was, Okay, where did you stand? And this is one of those times where you don't want to be at the top of the list. Of the top 20 districts in the United States, according to this manufacturing vulnerability index, 16 of the top 20 were from Ohio and Indiana. Unfortunately, in my case, I came in number three.

Number three, What's that going to mean? It means it's going to be tough to get jobs in northwest Ohio, north-central Ohio, and people are having a tough time right now because we have a manufacturing district. If we don't have those jobs and we don't have that electricity that we can turn on in the morning, make sure that those plants can run, we're not going to have people working.

It's not like it's just going to affect the folks on the industrial side and the manufacturing side. As I said, I also have the largest agricultural district in the State of Ohio. And one of the things that's tough out there is there are a lot of farmers in my district that not only farm full time, but they have a job also full time off the farm, and they have to balance the two together. They're working long, long hours, especially if they're on the livestock side. So these folks are worried about not only having to turn on the energy at the workplace but also the workplace on the farm.

And as we've seen some of these numbers being calculated as to what it might cost for a family of four with cap-and-tax, you're talking about in some cases right off the bat, \$1,500 additional for a family of four and all the way up in the out-years being calculated at up to \$4,800.

Let's also put this in context of what it's going to do on the farm income side. It's estimated by the Heritage Foundation that by the year 2012 you're going to see a drop of about \$8 billion in farm income; in 2024, \$25 billion; and in 2025, \$50 billion. So you're seeing decreases in farm income of 28, 60, and 94 percent respectively. You're going to see a total decrease from 2010 to 2035 of 57 percent and a total decrease in the baseline for farm income out there.

The question is, How is a farm going to survive in this country? It's going to be tough. Ag construction costs are estimated, because of cap-and-tax, they're going to go up 10 percent by the year 2034. By 2035—and here's a real tough one for farmers because of course, everything you're doing is out there in the field—gas and diesel prices are going to go up 58 percent; electricity costs on the farm, 90 percent. So when you're already out there struggling right there to make a living on the farm, it's going to be very difficult with these numbers to do it.

Then we have to think about this. Where are these young farmers going to go? We're going to try to get more younger people out on these farms, but we all know right now equipment costs are high. We all know that land prices are high. But then when you add all these costs up and you put these electricity costs and you put the energy costs and you put the fertilizer costs in, all these are all driven by energy costs. It's going to hit home real quick. We're going to have fewer and fewer people out on the farm. It's estimated we have less than 2 percent of Ameri-

cans farming today, less than 2 percent. In Ohio, it's under 1 percent, but they're feeding us all, and we should be thankful for them.

The co-ops in my district and across not only my district but the State and the country are very fearful about this. These electric co-ops out there are worried because if they have to buy more green energy, those costs would have to be passed on to the end user. That's the farmer, the manufacturer, the senior, the family, and they are all worried about it.

But who's our competition? You know, last week, we had the Ag Secretary before us in the Agriculture Committee, and we asked questions about China. And China is not going to abide by cap-and-tax, and in fact, the day that we had that hearing, they said that they were not going to abide by cap-and-tax. I would ask that this legislation be defeated.

THE NEED FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of long overdue health care reform. We've been talking about health care reform since the administration of Harry Truman. It's time for action.

Among the Jeffersonian rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the first was the right to life. And yet, today, with health costs spiraling out of control for millions of Americans, that right to life becomes more and more difficult to manage.

While the need for some level of reform is clear, whatever reform the Nation agrees upon must respect the right of the individual to continue to select their own physician. Assisting some Americans in accessing health care must not come at the expense of restricting health care access to others. We cannot have a government-imposed regime. We must respect people's right to maintain control over their current health care access and health care insurance.

Having said that, America currently has the most expensive health care system in the world. In 2006, we ranked first at 15.3 percent of our gross domestic product in expenditures for health care. Runner-up was Sweden with a socialized health care system. It was at 11.3 percent.

On a per capita basis, we spend the most in the world, \$5,267 for every man, woman, and child in America; and yet, if you look at our outcomes, we are in the middling ranks of industrialized countries in terms of outcomes. We rank 50th out of 224 Nations in the world in terms of life expectancy. As a Nation, we are spending more on health care than everybody else, but we're not necessarily getting the outcomes we need.

Our challenge is to make health care costs obviously more affordable. A re-

cent USA Today poll showed 21 percent of Americans struggling with health care costs, being able to manage it, significantly up from what it would have been a decade or 2 decades ago.

Those who currently have, and like their existing health care coverage, still nonetheless often lament the rapidly increasing costs of premiums and recognize that we all pay a cost for emergency room treatment for those without health care coverage. In fact, it is estimated that that costs everybody \$1,000 per capita per year because of our fellow 46 million Americans who lack health care coverage.

As we debate the various proposals, Madam Speaker, for reforming health care, I would like to propose five principles that certainly will guide me and I think many others as we move forward various proposals.

The first is, every child in America should have access to health care. No child should go in this country without having access to health care. We know that, for example, a child without health care who develops appendicitis has five times a negative outcome in terms of losing his or her life than a child with health insurance. That's unacceptable, it seems to me, as Americans.

Secondly, nobody should be financially destroyed due to a catastrophic illness. It's challenging enough to combat a deadly medical condition, but tremendous expenses incurred can wipe out a family's savings and, indeed, cost them their livelihood and their home.

Third, insurance companies should not be allowed to cherry pick, and I'm a proud cosponsor of a bill that would prescribe that. The whole point of having health care insurance is to share the risk. Previous existing conditions affect 45 percent of all Americans today, and indeed, if we all live long enough, every one of us is going to end up with a previous existing medical condition. The health insurance companies shouldn't be allowed to disqualify people in that case.

Fourth, we must respect the right of our fellow citizens to choose the health care insurance and provider they want.

Fifth, we must move toward universality of health care coverage. Everyone in America should have access to health care in this wonderful country of ours.

Ultimately, we must address health care reform for a number of reasons: to provide broader coverage for those currently uninsured; to bring down the increasingly difficult costs to businesses, especially small businesses, families, and sole proprietors; to reduce the growing strain of health care costs on our Nation's deficit; and to improve the overall health of our Nation.

Fiftieth place is nothing to be proud of, Madam Speaker, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting a health care reform program that will reposition America as a competitive, successful, and healthy society.

WINE TO WATER CHANGES LIVES AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this recession has been tough on my State of North Carolina. With high unemployment haunting our State, it is easy to lose sight of the inspiring stories of many who continue to work hard at doing good. One of those who committed to doing just that is Doc Hendley, the founder of a North Carolina nonprofit called Wine to Water based in Boone in the heart of the High Country.

Doc's vision for this organization is nothing short of inspiring. As a person who grew up carrying water, I am particularly sensitive to this issue. Doc started Wine to Water after doing some water sanitation work in Darfur, Sudan, with Samaritan's Purse, another exceptional relief organization located in Boone, North Carolina. Wine to Water was founded on the premise of giving the more fortunate members of our society an opportunity to bring life-giving water to people without access to clean drinking water around the world.

Wine to Water, which takes its name from the first miracle performed by Jesus during his Earthly ministry, took an otherwise everyday event like a wine tasting and turned it on its head. By using wine events to raise money and awareness about the lack of clean drinking water in the developing world, Doc Hendley has harnessed a powerful social force and multiplied the generosity of many, including a corps of dedicated ASU students who volunteer with Wine to Water. Doc is, in essence, turning wine to water for some of the neediest people on the planet.

The work of Wine to Water in places like Sudan and Cambodia has already brought clean water to more than 25,000 people. Today, Doc's entrepreneurial spirit and dedication are helping to tap sustainable sources of clean water for communities beyond the reach of many traditional aid organizations.

Doc Hendley is setting a compelling example of the value of hard work and a vision to help others. He's taken a commonplace object and used it to mobilize communities in America to help suffering communities around the world.

He is truly an exceptional North Carolinian, and I want to praise him for his dedication to serving needy and suffering people. He has taken personal risks to do the hard work of providing water and clean water education in far-flung locations around the globe.

Thank you, Doc and all those who work with Wine to Water, for your inspiring example during these difficult times.

THE UPCOMING ENERGY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, by the end of this year, we hope to pass a comprehensive energy bill which will help this country move forward on clean, renewable, American energy, and certainly, will help fuel our economic recovery.

As co-Chair of the New Democratic Coalition on Energy, I believe now is the time for a robust, market-based approach to approach our Nation's energy needs. We have to pass legislation that will make smart investments in alternative energy, and I think every American understands the common sense behind that. These are the kinds of things that will make us more viable and competitive, not only here in the United States but abroad, for our American companies.

It's also clear, as we know as we get into this energy debate, this is about our national security; the fact that we continue to import 60-plus percent of our oil from countries outside the United States, many of which, particularly in the Middle East, are not our friends and are funding our enemies.

We also know it's about, as I said, job creation, and it's also about good environmental policy.

Now, you've heard a lot about this energy bill so far. You may continue to hear a lot about it, and you hear studies on one side that say we're going to lose jobs; the other side saying we're going to create jobs. But I think there's quite a remarkable thing that's going on right now as I've worked on this with many other Members, on both the Democrat and Republican side.

There's a coalition of people out there, interested groups, that have come together and said we support the energy bill that is currently being presented by Congress. And I just want to name some of the companies and some of the groups because it just doesn't sound like the normal groups that would come together: BP, big oil company; Dow Chemical; ConocoPhillips, General Electric. You've got the entire labor union movement supporting this. You've got the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club.

Now, I know not everyone's familiar with every one of these organizations, but suffice it to say, you have got some very large corporate businesses that have their view of the world and certainly the necessity to having an efficient energy policy. You've got some environmental groups that have come together and said, you know, we like this, this makes some sense to us. And you've got labor which doesn't always necessarily but sometimes agrees with the other two groups.

So what I like to think when I hear a study from this organization, sometimes I've heard of that organization, sometimes I haven't, and you have got

another group that comes and says the opposite, I like to think of common sense when it comes to coming together and putting together logical and efficient legislation.

The fact that these three sort of disparate groups have come together and said, yeah, we support this, I think something is going on here that we should take a close look at and certainly consider in supporting.

I want to talk specifically about the jobs that will be created by this because I had a very unique conversation with the president of the largest utility company from Florida where I'm from. He was telling me they're building the largest solar plant in the world in Florida. Now, we like to call ourselves The Sunshine State, so we think that's a good place for it, but there are already a lot of solar plants in other parts of the world.

But they're building this in Florida, and what he told me was they were very unhappy about the fact that when they're building this huge plant, hundreds of millions of dollars, they're going to have to import the mirrors—that's the components to build the solar plant—from Germany. I said, Why is that? And he said, Well, we don't build them in the United States. There aren't the kind of incentives for businesses to do that here; but if you did build them in Florida or Georgia or California or Ohio, we would buy them here because they would be far less expensive. Just the shipping costs overseas of this very fragile equipment adds such an expensive piece to the equation.

That, to me, strikes at the heart of this whole point. Why aren't we doing everything we can to create these kinds of jobs in the United States and creating the incentives? Well, the good news is the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which we passed—that's the recovery bill—a few months ago has the kind of tax incentives and many of the components to begin to encourage this type of industry for creating jobs in the United States. I want these jobs to be in Florida or other parts of the United States because they're good quality jobs and will support a good industry.

Another area which I think we talked about, you know, nationally is wind power. A big part of what's going on around the world right now, a lot of that is built overseas, but here's another good example. A typical wind turbine has 8,000 parts and is made of 250 tons of steel. Americans make steel. We fabricate. We assemble. We can deliver that to a wind farm in the United States at far less of a cost than if it was done overseas. And guess what, you can't outsource the labor or the people that put these things together and install them. You can't do it from overseas. So, again, an idea whose time has come.

The great thing about this energy bill is this is the kind of forward-thinking that will create the next generation of jobs, whether it's wind or wave

or solar or any combination of things that will make this country more energy secure, smarter, more efficient, and will advance us into the next generation of not only energy but make this country very strong from a national security point of view and a jobs point of view.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill, move this country forward, and make us more secure.

THE CAP-AND-TRADE BILL WILL DEFINITELY COST JOBS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it's interesting to follow my colleague from Florida because this cap-and-trade bill that's going to the floor will definitely cost jobs, and I have a lot of examples to promote that and prove that.

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission said in a memo to members of his delegation that: However, if the Waxman-Markey bill were to pass, Pennsylvania is looking at a bleak scenario by 2020: a net loss of as many as 66,000 jobs, a sizeable hike in electricity bills of residential customers, an increase in natural gas prices.

You don't want to believe the public utility commission, just take JOHN DINGELL who is the chairman emeritus, having served here over 50 years. He's quoted as saying, Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax and it's a big one.

And if you don't believe that, just listen to the comments made by now-President Barack Obama in January 2008: Under my plan, a cap-and-trade system, electricity costs would necessarily skyrocket.

Now, in economies like we have today, the last thing you want to do is affect jobs and cause the loss of jobs, either by moving away from the fossil fuel infrastructure that makes our country great or by raising electricity rates.

I always bring this poster to the floor. These are miners that lost their jobs in the last iteration of the Clean Air Act. This one mine had 1,200 miners. After the passage of the Clean Air Act they lost their jobs. This is Monterey 10 in Kincaid, Illinois.

Here's a report from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Listen to what happened after the Clean Air Act of 1990's amendment: Exxon Coal, Monterey 2, closed by market conditions brought about by the Clean Air Act; the next one, Ziegler Coal, Old Bin No. 24, market conditions by the Clean Air Act Amendments. We also have this one, Monterey 10, market conditions brought about by the Clean Air Act Amendments, and many more on this report.

What a cap-and-trade bill does is cap fossil fuel use. It says you cannot use this anymore. What is a fossil fuel? It's

coal, it's natural gas, it's crude oil. It's what we use to create the strongest economy in this world, and if you cap it and we have electricity demands go up, only one thing can happen, higher electricity rates.

Now, if my friends on the other side were serious about carbon dioxide, in their bill they would forcefully push for the expansion and use of nuclear power. But is it there in their bill? No. Nuclear power emits no carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. That's why many of us on our side really question the sincerity of our friends on the other side because there's no major promotion of nuclear power.

Republicans have an alternative. It's the All-American Energy Security Act. It's very simple. It says we like energy, we like to use it, and we want all comers to come into the market of ideas to compete for use by consumers, driving down prices.

These areas, the Outer Continental Shelf, are all natural gas. We would exploit natural gas and crude oil reserves. We would take the revenues to go to renewables, wind and solar power which is being exploited around the country right now. We would make fuel from coal. We would take coal, 250 years' worth of recoverable coal, turn it into liquid fuels, decreasing our reliance on imported crude oil. We would continue to move and exploit biofuels, which is soy diesel, corn, cellulosic, and the like.

And the great "add" in the All-American Energy Security Act from the Republicans is, we need to build 100 new nuclear power plants in the next 20 years. That is a commitment on lower electricity prices for the consumer, and that is a down payment on energy security. We have 31 permits now in the process of going through. We only have credits for three nuclear power plants to be built. That doesn't touch the increased demand that we're going to have.

So either you have job loss, higher prices, and a cap-and-tax demand-control economy energy future, or you have an all-of-the-above strategy which sets standards and says we want all comers to come and provide the energy that Americans need, bringing more supply and lower prices, and creating jobs.

WE ARE WITNESSING TIANANMEN IN TEHRAN

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I come to this floor at a time of extraordinary moment on the global stage. According to the Islamic Republic News Agency, the official news agency of Iran, President Mahmud Ahmadinejad, supposedly won the election over his primary opponent on 12 June 2009.

But from the very moment that that election result was announced, the international community and the

international press called it into question, and the bases for that, even before the extraordinary demonstrations had begun to take place, is the fact that these were paper ballots, but the official government results of the election were announced literally within hours of the polls being closed.

Various media outlets around the world have questioned the authenticity of the results. Mr. Mousavi, the defeated candidate, has launched a legal appeal against the election results. On the day of the election, mobile phone communications were interrupted. Western media has reported "heavy electronic jamming" disturbing broadcasts. News Web sites were reportedly blocked by Iranian authorities, and the Iranian Government has allegedly arrested opposition political figures and journalists.

The Iranian Government has outlawed any protests following 2 days of extraordinary unrest. The BBC recently reported that recent rallies in the streets of Tehran were the biggest demonstrations in the Islamic Republic's 30-year history. The protests, according to news reports, became violent, and according to media reports, pro-government forces attacked demonstrators in the last 24 hours, causing at least one fatality.

We are witnessing a Tiananmen in Tehran, and the United States of America must stand in the gap on behalf of those brave Iranian citizens who are standing for free and fair elections, democracy, and basic rights. Freedom, in fact, may be flowering in Iran, as hundreds of thousands rally for democracy and free elections.

And while I appreciate President Obama's comments yesterday at the White House that he was "troubled by the violence," and his belief that the voices of the Iranian people should be "heard and respected," it seems by my likes that this administration has yet to express the unqualified support of the American people for those who are courageously taking to the streets for free elections and for democracy in Iran.

Let me say from my heart, the American cause is freedom, and in this cause, the American people will not be silent, here or abroad. If the President of the United States won't express the unqualified support of our Nation for the dissidents in the streets of Tehran, this Congress must.

Today, I am introducing a resolution that will do just that. It will express its concern regarding the reported irregularities of the presidential elections of 12 June 2009; condemn the violence against demonstrators by pro-government militias in Tehran in the wake of the election; it will affirm our belief in the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections; and lastly and most importantly, Madam Speaker, it will express the support of the American people for all Iranian citizens who struggle for freedom, civil liberties, and the protection of the rule of law.

Believe it or not, in my small town of Columbus, Indiana, I grew up next door to a Hungarian immigrant who fled Hungary in the wake of the Soviet repression of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956. I sat often with Julius Perr, now passed away, and heard of the way the Hungarian people, inspired by our calls for freedom, stood up for their own freedom. And as Bret Stephens recounts in today's Wall Street Journal, We stood by idly, we didn't want to interfere, and the Soviet tanks rolled.

We cannot stand idly by, speak of Iran sovereignty, speak of their own right to choose their own leadership at a time when hundreds of thousands of Iranians are risking their liberty, and even their lives, to stand for free elections and democracy.

Ronald Reagan said, There is no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. All of us desire a fresh start with Iran, and it seems from news reports and the extraordinary images coming from the streets of Iran that millions of Iranians long for a new start in their government. There is a reformist movement afoot in Iran.

Today, I will introduce a resolution. I urge all of my colleagues in both parties to join me in expressing support for these brave and courageous men and women.

WHERE'S THE TRANSPARENCY?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I do appreciate this opportunity.

You know, there's so many people out of work around this country. We know since President Obama took office 2 million more people have lost jobs. It's staggering and quite sobering.

I recently met with many people who are unemployed in a north Lufkin church, and I guess virtually all were African Americans. These were people that were ready to go to work, willing to go to work, good, strong work ethic, have families, deeply caring about their community and their families. And so it got me to looking and thinking what can I do to use my position to try to help people get jobs.

There's the Texas Workforce Commission that does a good job trying to have job fairs. It turned out by using my position, partnering with other groups, the Chamber, different groups, we were able to have 50 employers with over 1,000 jobs to offer, but even that doesn't satisfy all of the need for all of the jobs people are needing that are out of work.

But it did sensitize me to the fact, look around for job opportunities. Where is this Nation spending money that might go to help people who are unemployed? Where could they get jobs? We've got another job fair coming up in Longview in a couple of weeks, and we're hoping it will be as successful.

But as I look around and I see the millions of dollars being spent and I hear from constituents, and having a heart, wanting to help them, I'm brought to the question after we hear about the Uyghurs, four of them going to Bermuda—although we were promised great transparency—and that was one of the things that appealed to the voters of the United States, that if we elect this administration we will have complete transparency, everything will be transparent, we'll know what they're spending money on, we will know what they're doing. Well, we don't know. They won't tell us what money has been sent to Bermuda to take four Uyghurs, but some are estimating \$12 million apiece. They don't think it's very much, maybe \$12 million apiece or so. We know that supposedly other Uyghurs are going from Guantanamo to Palau.

One report I read estimated that over the last 14 years, going back to the middle of the Clinton administration, we paid Palau about \$852 million just for aid. And so there's some question that we're going to pay them more millions to take these, or since their 15-year agreement is up, are they willing to take these?

The bottom line is millions and millions of dollars are being paid to take 17 Uyghurs, and for those that don't know, those are people in China who, because of their religious belief, are adverse to China. And we know that these 17 were captured in terrorist camps in Afghanistan. Some say, well, they weren't being trained to terrorize us, but they were in terrorist camps in Afghanistan.

So the question many are asking now is, for those 2 million of us who have lost our jobs since January of this year, what terrorist camp can we go to to train so that maybe we could spend the rest of our lives at U.S. expense on the beaches of Bermuda? We saw the people, the pictures of the four Uyghurs in Bermuda. They really seemed to be enjoying themselves, laughing, cutting up, out there on the beach, the waves crashing. Those Uyghurs who have gone to Palau, how many millions have been paid we don't know. But I have got a bunch of constituents who are willing to go train in terrorist camps, in Afghanistan if necessary, if our government will pay millions of dollars to send them to the beaches.

Also, one other point, we know there's been no transparency with the auto task force. We don't know what they're being paid. We just know that this group that has never run anything in the car business is running the car businesses and dictating what will happen. Well, I've got lots of people that are every bit as unqualified to run the car business in my district who are unemployed. They want that job. Where do they apply to run the car businesses of America and get on the auto task force? We want to know because they'd like that job.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2009 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. HERTEL. It is an honor for me to introduce the gentleman from Maryland, who for over three decades has provided leadership in this House on behalf of the Democratic Party, on behalf of the State of Maryland but on behalf of our Nation, most importantly.

This session of Congress that we are in today has been the most productive in my lifetime. We see the many challenges that face us—on the economy, the war, on health care, on all the different issues that have faced the American public, and the majority leader, who has been forging ahead and working in a bipartisan way on these very important challenges, has had the time not only to play golf with us yesterday at our Wounded Warriors tournament but to come again this morning and take some time to welcome us.

Thank you very much, Majority Leader.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker. You know Bob Michel was my Speaker. You've heard my story on going up to Ray LaHood and saying, Ray—this is 1995, John—and I said to Ray, who was presiding—you know, Ray presided a lot and was an excellent presiding officer. I went up to him and told him—we had about 197 votes at that point in time. I said, you know, I'll get you 197, you get 21 and we'll elect Bob Michel the Speaker. He smiled. It probably crossed his mind that that was a worthwhile endeavor but maybe he couldn't get there.

But in any event, it's always a pleasure to be with Bob Michel and all of you; my former colleague in the Maryland delegation, Connie Morella, who is one of your officers in this organization; John Rhodes, with whom I served. John, thank you very much for the great service you gave to this country and that your father gave to this country and that you continue to give to this country. We're blessed by that. And all of you with whom I have served over the years. As a matter of fact, most of the people as I look around here, it was a great pleasure to serve with you. Marty Russo, of course, I served with him as well and that was a little more of a trial.

Marty played golf yesterday. Dennis, he's really feeling badly. He shot six under par and he didn't win. He thinks it was fixed that the former Members were not allowed to win the tournament. He said, you know, what was the worth of playing in it.

I'm very pleased to be here with you. I try to join you every year. Your ranks seem a little smaller this year than they have in years past. Maybe some folks will be coming in.

I rose on the floor about 3 or 4 weeks ago just before the Memorial break and said, Look, when we come back, we're going to be more timely in the counting of the votes. We're going to try to keep the votes down to somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 minutes as opposed to, they were getting to average 25 minutes, which was, you do that over 10, 15, 20 votes over the course of a day, it really extends the day. The chairmen were having people waiting in their committees. We're struggling to get there. If I close it out—Alexis Covey-Brandt—Alexis, wave—she is now our floor director. And then sitting next to Alexis is someone I think probably all of you know, she is the granddaughter of a great American, a great Representative in this House, the former Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, Catlin O'Neill, who represents the Speaker on the floor and helps manage the floor. We're pleased to be here with you.

Dennis, you were very kind about reaching out in a bipartisan way. I lament the fact that when Bob Michel was here, we had reaching out more in a bipartisan fashion because both sides I think were inclined to do so. We had more golf tournaments, Bob, and we played more and spent more time with one another. I played golf yesterday with JOHN BOEHNER. I drove the cart. He rode along. He scored well. I tried to stay in the hunt. JOHN and I talked about trying to work things in a more bipartisan fashion, but very frankly as all of you have observed, the confrontation continues in a somewhat strident tone too often in this House. That was not so early on when I came here but frankly almost every decade it has escalated and that's unfortunate.

But, on the other hand, I think Dennis is right. This may be the most productive 5 months that I've spent in the House. I don't mean that we haven't had other productive times—we have—but the agenda that we confronted as we took over at a time of crisis, with a brand new President, an historic President. 2008, an historic year. I think all of us are pleased that we were alive to watch what America did in 2008. I thought JOHN MCCAIN's best speech of the campaign was the night he lost. It was not only a gracious speech but it was a speech that tried to bring the country together in support of our newly elected President, and I thought it showed JOHN MCCAIN at his very best. Obama gave a speech that showed him at his very best. And frankly I think George Bush the next day, on Wednesday, gave a brief speech which showed him at his very best. And the three of them together showed America at its very best.

I tell people that one of the proudest days of my service in the House of Representatives and of my country was on

the day that was one of my most disappointing. And that, of course, was January 20, 2001, when my side clearly thought it had won the election, had received a half a million more American votes than our opponent, George Bush, but notwithstanding that, by a 5-4 vote, the Supreme Court of the United States had brought the election to a close. And so as we sat there on the podium, I was about 10 feet from Bill Clinton, about 15 feet from George Bush, and within minutes—and it happened in seconds as you know—within minutes, the most power in one person that exists on the face of the Earth was passed peacefully, notwithstanding the extraordinary concerns that the then-incumbent President of the United States, who had that power in his grasp—it was in his grasp—notwithstanding that, he released it peacefully, without a shot being fired, without demonstrations in the streets on that day, and America showed the world once again that it was a nation of laws.

That was a proud day, I think, for all of us, a wrenching day for those of us who were on the losing side on that day but a proud day for our country. All of us in this Chamber have had the opportunity to serve in the people's House, the repository of that power to make the laws that govern, not of men but of laws.

And so I always take the opportunity to thank all of you. And we lament the fact that we've lost—I'm not sure how many people we've lost. John, I am sure there will be a recitation of that and a remembrance of those we've lost. But one person with whom I had the opportunity and I think most of you had the opportunity to serve, we lost. In doing so, we lost a great spirit, not just a great former Member of the Congress. I'm not going to read all of it but I remember him quoting Teddy Roosevelt on a relatively regular basis. I've got the whole quote, but I'm just going to read you a few lines of it:

"It is not the critic who counts;

not the man who points out
how the strong man stumbles,
or where the doer of deeds
could have done them better.

The credit belongs to the man
who is actually in the arena."

I choose like I choose "all men are created equal" to consider "man" in that sense generic—for human beings.

It goes on to say:

"The credit belongs to the man
who is actually in the arena."

And then it concludes:

"Who at the best knows in the end
the triumph of high achievement,
and who at the worst, if he fails,
at least fails while daring greatly,
so that his place shall never be
with those cold and timid souls
who neither know victory nor defeat."

All of us got in the arena. We put our egos on the line. Sometimes those egos can be severely bruised in this business internally and certainly externally.

But we got in the arena because we knew that that is where you could make a difference, for the people that were your neighbors, for your family and for your country. And for that, I think Americans honor each and every one of you, and I thank you for having learned from you, been impressed by you, using in many cases you as an example of how we ought to work together.

It's easier when you get out of Congress, I think, to adopt that premise, because you then look not so much on the differences but on the similarities. Far too often as human beings we look at the differences, that which divides us, as opposed to that which brings us together, the values that we have in common.

JOHN, before you came in, I mentioned the fact that you and I played golf together. We had a great time. We spent 4 or 5 hours riding around the course together, enjoying one another, learning from one another. JOHN's really a student of golf. He was helping me be a little better than normally I am. But we need to learn from those experiences and learn from people like Bob Michel, who lived life in Congress teaching all of us that.

So I thank you for staying active, keeping the faith, providing ongoing examples that simply being elected is not the only way to serve. You continue to serve in so many positive roles. I know on behalf of the Speaker, I know JOHN will speak for himself, we welcome you back to this Chamber which meant so much in your lives and to which you meant so much in your service.

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

You know, I read that and of course I hope all of you know the person I was referring to was Jack Kemp—who reflected, I think, JOHN—I served with Jack on the Appropriations Committee for a significant period of time, and Jack always had that positive spirit, that hand reached out to include rather than to exclude. We miss Jack Kemp. He was a great servant in this House and a great servant of his party and a great servant of his country.

Mr. HERTEL, I want to thank the majority leader for taking the time with us. For someone of his stature and experience it means a great deal for those of us gone but not forgotten as he comes to see us and take the time out of his schedule. Today at noon, Majority Leader HOYER and Jack Kemp will be honored by the Victims of Communism Memorial program which is going to take place in the Visitors Center for all of their work in triumphing over communism. Leader HOYER was chairman of the Helsinki Commission which did so much to make a difference in this world that we have today because they brought down the Soviet Union and assisted all those people seeking freedom in Eastern Europe and around the globe. The Helsinki Commission's work is one of the most outstanding things this Congress has ever

done and it was led by Majority Leader HOYER.

And now it is my great honor to recognize the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio, our Republican leader, a great friend of ours who also took the time to spend with us yesterday at the Wounded Warriors golf match, Mr. JOHN BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. As I look around, most of you I know, not all of you but most of you, and on behalf of my colleagues and I, I just want to say welcome back. Your service here clearly was an honor or you probably wouldn't have come back, and clearly all of us have had an opportunity to work with you. But we do appreciate your service, we appreciate your coming back and appreciate what you do to help this institution that we have all had an opportunity to serve in. I think a special congratulations is in order for Lou today, having celebrated some 50 years in public service and will be receiving an award from all of you today.

STENY and I did play golf yesterday. We did have a wonderful time. And it really reminded me of kind of a motto that I learned from Bob Michel, and that is that you can disagree without being disagreeable. I think all of you know that there are some major things happening here and clearly there's not quite a consensus on those things moving ahead. And so part of my mantra to my colleagues on our side is that to stand up and fight the fight but, you know, you don't have to be disagreeable in the process. There are plenty of facts to lay on the table.

I really do appreciate all of you being here and appreciate the work you do for our institution and glad to welcome all back.

Thank you.

Mr. HERTEL. I want to thank the Republican leader for taking the time but also the interest and the leadership in helping us with the Wounded Warriors project that was so very important. He's been there the last 2 years to lead the way and we've been able to raise over \$200,000 now for the Disabled Sports and Wounded Warriors project. We just can't thank our two leaders enough for participating because that will make the difference in getting more participation of sponsors and Members to come out to that tournament so it can be ongoing and benefit these veterans that have done so much for our country.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. HERTEL. And now it is my privilege to ask our Republican leader, Bob Michel, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Michel 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.

Mr. HERTEL. The Clerk will now call the roll of former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, and the

following former Members answered to their names:

Hon. Bill Alexander, AR
 Hon. Clarence Brown, OH
 Hon. Nancy Boyda, KS
 Hon. Jack Buechner, MO
 Hon. Bill Burlison, MO
 Hon. Joe DioGuardi, NY
 Hon. Ed Foreman, TX, NM
 Hon. Lou Frey, FL
 Hon. Ben Gilman, NY
 Hon. Dennis Hertel, MI
 Hon. William Hughes, NJ
 Hon. Barbara Kennelly, CT
 Hon. Ron Klink, PA
 Hon. Ernie Konnyu, CA
 Hon. Ken Kramer, CO
 Hon. Martin Lancaster, NC
 Hon. Ron Mazzoli, KY
 Hon. Matt McHugh, NY
 Hon. Bob Michel, IL
 Hon. Connie Morella, MD
 Hon. Jay Rhodes, AZ
 Hon. Phil Ruppe, MI
 Hon. Marty Russo, IL
 Hon. Jim Symington, MO
 Hon. Lindsey Thomas, GA

Mr. HERTEL. The Chair announces that 26 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable Jay Rhodes, the President of our Association.

Mr. RHODES. Dennis, thank you. Thank you very much for hobbling in. We appreciate the fact that it's not altogether easy for you at this particular point in your recovery. We very much appreciate all of your service to all of us. You are now in the category of wounded warrior. We're happy to see that you are at least making a slow but steady recovery.

I appreciate very much the fact that Mr. HOYER and Mr. BOEHNER took the time to come and be with us this morning. I think their comments were very, very pertinent and to the point. I especially would like to associate myself with Mr. HOYER's comments about the regrettable deterioration in relationships between the parties on the floor. It does call to mind the days when Bob Michel was our leader and when Tip O'Neill was the leader and the Speaker, and also the days frankly when my dad had preceded Bob. Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Rhodes, and Mr. Michel, some of their favorite stories deal with their relationships off the floor. I think it's a shame that the relationships off the floor here don't reflect the kind of camaraderie that even was in existence still in 1986 when Ernie Konnyu and Connie Morella and Jack Buechner and NANCY PELOSI and I came into this Chamber. I think that each of us could say that things were a lot better in 1986 and we can each say we saw them start to deteriorate from that point on. And it's sad. It's not good for the institution and it's not good for the country.

It is a pleasure to be back here and we appreciate the opportunity to present the annual report of the U.S. Association. I and some of my colleagues will report on our activities

and projects that we have undertaken over the course of the past year and we will present our Distinguished Service Award.

As you all know, the Association is fiercely nonpartisan, or fiercely bipartisan. It was chartered by Congress but you know that we receive no public funding, no appropriations, no earmarks, nothing from the United States Congress in terms of funding the operations of this association. Our purpose is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, both abroad and at home. And when I say we promote public service, I want to emphasize that when we utilize one of our flagship programs, which is the Congress to Campus Program, that our purpose is not to go to college campuses and encourage young people to become politicians. Our purpose is to go to college campuses and encourage young people to consider public service as an honorable profession for their lives. And I think that we make a contribution in that regard. There are approximately 600 former Senators and Representatives who belong to this association. We reckon that there are probably about a thousand living persons who have served in the past in either the House or the Senate and roughly 600 of them belong to our association. We are united to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed either through dues, program-specific grants and sponsors, or our fundraising dinner. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our 2008 audit, which was completed fairly recently by our outside accounting firm, comes back to us with a completely clean bill of health. We have had a very successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures abroad; we have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring; we have developed new projects which we are in the process of expanding, including our webcasting civics education program; and we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members to university campuses here in the United States and abroad as part of the Congress to Campus Program. I am sure that those of you who have participated in that program know that in the majority of the cases our members who come back from having participated say almost universally that they benefited more, the former Members benefited more than they think they brought benefit to the young people that we talked to. That is a reflection of the fact that our young population is much more sophisticated, much more educated and much more enthusiastic about their futures than they generally get credit for.

I am very pleased now to report on the program work as we've gone through this year. Our first report will

be delivered by the gentlelady from Connecticut, Ms. Kennelly. Over the past 4 years, we have made it a priority to put unique capabilities inherent in our membership to productive use in the area of democracy building overseas and legislative strengthening overseas. I am pleased to announce today that we have a major new program to support these efforts. We have been awarded a grant by the U.S. Agency for International Development so that bipartisan teams of former Members can travel to emerging democracies and interact with their legislative branches on a peer-to-peer basis. Our teams will work with the bipartisan House Democracy Assistance Commission to conduct workshops, panels and presentations for the legislative branches of numerous countries around the globe. We not only talk to the elected legislative representatives but also to their staffs and silently we say to them, Do as we say, don't do as we do. But I think that we have lessons to impart to legislative branches, both Members and staff overseas, and I am very happy to yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut to report on this.

BENEDICTION

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. President, we have been joined by the House Chaplain, Father Coughlin, and at this moment I would just ask before we go further with our report that we ask Father Coughlin, the House Chaplain, to give us a benediction.

Mr. RHODES. I would yield to the House Chaplain, Father Coughlin.

Rev. COUGHLIN. I am honored to be here with you.

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we praise You and bless You as the Lord of our lives. Each of us has a story to tell. For each of us this has been a journey, a journey with many ups, many downs, many prizes, many rewards, and at the same time many sacrifices.

Bless our constituents who brought us here. Bless all our family members who have stood by us at all times. Bless us now. Help us, Lord, to meet You at the present moment, for that's where You are always to be found. We thank You for all You have given us in the past, we praise You now and ask for health and happiness in the present that we may be your instruments of bringing good news, power, integrity, justice and goodness to this country.

Bless us that we may serve always, upholding the Constitution that holds us all together. Confirm us in liberty and in justice, now and forever. Amen.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Father. Now I do recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Mr. President.

May I take this opportunity to thank you and our Executive Director, Pete Weichlein. These two gentlemen have worked so hard this year and as Dennis said, we've had really a very successful

year and I think we're going into a whole new dimension and my report will show that.

Thank you, Jay, for your introduction and thank you for your leadership in securing the AID grant you just announced. The House Democracy Assistance Commission is an undertaking of the House of Representatives to strengthen democracy in those institutions by assisting parliaments in emerging democracies. One of the objectives of HDAC is to provide expert advice to members and staff of the parliaments of partner countries. HDAC is chaired by Congressmen DAVID PRICE of North Carolina and DAVID DREIER of California. It is an extension of the great work begun by former Congressmen Martin Frost and Gerry Solomon as past of the Frost-Solomon Task Force. We are pleased to be able to play an important part in this outstanding project.

Via the AID grant, bipartisan teams of former Members will travel to six countries in 2009 and 2010. These countries probably will be Georgia, Kenya, Kosovo, Liberia, Peru and Ukraine. We will focus our projects on areas including legislative strengthening, legal reform, constituent representation, oversight and budget capacity. We will spend about one week in each country. In addition to meeting with legislators, we hope that each visit can include some time spent at local universities. It is one of the core beliefs of this organization that we need to reach out to the next generation of leaders, whether in the United States or abroad, and share some of our experiences and visions. This grant is a very exciting development for our organization and we look forward to reporting on these missions when we return to this great hall next year.

In addition to the HDAC project, we continue the good work commenced by Jack Buechner, former president of this organization. I am referring to the International Election Monitors Institute which we created in conjunction with our Canadian and European Union sister organizations. IEMI takes former legislators from the United States, Canada and Europe and trains them in proper election monitoring techniques and a code of conduct. To this end, we have been able to put together a 2-day training course which we have now administered six times in Ottawa. The course, as well as a host of other achievements for the Institute, was made possible via a 3-year grant from the Canadian International Development Agency. Dozens of United States, Canadian and European former legislators have gone through the training and are now well versed in the actual set of responsibilities and challenges that come with election observation. For the near future, we have identified two crucial elections, and these certainly are crucial elections, where we hope to have some of our observers present: August of this year in Afghanistan and January 2010 in Iraq. Our

model is to partner with reputable like-minded organizations in the United States, Europe or Canada and funnel our trained former Members into their delegations. In the past we have used this model quite successfully, for example, by working with the National Democratic Institute during their observer missions to Morocco and Ukraine. Our colleague Dennis Hertel of Michigan is the current president of IEMI and we thank him for his leadership.

In addition to partnering with organizations such as NDI, IRI and IFES on election monitoring missions, we have just entered a new partnership with the State University of New York. SUNY Albany houses one of the leading democracy building NGOs in the country—the Center for International Development. Our association has entered into a partnership agreement with SUNY to compete for a USAID contract which we expect will be announced in early 2010. This contract will focus on democracy and governance projects from 2010 through 2015 and only organizations which have been invited to compete are eligible to submit proposals. SUNY has an outstanding track record for these types of AID contracts and we are confident that via this new partnership our members will be able to engage in an even greater number of democracy building projects worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, we have made it our mission to create these important opportunities for our membership. Former Members of Congress can play a crucial role in these types of programs and it is quite rewarding that we are seeing the beginning of the fruits of our labor. I thank you for letting me give this report, Jay, and I say this looks very exciting and this organization is really moving.

Mr. RHODES. Barbara, thank you very much. And you're right—we are moving. And it's positive movement.

I am now pleased to recognize our colleague from Maryland, Ms. Morella, in her capacity as representative of the executive committee overseeing many of our international programs. We achieve our objectives through congressional study groups involving Germany, Turkey and Japan. We have arranged multiple special events in the Capitol for representatives of the parliaments of those countries, and we continue to plan for trips overseas for our congressional staff and for sitting Members to welcome sitting parliamentarians and staff people here to the United States.

I am pleased to yield to the gentlelady from Maryland, Connie Morella, my classmate, for her report on our study group events.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Jay.

Yes, we were members of the 100th Congress and it's a privilege to be here with former Members and with good friends who are here. And thanks for your leadership, Jay.

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress has created invaluable opportunities for current Members of Congress to engage with their counterparts around the world through programming hundreds of special events in the U.S. Capitol for international delegations. The Association is pleased to oversee the congressional study groups on Germany, Turkey and Japan as well as to initiate the first trilateral renewable energy roundtable for lawmakers from India, Germany and the United States. The Association's flagship international program is the Congressional Study Group on Germany, which has been conducted by the Association for over 25 years. The first trip I ever took was with that particular study group to Germany in 1987. The Study Group on Germany is one of the largest and the most active exchange programs involving the U.S. Congress and the parliament of another country. It is a bipartisan organization, with approximately one-third of the Members of the U.S. Congress participating. The House Chairs are Congressman RUSS CARNAHAN of Missouri and Congressman ROB BISHOP of Utah. The Senate Chairs are Senator EVAN BAYH of Indiana and Senator JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany serves as a model for all other study groups under the umbrella of the FMC. The Study Group on Germany has three programming pillars: the Distinguished Visitors Program, which hosts guests from Germany at the U.S. Capitol; annual seminars allowing for in-depth discussions for the lawmakers of both countries; and a senior congressional staff study tour in Germany. In addition, the Congressional Study Group on Germany is a resource for Members of Congress to receive objective information on current U.S.-German relations. The study group also supports the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program. Nearly every month, the study group brings high-ranking German elected officials to Capitol Hill to meet with Members of Congress as part of its Distinguished Visitors Program. Recently honored guests include: the German Federal Minister for Labor, Olaf Scholz; the Chairman of the Bundestag's Foreign Affairs Committee, Ruprecht Polenz; and the German Federal Minister for Economics and Technology, Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg.

The highlight of each programming year is the annual Congress-Bundestag seminar. Each year, the study group brings approximately eight Members of Congress together with German legislators for several days to reinforce friendships and examine pertinent topics in transatlantic relations, such as NATO, climate change, or trade. The parliamentarians are joined by former Members of the Congress and the Bundestag, officials of the two federal governments, think tank and foundation representatives and members of the German-American corporate commu-

nity. The 26th annual seminar took place at the end of May in Berlin and Cologne. Highlights included meetings with Chancellor Angela Merkel and Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier. A study tour for senior congressional staff is planned for the fall in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany has received generous grants from the German Marshall Fund of the United States which has supported it for 25 years. The Association would like to thank Craig Kennedy, GMF's President, for his support of the Congressional Study Group on Germany. Additional funding to assist with administrative expenses is received from a group of organizations whose representatives serve on a Business Advisory Council to the study group. The Business Advisory Council is chaired by former Member Tom Coleman of Missouri, who served as the chairman of the Congressional Study Group on Germany in the House in 1989. Current Business Advisory Council members are Airbus, Allianz, BASF, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, Deutsche Post DHL, Eli Lilly, Fresenius, Lufthansa, RGIT, SAP, and Volkswagen. It's a large group.

Now there is a Congressional Study Group on Turkey, also. The Association established that congressional study group in 2005 and it has quickly become a major program for the Association. The Study Group on Turkey educates U.S. Members of Congress about the strategic relationship between the United States and Turkey and promotes increased cooperation between the two countries. Using the successful, long-running Congressional Study Group on Germany as a model, the Study Group on Turkey has become a highly relevant and unique forum for dialogue between U.S. and Turkish legislators and government officials. The Study Group on Turkey's House Chairs are Representative WEXLER of Florida and Representative WHITFIELD of Kentucky. Congressman COHEN of Tennessee and Congresswoman FOXX of North Carolina are the Vice Chairs.

Turkey is one of our strategic allies and is uniquely positioned to work with the United States on many important challenges such as peace in the greater Middle East and energy security. The Study Group on Turkey brings current Members of Congress together with their legislative peers, government officials and business representatives in Turkey and serves as a platform for all participants to learn about U.S.-Turkish relations firsthand.

Thanks to funding from the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, a nonpartisan foundation established by the Turkish business association TOBB, the German Marshall Fund of the United States and a group of corporate sponsors making up the Business Advisory Council, the Study Group on Turkey can carry out its

mandate to strengthen cooperation between the United States and Turkey. The Business Advisory Council members are Coca-Cola, Eli Lilly, Philip Morris and the Turkish-American Business Council.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey runs a Distinguished Visitors Program for Members of Congress featuring visiting dignitaries from Turkey. Recent guests for roundtable discussions include Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu and Chairman Mercan of the Turkish Grand National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee. The Congressional Study Group on Turkey also conduct an annual U.S.-Turkey seminar. In 2008, Representative STEVE COHEN from Tennessee hosted the annual seminar in Memphis. United States Members of Congress and Turkish parliamentarians participated in the seminar and discussed topics that included U.S.-Turkish trade relations, the integration of immigrants and energy security. The seminar is a conference for U.S. members of Congress to discuss areas of mutual concern with their legislative counterparts in Turkey. This year's U.S.-Turkey seminar is scheduled to take place during the first week of September in Ankara and in Istanbul. Members of Congress and their counterparts in the Turkish Grand National Assembly will discuss such issues as stability in the Middle East and prospects for Turkey's accession into the European Union.

There are other study groups. I would like to mention that the Association serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan. Founded in 1993 in cooperation with the East-West Center in Hawaii, the Congressional Study Group on Japan is a bipartisan group of Members from the House and the Senate. The Congressional Study Group on Japan arranges opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the Japanese Diet in addition to organizing discussions for Members to hear from American and Japanese experts on U.S.-Japanese relations. The House Chairs for the Congressional Study Group on Japan are Congressman JIM McDERMOTT of Washington and Congresswoman SHELLY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia. In the Senate, Senators JIM WEBB of Virginia and LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska take an active role in study group programming. The Congressional Study Group on Japan is funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

Finally, the Association is excited about the launch of a new program. Together with the Alliance for U.S. India Business, the Bertelsmann Foundation, the Robert Bosch Foundation, and TERI North America, we will hold the first Trilateral Renewable Energy Roundtable for lawmakers from Germany, India and the United States at the beginning of July. All three countries are major democratic economies from crucial regions of the globe that have a stake in world GDP as well as

environmental sustainability. Lawmakers from each country will have the opportunity to exchange their policy views to find common approaches for promoting renewable energy. The House leadership for this new project is Congressman JAY INSLEE of Washington and Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas.

The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Turkey and Japan as well as the Trilateral Roundtable demonstrate the important role that the Former Members Association plays in assisting current Members in their foreign relations portfolio. I think the former Members can be very proud of the work they do to make these study groups possible and the opportunities they are in, and I consider it a privilege to participate in many of those activities.

I thank you for listening to this lengthy report that indicates some of the very important work being done by the Former Members Association. Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, Connie. I think we can be proud of our excellent programming offered by our Congressional Study Groups.

Another program which our association and its members hold in very high esteem is the Congress to Campus Program. This wonderful program has been administered for the past 2 years internally by our staff. We have made the program grow and we have expanded it internationally. We've also reached out to community colleges and high schools. This growth was due to a large extent to a grant we received from the Joyce and Donald Rumsfeld Foundation. Let me take this opportunity to thank Secretary Rumsfeld for his invaluable support, which we really appreciate. We continue to work with the Stennis Center for Public Service, but all administration of this program is now done in-house by our staff.

I am very pleased to yield to a former president of our association, the Honorable MATT MCHUGH of New York, who chairs the Congress to Campus Program.

MATT, thanks for all your work.

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you very much, JAY. It is always a pleasure to be here with our friends and colleagues.

Before giving my report on the program, I want to say it's a special pleasure to be here this year because we're giving our annual award to Lou Frey. I had the privilege of serving as vice president during Lou's tenure as president and he was a tremendously strong leader for us in those days and has since then been a leader of our association. I think no one really deserves the honor more than Lou and I note that he has Marcia his wife with him and many of his beautiful family members. And so we're delighted to be with you today, Lou, and to give you this long-deserved honor.

As JAY said, the Congress to Campus Program has been administered by the Association in cooperation with the Stennis Center for 2 years now. During

that time, the program has experienced a marked growth and has expanded for the first time to include community colleges across the country. As most of you know, this program is the flagship program for our Members. It sends bipartisan teams of former Members to colleges, universities and high schools across the country to educate the next generation of leaders on the importance of civic engagement. The participating students benefit, we think, from the interaction with our association members, whose knowledge and experience are truly a unique resource. Our members, as JAY said, benefit through their continued involvement in public service and the ability to engage young people on issues of importance to them.

During each visit, our bipartisan team conducts classes, meets individually with students and faculty, speaks to campus media, participates in both campus and community forums, and meets with local citizens. Institutions that we visit are encouraged to market the visit to the entire campus community, not just simply to students who major in political science, history or government. Over the course of 2½ days, hundreds of students are exposed to the former Members' message regarding the significance of public service.

The program has made both domestic and international visits this academic year, including two separate visits to campuses in the United Kingdom and one in Canada. Over the 2008–2009 academic year, the program has made 20 campus visits, including visits to institutions we had not previously visited, such as the U.S. Air Force Academy, the University of Montana, and a number of community colleges as I have mentioned. More than 30 former Members participated this year, and I want to thank all of you who took the time from your schedules to do so. I would also like to encourage those of you who have not had the opportunity to seriously consider participating. It's truly a great way to continue our public service after Congress.

I also want to extend our thanks to the faculty, the staff members and students who worked so diligently on each of these visits. Without their hard work, these visits would simply not have been possible. We rely heavily on the universities to take the lead in coordinating logistics related to each visit and appreciate the time they devote to ensuring that their students receive the full benefit of the program.

We have continued our relationship with the Stennis Center for Public Service, as JAY mentioned earlier, in the administration of this program and I think we owe a special debt of gratitude to Tracy Fine of our staff and to Brother Rogers of the Stennis Center for their fine work on this program. Our two staffs work very closely together to make the program such a success and we appreciate the continuing financial support we also receive from the Stennis Center. We look

forward to working with the Center in the years ahead.

I would also like to take this opportunity to second JAY's note of thanks to the Joyce and Donald Rumsfeld Foundation for its generous financial support for the program during this past year. The Foundation's generous grant enabled the program to reach an even wider array of students, including those at the community colleges that participated for the first time this year.

In addition to the expansion of the program to community colleges, the program has also commenced a concerted effort in partnership with the University of Central Florida and the Lou Frey Institute of Politics and Government to reach out to high school students via a series of webcasts, another example of the kind of work that Lou does consistently with younger people. These programs focus on specific issues and are designed as a tool for teachers to showcase the legislative process and encourage involvement in government. During the fall, the first in the series was piloted to high schools in Florida, and in 2009 and 2010 it will expand its reach to high schools in other States. Using this technology, the Association can reach a much larger audience and can make an even greater contribution to civics education. While these "virtual" visits cannot replace the person-to-person experience of a traditional Congress to campus visit, they can play an important supplemental role in teaching about representative democracy at the high school level.

We have also continued our working relationship with the People to People Ambassador Program which brings young people to our Nation's capital for a week of events centered on the concepts of character and leadership. These students are younger than those who participate in the Congress to Campus activities but they have already demonstrated a commitment to the ideals that Congress to Campus seeks to promote. The Association's involvement in this program allows our members living in this area, the Washington area, to speak to these younger students on the importance of public service and to answer their many questions about our government and our country. A number of our members continue to work full time, but this program permits them to continue their public service in this way. The events are typically held in the early morning at suburban locations, and I want to thank my colleagues who have participated in this program.

As some of you may know, the Association also partners with the Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars to organize panels of former Members of Congress to meet with students who are interning in the area, and to participate in seminars that address current issues and the relationship between the administration and the Congress. During the past academic year, the Washington Center and

the Association convened six separate panels of former Members to speak with the students. Since last year was an election year, the Washington Center held seminars at each of the party conventions at which former Members of Congress spoke to the students about the party platforms, the nomination process and other issues that the students were interested in. I also want to thank my colleagues who participated in these panels throughout the year.

Finally, I want to say again how really grateful we are to those who have made the Congress to Campus Program such a success and to strongly encourage all of my friends and colleagues to participate in the program either by making a visit to a school or by recommending a school to host the program. As all of us know, a democracy can prosper only if its citizens are both informed and engaged, and as former legislators we have a particular opportunity and responsibility to encourage such involvement. This program gives us a good chance to do so, particularly with our young people. Again, I thank those who have been part of it and encourage all of us to continue to participate.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, MATT. I appreciate the time that you spend for the Association and for our projects and especially Congress to Campus which is one of our finest undertakings and at this point in time at least is the face of this organization publicly. That's where we are seen the most. I hope you will have a chance to read the article that was in Roll Call yesterday which should give you an indication in conjunction with the earlier reports about some of our international programs that we are going to try to expand the face so that it is recognized in areas other than the College to Campus Program. But College to Campus is clearly our flagship at this point and we really appreciate all the help we get, especially from MATT.

Now I need to talk to you a bit about the Statesmanship Dinner. Incidentally, in the Roll Call article, the only slight error that the reporter made in that the article was the implication that this is my swan song as president and that Dennis is taking over immediately after this meeting. I'm sorry to report to you, that's not true. You're stuck with me for another year. And Dennis is stuck up in that chair for another year. But next year he'll be up here lecturing you on how great we all are. We are chartered by Congress and receive no funding. The Association is responsible for finding our money to conduct our programs and one of the ways we do this is through our annual fundraising dinner. As part of this dinner, we recognize former and current Members of Congress for a particular achievement through our Statesmanship Award. In March of this year, we honored former and current Members who preceded their service in Congress

with their service in the military. The very first Congress included veterans of our revolutionary war and veterans have played a key role in the Congress ever since. This Congress in particular includes veterans from the Iraq war, and there are probably going to be some after the next election from the Afghan war. These are fine men and women who deserve our recognition. During the course of this dinner, four individuals, Representative BUYER, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Senator DANIEL INOUE represented the different generations of Members who went from service in uniform to service in Congress. It was a very, very successful evening. It was very well received. And it was a successful fundraiser. This was our 13th fundraising dinner and the 13th time Lou Frey has chaired the undertaking. He deserves a special thanks for his tireless efforts on our behalf for this dinner. Lou is responsible for more ulcers amongst his dinner committee than he probably cares to acknowledge. A hard taskmaster he is, but he's a tremendous leader. He is outgrowing his own ulcers while he's making ours prosper as well. And he has promised me that he will not resign as dinner chairman while I am on the bridge. He is very disappointed to realize that there is another year, that he's got to do it another year. It's a solemn pledge.

Proceeds of the dinner help us with many of our projects. One of them is to collect the wisdom and experience of our members in book form. We have published one book called Inside the House, Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works. It was heavily censored, but it has been widely received by political science departments in colleges and universities across the country. In a few weeks, we will be publishing volume 2 which is called Political Rules of the Road. This book collects various and sundry experiences and words of advice from people such as every single one of us in this room who has been through the caldron and have special stories to tell either because they are interesting or amusing, entertaining or enlightening. I am looking forward to seeing this book. We understand that 200 former and current Members participated and there are some 500 anecdotes contained in the volume. Another effort that we have undertaken is our annual golf tournament. Now we have had the annual golf tournament for 35 some years and it always involved sitting and former Members of Congress. Last year we expanded it to have a charitable role and we partnered with the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation. Yesterday was the second tournament which involved the wounded warriors. As Dennis Hertel mentioned, we have been very successful in raising money for the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation. We receive no proceeds from this tournament. And we have raised approximately \$175,000 over

the 2 years for the Wounded Warriors Disabled Sports Foundation.

There are many other things that we have been doing. We are running short on time. We need to move to one of the major reasons for being here, which is to honor Mr. Frey. We have continued the Life after Congress Seminar and we have sent a former Members delegation to Canada and our members had a chance to interact with colleagues in Ottawa, to strengthen that bond and that bond is very strong. We are organizing a similar mission to travel to Eastern Europe later this year. We will have a continuing relationship with the Web site project and next month, July, and I believe July 15 is the drop dead date, and I do mean drop dead date, for launching our new Web site. After July 15, I invite you to log on to www.usafmc.org and learn more than you probably want to know about all of us and all of you.

It is now my very distinct pleasure to present our 2009 Distinguished Service Award to our colleague from Florida, Mr. Frey.

For those of us who have known Lou for quite a few years, we can say without reservation, few people have the energy and the dedication that Lou commits to everything that he does. Few people have the boundless enthusiasm and his devotion to the task at hand and to the people he works with. He loves his country. He loves this institution. From the day he walked onto the House floor until this minute, he has always looked for ways to teach about Congress, to encourage the next generation of leaders, to help citizens become involved in their communities and in public service and in government. His work before, during and after his service has been distinguished and has made us a better and stronger institution and a better and stronger country. In addition, he has taken on a number of leadership positions within this organization, most of which have been alluded to. He has been our president, he has been our board member, he has been our taskmaster. We most of the time really, really appreciate him and when we don't, we are really, really not appreciating him. But most of the time we—I would not say, Lou, that you are the indispensable man, because we both know there is no such thing, but you are fairly close. Would you join me.

On behalf of the U.S. Association, it is my pleasure to present to you the 2009 Distinguished Service Award with plaque which is inscribed to Lou Frey. It says Congressman Lou Frey but "Congressman" is superfluous—it's just good old Lou—for his lifetime of exceptional public service. Both in and out of Congress, Lou Frey has demonstrated his great love of country and the democratic process. Renting the State of Florida, he served in the leadership of his party in the House of Representatives. He dedicated his congressional career to the youth of America, for example, by sponsoring legislation

that made higher education more financially attainable. After his tenure in Congress, he continued reaching out to America's high school and college students by establishing multiple programs that teach civic education. Thanks to Lou Frey, a new generation of leaders has become a better educated and engaged citizenry. Washington, D.C., June 16, 2009.

And it's got a gavel in it. I hope you don't think you're going to use that.

It is also my pleasure to give you a scrapbook of mementos from your friends and colleagues. I am happy to yield such time as he may consume, so long as it's not more than 10 minutes, to the Honorable Lou Frey.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, all my friends. It's so great to see all of you and so many in the 91st Club back. I am so proud of my family who have helped so much. I guess there's 15 of them here. I hope you've had a chance to see them before. If not, they're up in the gallery and my bride is here which I'm not allowed to introduce but I will, anyway.

I went back before I looked at these remarks and read the speeches of Bob Michel and so many great people and what they felt about the House. I just can't match it. No way that I can match the eloquence of the words, Bob, that you and the other people did. So I thought what I would do is sort of talk about what I really care about and what I've been working on. I think we as former Members have a unique opportunity to do something that no one else can do because we're better at it where we sit in life right now than anybody, and that's the dream I had of young people and young people understanding what we've been given. It's amazing what our country has been given and it's amazing what we don't know about it. I guess I first ran into that when I started an intern program where young people come up and live with me or stay with Marcia and I, eight at a time. We would have them chaperoned. We'd go back and talk about it. And most of them were like me. I never went to my first political meeting until I was 25 years old. In school I had one course in civics. I never met a Member of Congress or a member of a State legislature basically until I started to run for office. I ran for office because I didn't want to be a State legislator and that's about all I knew. I got going on that path, I'm in Congress, and gee whiz, now what do you do, Coach? My leader wants me to play shortstop. What else can I do? I found as I got into it and spent more and more time that really our country is civically illiterate. Just plain and simple, we don't know what the devil we have. So what we tried to do in Florida as a pilot program is figure out what we could do about it rather than just saying it really doesn't work.

If you go back and you look at Jefferson, we were at the monument the other night and the quotes. I went back and I found a letter he wrote in 1816. He

said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." This is going back pretty far, to 1816. When we look at our national landscape, there's a lot of studies that have been done, polls that have been out. A guy in Texas at the LBJ School looked at young people, and he said that the "lack of civic engagement and civic literacy among American youth is widespread. They know very little about even the basic of the American constitutional system and have no historical perspective on the development of the nation and its relations with the rest of the world." I'll use my State as an example but, let me tell you, your States aren't much better and some may even be worse. But I'll pick on Florida a little bit. Senator GRAHAM and I started a joint center of civics. We had some surveys done. Florida, of the 50 States, is 47th in the average rate of volunteerism, 49th in the percentage of people who attend public meetings, and 40th in the percentage of citizens who work with others to solve a problem. And overall of the 50 States, Florida is 47th from the top in terms of civic literacy. But, let me just add to that, we've had some national tests done, surveys done. These statistics really blow you away. Seventy-three percent of the students in fourth grade could not identify the Constitution from among four choices as the instrument that contains the basic rules. That's 73 percent of the students in fourth grade. Seventy-five percent of the students in fourth grade can't identify the three parts of the Federal Government out of four possible choices. Ninety-four percent of students in grade eight couldn't give two reasons why it would be useful for a country to have a Constitution. And on and on.

The studies that really make you cry are, for instance, the studies that were done by the University of Connecticut who tested 14,000 freshmen and seniors. The average grade of the senior in civics was 53 percent. Fifty-three percent. These are seniors in school. A Florida bar survey found out that 41 percent of adults in Florida couldn't identify the three branches of American government; 54 percent couldn't correctly describe the meaning of separation of powers; 39 percent couldn't describe the meaning of checks and balances. We have two U.S. Senators living in my hometown. Ninety percent of the kids couldn't name one of them. But they haven't been indicted, so that sort of takes away from it, I guess, a little bit.

In the Florida primary in '06 which nominated a Governor and a Senator, the effective winning vote was 5.1 percent of the total Florida population. Really not a great turnout. Now there has obviously been a better turnout in the Presidential race. It was a nice spike. But when we surveyed the people there, they said, Well, we're not going to really do much after it. We don't intend to really do much. Over half the

people said, yeah, they were going to vote and everything but they weren't going to do anything after it because politics just stunk.

So what you're looking at is a situation where really as a country we've been given this incredible gift and we don't know what we have and it's getting worse each year. It isn't getting better. We've been privileged to be here. There's been about 11,000 people who have ever served in the House. That's about half as many as you get at a national ball game these days. Not really very many people have ever had the privilege that we have here. We have an opportunity that is unique. Because as a Member of Congress you don't have any credibility. Right now there's a lot of fussing going on and so forth and so on and when you go out and teach in that, it's tough because as a Member of Congress you're rightly caring about your party and, you know, are you going to get reelected, are you going to get your party to stay in power. You have all these other things going. We've been in the big leagues. We've made it. All of us have been a product of the toughest system going and we've served in the greatest legislative body in the world. But our goal is different now. If our party's in, okay, fine. If it isn't, okay, we're going to survive it. We're not running for election. We are running, though, to change the young people and change what they believe and what they can do. Let me tell you, young people care. We've got a symposium. We've had 13 of them. We get about a thousand kids that come every 6 months to it. We put it on the Internet. Kids care if you give them a chance. We have a civics academy for high schools, for colleges and for elected officials, for local officials we have. We've created a civics academy in Leon County where for 3 years we're going to teach civics. We're trying to change the law in Florida so civics will be taught not just once but three or four times as we go along. People will come. Young people will come. And as former Members with what we're doing with the programs we have, University Press is here today with a new book coming out, with the program we're starting on the Internet which is going to reach across the country, there are a lot of things that we can do. We don't have to take second place to anybody. Because we are on the frontlines and we can do it better, we have more knowledge, we've been through it, but we don't have a dog in the fight in terms of where it comes out. We just want young people, young Americans, to be exposed to what it is. We're not telling them to vote Republican, vote Democrat but we are telling them, look at what we have, look at the Constitution, look at what we've been given. It would be a shame to let this go away. And if we don't reach out to the young people, the young people coming along, it is going to continue to go away. And I think that's the challenge.

Tom Brokaw, when he gave Ford's eulogy, talked about the Greatest Generation who enlisted in the war and they went and they fought and they came back and they reenlisted. They reenlisted in this country. That's what I'm asking us to do, all of us. Let us reenlist like they did and make a difference and we can do it.

Thank you so much. I'm obviously humbled by the award. Everyone here could get, I recognize that. I thank you for it. I want to thank especially my family whom I dearly love and who has been with me all the way.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES. Lou, thank you. It's leadership that our young people are looking for. With the efforts of people such as you and the people that you work with and the people you work with here, hopefully we are positioning ourselves to be able to assist in providing that leadership. A lot of the programs that you have instituted which we have been privileged to participate in, and I am particularly speaking of the civics education program and the webcasts, I think we have a very, very unique opportunity to reach young men and women who really are hungry to be told, not what to do but why they are free and why they have the opportunities that they have. And it is because of you and efforts of people like you that we are going to make that effort.

We thank you very much.

I now have a portion of the program that we will go through. It's not a happy one, but I will read to you the names of our former colleagues who have passed away during the course of the past year. Each of us probably knows at least some of these names, and some may know all of them. During the past year, the following individuals have gone to a greater reward:

Glenn Andrews of Alabama
 Robert Cornell of Wisconsin
 Tim Hall of Illinois
 Frank Harrison of Pennsylvania
 Jesse Helms of North Carolina
 Jack Kemp of New York
 David King of Utah
 Horace Kornegay of North Carolina
 Dan Kuykendall of Tennessee
 Raymond Lederer of Pennsylvania
 Clem McSpadden of Oklahoma
 Bill Orton of Utah
 William Patman of Texas
 James Pearson of Kansas
 Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island
 Carl Pursell of Michigan
 Matthew Rinaldo of New Jersey
 Paul Rogers of Florida
 John Seiberling of Ohio
 Paul Todd of Michigan
 Stephanie Tubbs-Jones of Ohio
 Lionel Van Deerlin of California
 Jerome Waldie of California
 Lyle Williams of Ohio
 Wendell Wyatt of Oregon.

I ask all of you, including those in the gallery, if you would rise for just a moment of silence to pay respect to their memories.

Thank you.

A new addition to our annual meeting is a memorial breakfast where we will further celebrate the lives and contributions of our past former colleagues. The breakfast is tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. at the Capitol Hill Club. Chaplain Coughlin will join us and it would be very nice to see as many of you there as possible. We are going to give opportunities for us to share memories, if we will, of some of those with whom we were particularly acquainted who have gone on.

Before I conclude, I need to make mention of the fact that we have two former parliamentarians from Canada who have joined us. Lou Duguay is my counterpart in the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians and Murad Velshi is a former member of the Ontario legislature. We are honored that you have joined us and hope that you will participate in the rest of our programs.

I want to thank other members of our executive committee: Vice President Hertel; Treasurer Morella; Secretary Kennelly; and our immediate Past President, Jim Slattery. I also want to pay special recognition to our special immediate Past President, Jack Buechner. When Mr. Slattery left Washington to go back to Kansas to run for the Senate, we were lacking an immediate Past President who is a valuable member of the executive committee, and we were able to prevail upon Jack to fill in, which he did, he did very ably and contributed very much to the Association's efforts during the course of time that Jim was not here. As we know, Mr. Slattery fell short in his campaign for the Senate and has returned to Washington and has resumed his duties as immediate Past President. But, Jack, thank you for your help. We needed it and we appreciate it.

I think that it would be appropriate for me to take a moment to recognize our staff. These are very, very talented professional, hardworking, dedicated people, and they work for us and they work very, very well for us. A lot of the things that we get accomplished we couldn't do without the assistance of our five staff personnel. They are:

Esra Alemdar, Jr., Program Officer
 Whitney Novak, Member Services Manager

Tracy Fine, Democracy Officer
 Sudha David-Wilp, International Programs Director

Pete Weichlein, Executive Director.

Our thanks to all of you for everything you do for us.

That is the end of my report. I want to thank Leader HOYER and Leader BOEHNER for giving us the opportunity to be here on the floor today and Speaker PELOSI for making the Chamber available to us.

Mr. HERTEL. The Chair wants to thank the president of our association, the gentleman from Arizona, for all his hard work and leadership, especially in these difficult times. He does have this extra burden to carry since the gen-

tleman from Kansas ran for the Senate and it's been in difficult times, especially in this economy. It's much harder to get the people to volunteer to contribute money. As we thank Lou Frey for his leadership all these years, it goes to such wonderful programs as our Congress to Campus Program but to Jay Rhodes for carrying this heavy load.

I also wanted to recognize Mr. Buechner who has done such a wonderful job as President and Past President in leading our group and with advice. And also Matt McHugh, our former President of the Association who is here; and Phil Ruppe from my State of Michigan. Because of all these gentlemen, we've had such a great opportunity. We have also had women before as Lindy Boggs, one of our outstanding Presidents before of our association. What a difference they have made in getting people to participate and bringing these programs to fruition. I have to also thank Barbara Kennelly, our treasurer, and Connie Morella for all their hard work and all the time they devoted, especially in this last year.

The Chair again wishes to thank all the former Members of the House for their presence here today. Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their name to the Clerk for inclusion on the roll. The Chair wishes to thank the other former Members of the House for their presence here today and all of their work in contributing to all the programs that we have been talking about for the last hour and a half. As Lou Frey said, it's only with the former Members that we can continue to participate and have these programs work internationally and in over 40 campuses around our country. And now with the Wounded Warriors addition to make that disabled sports program so successful. Thank you again. We appreciate all the work that you have done.

The meeting is adjourned.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Who knows the truth when it is still hidden from our mind's eye, and Who reads our hearts, filled with hidden desires, we bring our needs to You in prayer.

Sometimes we are simply elated by hope. Often we are overwhelmed by the reality of daily concerns. Occasionally we are totally blinded by the emotional force field around us. Yet, we try to clear the air with our prayer.

Help us, Lord, to humbly admit that at times we are not fully conscious of what is our greatest need.

Dealing with issues that are beyond psychological admission or sociological determination or political timing, Lord, we are led to a deeper confidence that You know us better than we know ourselves.

You will help us if we simply call upon Your Holy Name, and will answer our deepest needs, even if we cannot name them ourselves, for You are the Creative One and Savior of Your people, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HERGER 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.

WAR SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. KUCINICH. We're destroying our Nation's moral and fiscal integrity with the war supplemental. Instead of ending wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan now, by appropriating only enough money to bring our troops home, Congress abdicates its constitutional authority, defers to the President and asks for a report. That's right. All we're asking for is a report on when the President will end the war.

There's money, too, for the IMF, presumably to bail out private European banks, billions for the IMF so they can force low- and middle-income nations to cut jobs, wages, health care and retirement security, just like corporate America does to our constituents.

And there's money to incentivize the purchase of more cars, but not necessarily from the U.S. because a "Buy America" mandate was not allowed. Another \$106 billion, and all we get is a lousy war. Pretty soon, that's going to be about the only thing made in America: war.

ELECTING CERTAIN MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That the following Members are, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Mr. McKeon, to rank before Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Platts.

Mr. PENCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BREAKING DOWN THE UNINSURED

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, and in the many days before, we heard our colleagues talk over and over and over again about how we have so many people in this country who do not have access to health care. That's not accurate. They have access to health care. What they're talking about is people who are uninsured.

But let me talk about the numbers that make up what they're talking about as 45.7 million Americans who are uninsured. That's not true either; 9.5 million of those are noncitizens; 12 million of them are eligible for public programs such as Medicaid and Medicare; 7.3 million have incomes over \$84,000 and choose not to purchase health insurance; and 9.1 million are only temporarily uninsured. That brings us down to 7.8 million American citizens, lower income, long-term uninsured, a much different figure from the 45 million they tout all the time. And a preliminary report by CBO says that they want to spend \$1 trillion on this.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SENIOR AIRMAN ASHTON GOODMAN

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen hero who was laid to rest in my district earlier this month.

Senior Airman Ashton Goodman was killed by a roadside bomb in Afghanistan on May 26. Her ultimate sacrifice is a stark reminder of the human cost of war. However, it is Ashton's life that should serve as a shining example of American achievement in Afghanistan.

While tasked with protecting vital reconstruction teams, Ashton worked to win over the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. She regularly mentored Afghan women, providing them with the guidance and skills needed to stand up against oppression and violence. Because of Ashton, many women are now combating the economic and social conditions that breed extremism.

Through her exceptional support of Afghan women and her sacrifice on behalf of her country, she has set a lasting example for our military and for all Americans.

THE CALIFORNIA CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, today, I'm introducing legislation to address the dire situation facing my district and the State of California with respect to accumulation of forest fuels and the threat of catastrophic wildfires.

The California Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention and Community Protection Act of 2009 seeks to implement hazardous fuels reduction and other forest-thinning projects on Federal land that have been collaboratively developed and identified within a community's wildfire protection plan or county fire plan.

Since 2003, California has witnessed three of its worst fire seasons ever. This legislation would help address the only aspect of wildfire we can control: accumulation of forest fuels. Without action, our communities remain at risk to catastrophic wildfire.

I urge my fellow Members to support this commonsense solution.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR EVERYONE

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we've come to a point in time in American history when it's past time for us to guarantee access to affordable health care for everyone.

Last week, Thursday, President Obama came to Green Bay, Wisconsin, and he didn't have to travel very far to find a health care story. At the airport restaurant there's Jeff. And Jeff is working 65 hours a week, two different jobs, and he doesn't have the health care coverage that he needs. He can't get health care coverage because he has a preexisting medical condition.

It's time for this House, on both sides of the aisle, to understand that Jeff isn't the only one who needs our help.

We need to have choices. We need to have the care that we require just to get through the day, and we have to have health care at a price we can all afford to pay. And we must guarantee that no citizen shall suffer any discrimination due to any preexisting medical conditions.

And I'll ask you this question: Isn't it time that we have a Federal standard, a standard health benefit plan, that's available to each and every American citizen and legal resident?

I think it's time, and so do the people of northeast Wisconsin.

A PEACEFUL FUTURE FOR IRAN

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, half-way across the world today people are rioting in the streets. Violence, gunshots and even death have overtaken Iran's streets as its citizens protest the results of their recent election.

Iran's security affects the entire Middle East, and the riots there show how fragile their government really is. Recently, Iran successfully tested a long-range missile, and their intentions with their nuclear program are still unknown.

The United States must utilize every diplomatic, economic, and political tool at our disposal, including the further use of sanctions. Ultimately, our goal is peace for Iran, peace now and in the future. That's why I encourage Members of this body to join me in the support of the Iran Petroleum Sanctions Act. This legislation would use sanctions on refined petroleum to Iran in order to convince the government to give up its nuclear ambitions.

Our desire, all of us across the world, is to see a secure and peaceful future for the people of Iran, the greater Middle East and the world, but this cannot happen without some changes in Iran's policies, regardless of the outcome of their election.

COMBATING A NATIONAL PROBLEM

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to report to the House about another blow made against the drug cartels who smuggle narcotics into the United States from Mexico.

Recently, two women from Michigan were arrested for driving a van filled with \$1 million dollars worth of marijuana down I-40 near Holbrook in my district. The Major Crimes Apprehension Team K-9 Unit pulled over the van for a traffic violation and discovered two occupants from Michigan carrying \$1 million worth of marijuana.

This case further demonstrates the important role that local law enforcement in Arizona and throughout the Southwest are playing in combating a national problem.

I commend Navajo County Sheriff K.C. Clark and his department for yet another successful operation.

COMMENTS MADE BY LEON PANETTA

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I cheered when CIA Director Leon Panetta recently defended the honor of his agency against unsubstantiated charges by the Speaker of the House that the CIA routinely lied to Americans and to the Congress of the United States.

Given those remarks, I was surprised to see his recent remarks about Vice President Cheney when he said, It's almost as if he wishes that this country would be attacked again in order to make his point.

Just as Mr. Panetta deserves an apology from the Speaker, Mr. Panetta owes one to the Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President was Vice President when this country was attacked. He and the President spent the next 7½ years making sure it didn't happen again. They deserve our thanks and our appreciation, not cheap shots and not questions about their motives when they address the critical issues before our country.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reforming our health care system this year. Every day Americans with health concerns worry, not just about getting well, but whether they can afford to get well.

Statistics show that the average American family already pays an extra \$1,100 in premiums every year for a broken system that leaves 46 million uninsured Americans, and millions more who are insured without the care they need when they need it.

Americans spend more than any other population on health care; yet we are no healthier for the investment. President Obama and this Congress want to change this dynamic.

We must make quality health care more affordable and accessible to every American: man, woman and child. We must enact a health care system, promote a health care system, ensure a health care system that will work for our constituents and be worthy of this great Nation.

□ 1215

TALKING ON THE PHONE TAX

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "can you hear me now?"

That phrase repeated by cell phone users across the vast prairies and wide-open spaces of America soon may be taxed by the Feds.

That's right. The taxacrats want to tax citizens for their private cell phone use and for the use of mobile phones at work. It's a benefit, the taxacrats saith. So they want to tax it.

Don't think this new "talking on the phone tax" will ever leave. In 1898, Congress passed temporary phone taxes to fund the Spanish-American War, but Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders had the 4-month war won even before the tax took effect. Guess what? Americans are still paying that temporary phone tax for that war 111 years ago.

Phone taxes never die. They don't even fade away. Americans are taxed enough already. Government addiction to spending should be cured cold turkey style. Citizens don't need more silly taxes to fund pet projects. Mr. Speaker, the people are weary of taxes.

"Can you hear them now?" No more taxes. No "talking on the phone tax."

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH JIM OWENS

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today in Seattle, a memorial service is taking place for the University of Washington's legendary football coach, Jim Owens, who passed away on June 6, leaving a legacy that extends far beyond Husky Stadium where he coached for 18 years. In fact, that legacy extends here to the Nation's Capital because I was one of the many individuals he recruited, coached and counseled on and off the field, and we remained friends for nearly 50 years.

He was a remarkable leader, assuming the job of head coach at the university at the age of 29. It was said that he brought a work ethic and a coaching style that would have intimidated a Marine Corps drill instructor. That was accurate. I can say that from personal experience. He had high expectations, and he could be tough. He once told me I was fine on defense as a linebacker, but I was the weakest weak guard on the team.

Most of all, he was a real leader, and he was successful. Three years after arriving at the University of Washington, he produced a Rose Bowl championship team, defeating Wisconsin, 44-8, in the 1960 Rose Bowl. I was proud to play for him the next year when we repeated a Rose Bowl victory over Minnesota, 17-7.

He was a great coach. Though he will be missed, his lessons will endure long beyond his death. Our prayers go out to the entire Owens family. They have lost a wonderful husband and father. His players will never forget him.

PEACEFUL DISSENT IN THE STREETS OF IRAN

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with President Obama, with Vice President BIDEN and with all of those around the world who have been

expressing their most profound concern about the events in Iran and, in particular, about the violence being used against those people who have been peacefully dissenting in the streets of Iran.

There are news reports that at least seven have been killed. Others have been beaten and have been badly injured. Both the protests and the violent suppression have been spreading. It has been reported that there are instances of live fire being used by police in the cities. The Iranian authorities have now indicated that they will do a limited recount of the election results. I hope they are sincere and earnest in this offer.

As President Obama has said to those who have used their right to dissent: The world is watching and the world is inspired.

RECOGNIZING VIETNAM VETERANS FROM NEW MEXICO

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Day weekend, there was a solemn moment for one family of New Mexico. Enrique Valdez, who served as a gunnery sergeant in the United States Marine Corps, was the 400th New Mexican to have his name added to the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington. Valdez was injured during his second tour of duty in South Vietnam.

Today, I would like to say that I am thankful for the service that Sergeant Valdez gave to his country. New Mexico has always had a proud military history from the Civil War to the Operations of Enduring and Iraqi Freedom.

New Mexico's sons and daughters have always answered their Nation's call. For those who served during the Vietnam war, we as a Nation have been lax in our gratitude and appreciation. As we remember Sergeant Enrique Valdez, let us not only honor his memory and sacrifice but also honor the price that was paid by all who served in Vietnam.

FISCAL CRISES

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. is facing a fiscal crisis which we must soon begin to address. This will not be easy, but there are two clear things that we know we must do.

First, we know we must fix the spiraling cost of our health care system, and those who would point to our Federal deficits ignore the much larger numbers associated with the promises that we have made through Medicare and Social Security that we are going to have trouble keeping if we don't take a hard look at those things.

Secondly, as the economy recovers, this House must put the brakes on gov-

ernment spending. That's why I am delighted that, tomorrow, this House will take up pay-as-you-go legislation that would simply say: You pay for what you spend. You either have the guts to ask the citizenry to pay for it via taxation or you choose other things that you don't want to spend it on. We've seen PAYGO rules in place before, in the 1990s, when the government ran surpluses and when we saw unrivaled prosperity.

So we need to look back at that and have the discipline to pass that legislation so that we restore confidence in our fiscal probity and in the prosperity to our economy.

HEALTH CARE CRISIS

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop playing politics and solve the health care crisis. Americans deserve a choice in quality health care that is affordable.

Health care reform will make sure that we have the option to keep the health care insurance we have, if we like it, or to choose a quality public health care option.

Health care reform will stop the insurance companies from denying coverage to those with preexisting conditions. You will also no longer be denied care because of your age. Health care reform will make sure that you will have coverage that can never be denied or taken away. Our families need this peace of mind. We spend almost 50 percent more per person on health care than does the next most costly nation, but we are no healthier for it.

We cannot wait any longer to make health care reform a reality. Quality, affordable health care for all is long overdue.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people don't need to be told there is a health care crisis in America. They're the ones living it every day. They're the ones who, for decades, have seen the price they pay out of every paycheck for health insurance skyrocket while their coverage has shrunk or has been denied altogether. They've seen the increasing copays and premiums.

We can give every American a choice. We can offer an alternative to the mountains of medical debt that so often lead to bankruptcy. We can offer an alternative to the fear that they or their children might be denied a doctor visit simply because it is more profitable to deny them coverage than to see them get well.

I want to encourage all Americans to stand up to the same fear-mongering attacks that have prevented them for

decades from getting the health care they deserve. We can offer a public option that helps all Americans. I implore the American people to remember that we are not the country of "no, we can't." We are America, the country of "yes, we can."

IRAN

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, while we are often focused on the things that make us different from other cultures, the recent news in Iran illustrates that there are far more things that bind us than that divide us. Freedom of speech, democracy and respect for basic fairness are not uniquely American or Western values. They are hardwired into all of us and are as elemental to the human experience as is the need for food, water or love.

We will likely have political differences with the Government of Iran for years to come. Despite this, let us all remember that the Iranian people want many of the same things that Americans do. They want their voices to be heard just like us. They want their government to be just, open and accessible just like us. They want their economy to be strong and for their country to work towards greater peace and understanding around the world just like us.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, the health care crisis in our Nation is real. We need to step forward and take action to provide quality and affordable care for those who need it. With 46 million Americans uninsured in this country, there is no time to waste in offering hardworking families the option of health insurance while infusing competition into the health care market, which desperately needs it.

Our broken health care system also happens to be the most expensive health care system in the world. If we don't act now, the cost of health care in this country in 10, 20 or 30 years will bog down our economy. Reforming our health care system now makes economic sense.

Proposed health care reform is all about options. If you are happy with your current plans and with your current providers, keep them. The choice to have health insurance and the choice to get the best medical care you can possibly get is up to you. Health care should be a right for every American, and our current health care system in this country is broken. It is time for Congress to take the lead and to make the tough choices that we were sent to Washington to make.

DAY OF THE AFRICAN CHILD

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the Day of the African Child, which has been celebrated on June 16 each year since 1991 when it was first initiated by the Organization of African Unity, the predecessor to the African Union.

This year, the African Union has designated child survival as the theme of this year's Day of the African Child.

According to the United Nations Children's Fund, sub-Saharan Africa remains the most difficult place in the world for a child to survive. Each year in sub-Saharan Africa, 1.2 million babies die in their first month of life. Roughly, one in every six children fails to reach his 5th birthday. In response to these shocking statistics, the African Union made child survival a theme for their 15th meeting coming up in 2010.

The top five killers of children under age 5 include neonatal causes such as respiratory infections, pneumonia, malaria, diarrhea, and HIV/AIDS.

So, Mr. Speaker, we encourage the legislators to support this, and I join in solidarity with UNICEF for the African child.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to wait for health care reform. Right now, more than three out of four Americans are dissatisfied with the total cost of health care. That is why Congress is working hard to craft legislation to fix the health care system for American families, for American businesses, for future generations, and of course, for our own fiscal survival.

Since 2000, wages have only increased 3 percent while health insurance has increased more than 50 percent. This has caused many families to delay visits to the doctor, to skip treatments and to allow their health coverage to lapse. Despite having the most expensive health care system in the world, Americans are no healthier than many of our global partners.

President Obama and this Congress are working together to provide adequate, accessible and affordable health care now.

GOVERNMENT HASTE MAKES TAXPAYER WASTE

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

Mr. McCOTTER. We are going to soon be facing a question of health care for Americans. We've heard about how

important it is for fellow Americans to have access to quality, affordable health care, and we hear that government is the answer. We hear that, if we spend \$1 trillion, we may be able to insure one-third of our fellow citizens. Extrapolating from that, that means, to insure all of the uninsured, it will cost us \$3 trillion. We hear this must be done by August.

Government haste makes taxpayer waste. We must do this properly. We must do this correctly. We cannot do it properly or correctly with an arbitrary deadline set by people who have, to date, passed bills they have not read and that have yet to work for the American people, whose number one concern right now is keeping a job or finding one.

□ 1230

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS CEREMONY

Mrs. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members ceremony be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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 later.

NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2009

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1674) to amend the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act to allow for the treatment of the nonprofit corporation affiliate of the Bank as a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1674

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE BANK AFFILIATE AS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.

Section 211 of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 3051) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) TREATMENT AS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the nonprofit corporation established under this section shall be deemed to be a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, unless, after the date of the enactment of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009, the Bank, or any affiliate (as defined in section 103(3) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994) of the Bank, participates in depository institution incentives under section 114 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this particular legislation and to insert additional information.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1674, the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009. This legislation is necessary to make a technical correction to the statute of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act.

The National Consumer Cooperative Bank was created by Congress in 1978 and is dedicated to strengthening communities nationwide through the delivery of banking and financial services, complemented by a special focus on cooperative expansion and economic development.

The National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act of 1978 established a nonprofit corporation to reach further into low-income communities and to serve disadvantaged populations. NCB Capital Impact is that nonprofit, mission-driven subsidiary of NCB that works to provide housing, education, health care, cultural centers, small businesses, and social services in economically distressed communities.

In the last 10 years alone, NCB Capital Impact has invested more than \$600 million in assistance to low- and moderate-income communities. These funds helped finance more than 33,000 affordable housing units; 8,000 affordable assisted living units for seniors and persons with disabilities; 137,000

school seats; 2.9 million square feet of community health center space serving 350,000 patients; and helped create 25,000 jobs for low-income individuals.

In my home State of New York, NCB Capital Impact has played a significant role in providing housing finance. In fact, NCB has participated in more than 600 loans in my district alone. Most of these loans are for housing, including affordable housing, as well as loans for community facilities and loans to nonprofit organizations like the Council of New York Cooperatives and Condominiums. Together, these groups are able to provide assisted living, affordable housing and services to the frail and elderly.

Presently, NCB Capital Impact is working with five community-based organizations to help finance 17 projects that will create 558 housing units. Despite their good work in serving low-income communities and disadvantaged populations, NCB Capital Impact is not eligible for assistance authorized under the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, which is administered by the CDFI Fund. The fund has ruled it cannot certify NCB Capital Impact as a CDFI because of the corporate structure of its parent, NCB. In short, NCB Capital Impact is shut off from critical sources of financial awards that are needed to maintain their housing and community development efforts.

The interest of NCB Capital Impact in gaining CDFI certification is twofold. First, it has a track record that is comparable to other organizations that receive CDFI status; its mission is dedicated to working with low-income populations and communities. Second, increasingly in the community development finance field, CDFI certification is viewed as a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval in working with other Federal agencies and other public and private institutions.

I think that it is important to note that this legislation does not guarantee the NCB any assistance, nor does it authorize additional amounts for the CDFI program. All it does is allow NCB to better fulfill its mission by allowing them to compete for these funds. As such, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation will have no significant impact on the Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this technical amendment to the NCB statute so that the nonprofit, mission-driven NCB Capital Impact may continue to provide services to distressed and underserved communities throughout New York and throughout the entire country.

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

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

H.R. 1674 makes a small but significant fix to the National Consumer Cooperative Bank that will have the effect of expanding financial services options to low-income communities.

The bill would give NCB Capital Impact, the nonprofit subsidiary of NCB, the opportunity to compete with hundreds of other institutions for grants from the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund administered by the Treasury Department. Today, NCB Capital Impact is not eligible for the CDFI grants even though it provides housing, education, health care, cultural centers, small businesses, and social services in distressed areas. The mission of the CDFI Fund is to expand the capacity of financial institutions to provide credit, capital and financial services to underserved populations.

So long as the activities of the NCB Capital Impact meet the letter and the spirit of the CDFI's eligibility requirements, their organizational structure should not preclude them from receiving those dollars. This bill would allow NCB Capital Impact to compete for grants and continue providing economic development support to low- and moderate-income communities.

In closing, I would like to commend the sponsor of this legislation, Mrs. MALONEY, for her work on this bill. I am in support of her statement and would urge my colleagues also to support that.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1674.

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.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2009

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 403) to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 403

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Homes for Heroes Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS IN OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Section 4 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be in the Department a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, who shall be in the Office of the Secretary.

"(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be appointed based

solely on merit and shall be covered under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

"(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be responsible for—

"(A) ensuring veterans have access to housing and homeless assistance under each program of the Department providing either such assistance;

"(B) coordinating all programs and activities of the Department relating to veterans;

"(C) serving as a liaison for the Department with the Department of Veterans Affairs, including establishing and maintaining relationships with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

"(D) serving as a liaison for the Department, and establishing and maintaining relationships with officials of State, local, regional, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans;

"(E) providing information and advice regarding—

"(i) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered by the Department; or

"(ii) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department;

"(F) preparing the annual report under section 8 of Homes for Heroes Act of 2009; and

"(G) carrying out such other duties as may be assigned to the Special Assistant by the Secretary or by law."

SEC. 3. SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to expand the supply of permanent housing for very low-income veteran families; and

(2) to provide supportive services through such housing to support the needs of such veteran families.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent amounts are made available for assistance under this section and the Secretary receives approvable applications for such assistance, provide assistance to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives to expand the supply of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(2) NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.—The assistance provided under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be available for use to plan for and finance the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation of a structure or a portion of a structure to be used as supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in accordance with this section; and

(B) may also cover the cost of real property acquisition, site improvement, conversion, demolition, relocation, and other expenses that the Secretary determines are necessary to expand the supply of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In meeting the requirement of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(B) the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, as such Special Assistant was established under section 4(g) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

(c) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section shall be made available in the following forms:

(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—Assistance may be provided as a grant for costs of planning a project to be used as supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(2) CAPITAL ADVANCES.—Assistance may be provided as a capital advance under this paragraph for a project, such advance shall—

(A) bear no interest;

(B) not be required to be repaid so long as the housing remains available for occupancy by very low-income veteran families in accordance with this section; and

(C) be in an amount calculated in accordance with the development cost limitation established pursuant to subsection (i).

(3) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Assistance may be provided as project rental assistance, under an annual contract that—

(A) obligates the Secretary to make monthly payments to cover any part of the costs attributed to units occupied (or, as approved by the Secretary, held for occupancy) by very low-income veteran families that is not met from project income;

(B) provides for the project not more than the sum of the initial annual project rentals for all units so occupied and any initial utility allowances for such units, as approved by the Secretary;

(C) provides that any contract amounts not used by a project in any year shall remain available to the project until the expiration of the contract;

(D) provides that upon the expiration of each contract term, the Secretary shall adjust the annual contract amount to provide for reasonable project costs, and any increases, including adequate reserves, supportive services, and service coordinators, except that any contract amounts not used by a project during a contract term shall not be available for such adjustments upon renewal; and

(E) provides that in the event of emergency situations that are outside the control of the owner, the Secretary shall increase the annual contract amount, subject to reasonable review and limitations as the Secretary shall provide.

(d) TENANT RENT CONTRIBUTION.—A very low-income veteran family shall pay as rent for a dwelling unit assisted under this section the highest of the following amounts, rounded to the nearest dollar:

(1) 30 percent of the veteran family's adjusted monthly income.

(2) 10 percent of the veteran family's monthly income.

(3) If the veteran family is receiving payments for welfare assistance from a public agency and a part of such payments, adjusted in accordance with the veteran family's actual housing costs, is specifically designated by such agency to meet the veteran family's housing costs, the portion of such payments which is so designated.

(e) TERM OF COMMITMENT.—

(1) USE LIMITATIONS.—All units in housing assisted under this section shall be made available for occupancy by very low-income veteran families for not less than 15 years.

(2) CONTRACT TERMS FOR PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) INITIAL TERM.—The initial term of a contract entered into under subsection (c)(3) shall be 60 months.

(B) EXTENSION.—The Secretary shall, subject only to the availability of amounts provided in appropriation Acts, renew the contract entered into under subsection (c)(3) for 10 consecutive one-year terms, the first such term beginning upon the expiration of such 60-month period.

(C) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY TO MAKE EARLY COMMITMENTS.—In order to facilitate the orderly extension of expiring contracts, the Secretary may make commitments to extend expiring contracts during the year prior to the date of expiration.

(f) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available under this section shall be allocated by the

Secretary among approvable applications submitted by private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives.

(2) CONTENT OF APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Applications for assistance under this section shall be submitted by an applicant in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary shall establish.

(B) REQUIRED CONTENT.—Applications for assistance under this section shall contain—

(i) a description of the proposed housing;

(ii) a description of the assistance the applicant seeks under this section;

(iii) a description of—

(I) the supportive services to be provided to the persons occupying such housing;

(II) the manner in which such services will be provided to such persons, including, in the case of frail elderly persons (as such term is defined in section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q)), evidence of such residential supervision as the Secretary determines is necessary to facilitate the adequate provision of such services; and

(III) the public or private sources of assistance that can reasonably be expected to fund or provide such services;

(iv) a certification from the public official responsible for submitting a housing strategy for the jurisdiction to be served in accordance with section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705) that the proposed project is consistent with the approved housing strategy; and

(v) such other information or certifications that the Secretary determines to be necessary or appropriate to achieve the purposes of this section.

(3) REJECTION.—The Secretary shall not reject any application for assistance under this section on technical grounds without giving notice of that rejection and the basis therefore to the applicant.

(g) INITIAL SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESSING.—

(1) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish selection criteria for assistance under this section, which shall include—

(A) criteria based upon—

(i) the ability of the applicant to develop and operate the proposed housing;

(ii) the need for supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in the area to be served;

(iii) the extent to which the proposed size and unit mix of the housing will enable the applicant to manage and operate the housing efficiently and ensure that the provision of supportive services will be accomplished in an economical fashion;

(iv) the extent to which the proposed design of the housing will meet the service-connected disability needs of very low-income veteran families;

(v) the extent to which the applicant has demonstrated that the supportive services identified pursuant to subsection (f)(2)(B)(iii) will be provided on a consistent, long-term basis;

(vi) the extent to which the proposed design of the housing will accommodate the provision of supportive services that are expected to be needed, either initially or over the useful life of the housing, by the very low-income veterans the housing is intended to serve;

(vii) the extent to which the applicant has ensured that a service coordinator will be employed or otherwise retained for the housing, who has the managerial capacity and responsibility for carrying out the actions described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (h)(2)(A); and

(viii) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to ensure that

funds made available under this section are used effectively;

(B) a preference in such selection for applications proposing housing to be reserved for occupancy by very low-income veteran families who are homeless (as such term is defined in section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302)); and

(C) criteria appropriate to consider the need for supportive housing for very low-income veteran families in nonmetropolitan areas and by Indian tribes.

(2) DELEGATED PROCESSING.—

(A) DELEGATION TO STATE OR LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITY.—In issuing a capital advance under this subsection for any project for which financing for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2) is provided by a combination of a capital advance under subsection (c)(2) and sources other than this section, within 30 days of award of the capital advance, the Secretary shall delegate review and processing of such projects to a State or local housing agency that—

(i) is in geographic proximity to the property;

(ii) has demonstrated experience in and capacity for underwriting multifamily housing loans that provide housing and supportive services;

(iii) may or may not be providing low-income housing tax credits in combination with the capital advance under this section; and

(iv) agrees to issue a firm commitment within 12 months of delegation.

(B) PROCESSING BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall retain the authority to process capital advances in cases in which no State or local housing agency has applied to provide delegated processing pursuant to this paragraph or no such agency has entered into an agreement with the Secretary to serve as a delegated processing agency.

(C) PROCESSING FEES.—An agency to which review and processing is delegated pursuant to subparagraph (A) may assess a reasonable fee which shall be included in the capital advance amounts and may recommend project rental assistance amounts in excess of those initially awarded by the Secretary. The Secretary shall develop a schedule for reasonable fees under this subparagraph to be paid to delegated processing agencies, which shall take into consideration any other fees to be paid to the agency for other funding provided to the project by the agency, including bonds, tax credits, and other gap funding.

(D) AUTHORITY RETAINED BY SECRETARY.—Under such delegated system, the Secretary shall retain the authority to approve rents and development costs and to execute a capital advance within 60 days of receipt of the commitment from the State or local agency. The Secretary shall provide to such agency and the project sponsor, in writing, the reasons for any reduction in capital advance amounts or project rental assistance and such reductions shall be subject to appeal.

(h) PROVISION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES TO VETERAN FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall coordinate with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that any housing assistance provided to veterans or veteran families includes a range of services tailored to the needs of the very low-income veteran families occupying such housing, which may include services for—

(A) outreach;

(B) health (including counseling, mental health, substance abuse, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury) diagnosis and treatment;

(C) habilitation and rehabilitation;

(D) case management;

(E) daily living;

(F) personal financial planning;
 (G) transportation;
 (H) vocation;
 (I) employment and training;
 (J) education;
 (K) assistance in obtaining veterans benefits and public benefits;
 (L) assistance in obtaining income support;
 (M) assistance in obtaining health insurance;
 (N) fiduciary and representative payee;
 (O) legal aid;
 (P) child care;
 (Q) housing counseling;
 (R) service coordination; and
 (S) other services necessary for maintaining independent living.

(2) LOCAL COORDINATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that owners of housing assisted under this section have the managerial capacity to—

(i) assess on an ongoing basis the service needs of residents;
 (ii) coordinate the provision of supportive services and tailor such services to the individual needs of residents; and
 (iii) seek on a continuous basis new sources of assistance to ensure the long-term provision of supportive services.

(B) CLASSIFICATION OF COSTS.—Any cost associated with this subsection relating to the coordination of services shall be an eligible cost under subsections (c)(3).

(1) DEVELOPMENT COST LIMITATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall periodically establish reasonable development cost limitations by market area for various types and sizes of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families by publishing a notice of the cost limitations in the Federal Register.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The cost limitations established under paragraph (1) shall reflect—

(A) the cost of construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families that meets applicable State and local housing and building codes;

(B) the cost of movables necessary to the basic operation of the housing, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) the cost of special design features necessary to make the housing accessible to very low-income veteran families;

(D) the cost of community space necessary to accommodate the provision of supportive services to veteran families;

(E) if the housing is newly constructed, the cost of meeting the energy efficiency standards promulgated by the Secretary in accordance with section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12709); and

(F) the cost of land, including necessary site improvement.

(3) USE OF DATA.—In establishing development cost limitations for a given market area under this subsection, the Secretary shall use data that reflect currently prevailing costs of construction, reconstruction, or moderate or substantial rehabilitation, and land acquisition in the area.

(4) COMMUNITY SPACE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), a community space shall include space for cafeterias or dining halls, community rooms or buildings, workshops, child care, adult day health facilities or other outpatient health facilities, or other essential service facilities.

(5) COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—Neither this section nor any other provision of law may be construed as prohibiting or preventing the location and operation, in a project assisted under this section, of commercial facilities

for the benefit of residents of the project and the community in which the project is located, except that assistance made available under this section may not be used to subsidize any such commercial facility.

(6) ACQUISITION.—In the case of existing housing and related facilities to be acquired, the cost limitations shall include—

(A) the cost of acquiring such housing;
 (B) the cost of rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement, including the moderate or substantial rehabilitation thereof; and

(C) the cost of the land on which the housing and related facilities are located.

(7) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall adjust the cost limitation not less than annually to reflect changes in the general level of construction, reconstruction, and moderate and substantial rehabilitation costs.

(8) INCENTIVES FOR SAVINGS.—

(A) SPECIAL HOUSING ACCOUNT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the development cost limitations established under paragraph (1) or (6) to calculate the amount of financing to be made available to individual owners.

(ii) ACTUAL DEVELOPMENTAL COSTS LESS THAN FINANCING.—Owners which incur actual development costs that are less than the amount of financing shall be entitled to retain 50 percent of the savings in a special housing account.

(iii) BONUS FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—The percentage established under clause (ii) shall be increased to 75 percent for owners which add energy efficiency features which—

(I) exceed the energy efficiency standards promulgated by the Secretary in accordance with section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12709);

(II) substantially reduce the life-cycle cost of the housing; and

(III) reduce gross rent requirements.

(B) USES.—The special housing account established under subparagraph (A) may be used—

(i) to provide services to residents of the housing or funds set aside for replacement reserves; or

(ii) for such other purposes as determined by the Secretary.

(9) DESIGN FLEXIBILITY.—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, give owners the flexibility to design housing appropriate to their location and proposed resident population within broadly defined parameters.

(10) USE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.—An owner shall be permitted voluntarily to provide funds from sources other than this section for amenities and other features of appropriate design and construction suitable for supportive housing under this section if the cost of such amenities is—

(A) not financed with the advance; and
 (B) is not taken into account in determining the amount of Federal assistance or of the rent contribution of tenants.

(j) TENANT SELECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner shall adopt written tenant selection procedures that are—

(A) satisfactory to the Secretary and which are—

(i) consistent with the purpose of improving housing opportunities for very low-income veteran families; and

(ii) reasonably related to program eligibility and an applicant's ability to perform the obligations of the lease; and

(B) compliant with subtitle C of title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13601 et seq.) and any regulations issued under such subtitle.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF REJECTION.—Owners shall promptly notify in writing any rejected applicant of the grounds for any rejection.

(3) INFORMATION REGARDING HOUSING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor, information regarding the availability of the housing assisted under this section.

(B) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH ADDITIONAL AGENCIES.—Within 30 days of receipt of the information, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of Labor shall provide such information to agencies in the area of the housing that receive assistance from the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labor for providing medical care, housing, supportive services or employment and training services to homeless veterans.

(k) MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.—

(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make available appropriate technical assistance to ensure that prospective applicants are able to participate more fully in the program carried out under this section.

(2) CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE.—Each owner shall certify, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that assistance made available under this section will be conducted and administered in conformity with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.), the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and other Federal, State, and local laws prohibiting discrimination and promoting equal opportunity.

(3) OWNER DEPOSIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require an owner of housing, assisted under this section, to deposit an amount not to exceed \$15,000 in a special escrow account to ensure the owner's commitment to the housing. Such amount shall be used only to cover operating deficits during the first three years of operations and shall not be used to cover construction shortfalls or inadequate initial project rental assistance amounts.

(B) REDUCTION OF REQUIREMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the owner deposit specified under subparagraph (A) for individual applicants if the Secretary finds that such waiver or reduction is necessary to achieve the purposes of this section and the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has the capacity to manage and maintain the housing in accordance with this section.

(ii) NONPROFITS.—The Secretary may reduce or waive the requirement of the owner deposit under subparagraph (A) in the case of a nonprofit applicant that is not affiliated with a national sponsor, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) NOTICE OF APPEAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify an owner not less than 30 days prior to canceling any reservation of assistance provided under this section.

(B) APPEAL.—

(i) FILING DEADLINE.—During the 30-day period following the receipt of any notice required under subparagraph (A), an owner may appeal the proposed cancellation.

(ii) TIMING OF DECISION.—Any appeal undertaken under clause (i), including review by the Secretary, shall be completed not later than 45 days after the appeal is filed.

(5) LABOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the construction of housing with 12 or more units assisted under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than the rates prevailing in the locality involved for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics

employed on construction of a similar character, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.

(B) EXEMPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any individual who—

(i) performs services for which the individual volunteered;

(ii) does not receive compensation for such services or is paid expenses, reasonable benefits, or a nominal fee for such services; and

(iii) is not otherwise employed at any time in the construction work.

(6) ACCESS TO RESIDUAL RECEIPTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall authorize the owner of a housing project assisted under this section to use any residual receipts held for the project in excess of \$500 per unit (or in excess of such other amount prescribed by the Secretary based on the needs of the project) for activities to retrofit and renovate the project as described under section 802(d)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8011(d)(3)) or to provide supportive services to residents of the project.

(B) REPORT.—Any owner that uses residual receipts under this paragraph shall submit to the Secretary a report, not less than annually, describing the uses of the residual receipts.

(C) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—In determining the amount of project rental assistance to be provided to a project under subsection (c)(3) of this section, the Secretary may take into consideration the residual receipts held for the project only if, and to the extent that, excess residual receipts are not used under this paragraph.

(7) OCCUPANCY STANDARDS AND OBLIGATIONS.—Each owner shall operate housing assisted under this section in compliance with subtitle C of title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13601 et seq.) and any regulations issued under such subtitle.

(8) USE OF PROJECT RESERVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts for project reserves for a project assisted under this section may be used for costs, subject to reasonable limitations as the Secretary determines appropriate, for reducing the number of dwelling units in the project.

(B) APPROVAL OF SECRETARY REQUIRED.—Any use described in subparagraph (A) of amounts for project reserves for a project assisted under this section shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary to ensure that such use is designed to retrofit units that are currently obsolete or unmarketable.

(9) REPAYMENT OF ASSISTANCE AND PREVENTION OF UNDUE BENEFITS.—

(A) REPAYMENT.—If a recipient, or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient, receives assistance under subsection (b) for use pursuant to paragraph (2) of such subsection for the construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families and the project ceases to provide permanent housing, the Secretary shall require the recipient, or such project sponsor, to repay the following percentage of such assistance:

(i) In the case of a project that ceases to be used for such supportive housing before the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, 100 percent.

(ii) In the case of a project that ceases to be used for such supportive housing on or after the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, but before the expiration of the 15-year period beginning upon such commencement, 20 percent of the assistance for each of the years during such 15-year period for which the project fails to provide permanent housing.

(B) PREVENTION OF UNDUE BENEFITS.—Except as provided in paragraph (C), if any property is used for a project that receives assistance under subsection (b) for use pursuant to paragraph (2) of such subsection for the construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families, and the sale or other disposition of the property occurs before the expiration of the 15-year period beginning upon commencement of the operation of the project, the recipient (or the project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient) shall comply with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to prevent the recipient (or such project sponsor) from unduly benefitting from such sale or disposition.

(C) EXCEPTION.—A recipient, or a project sponsor receiving funds from the recipient, shall not be required to make repayments, and comply with the terms and conditions, required under subparagraph (A) or (B) if—

(i) the sale or disposition of the property used for the project results in the use of the property for the direct benefit of very-low income persons;

(ii) all of the proceeds of the sale or disposition are used to provide permanent housing for very-low income veteran families meeting the requirements of this section;

(iii) project-based rental assistance or operating cost assistance from any Federal program or an equivalent State or local program is no longer made available and the project is meeting applicable performance standards, provided that the portion of the project that had benefitted from such assistance continues to meet the tenant income and rent restrictions for low-income units under section 42(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(iv) there are no low-income veteran families in the geographic area of the property who meet the program criteria, in which case the project may serve non-veteran individuals and families having incomes described in subsection (1)(2) of this section.

(10) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—A veteran family residing in supportive housing assisted under this section may not be considered to lose its status as such a family for purposes of eligibility for continued occupancy in such housing due to the death of any veteran member of the family, including the sole veteran member of the family.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) CONSUMER COOPERATIVE.—The term “consumer cooperative” has the same meaning given such term for purposes of the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q).

(2) VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILY.—The term “very low-income veteran family” means a veteran family whose income does not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families, except that the Secretary may establish an income ceiling higher or lower than 50 percent of the median for the area on the basis of the Secretary’s findings that such variations are necessary because of prevailing levels of construction costs or fair market rents (as determined under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f)), or unusually high or low family incomes.

(3) OWNER.—The term “owner” means a private nonprofit organization or consumer cooperative that receives assistance under this section to develop and operate supportive housing for very low-income veteran families.

(4) PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term “private nonprofit organization” means—

(A) any incorporated private institution or foundation—

(i) no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any member, founder, contributor, or individual;

(ii) which has a governing board that is responsible for the operation of the housing assisted under this section; and

(iii) which is approved by the Secretary as to financial responsibility;

(B) a for-profit limited partnership the sole or managing general partner of which is an organization meeting the requirements under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) or a corporation meeting the requirements of subparagraph (C);

(C) a corporation wholly owned and controlled by an organization meeting the requirements under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A); and

(D) a tribally designated housing entity, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, except where specifically provided otherwise.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

(7) SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—The term “supportive housing for very low-income veteran families” means housing that is designed to accommodate the provision of supportive services that are expected to be needed, either initially or over the useful life of the housing, by the veteran families that the housing is intended to serve.

(8) VETERAN.—The term “veteran” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(9) VETERAN FAMILY.—The term “veteran family” includes a veteran who is a single person, a family (including families with children) whose head of household (or whose spouse) is a veteran, and one or more veterans living together with 1 or more persons.

(m) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of any amounts made available for assistance under this section:

(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—Not more than 2.5 percent shall be available for planning grants in accordance with subsection (c)(1).

(2) CAPITAL ADVANCES.—Such sums as may be necessary shall be available for capital advances in accordance with subsection (c)(2).

(3) PROJECT RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Such sums as may be necessary shall be available for project rental assistance in accordance with subsection (c)(3).

(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Not more than 1 percent shall be available for technical assistance in accordance with subsection (k)(1).

(n) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—There is authorized to be appropriated for assistance under this section \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 4. HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHERS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended to read as follows:

“(19) RENTAL VOUCHERS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.—

“(A) ADDITIONAL VOUCHERS.—In addition to any amount made available for rental assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall make available the amount specified in

subparagraph (B), for use only for providing rental assistance for homeless veterans in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(B) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this subparagraph is, for each fiscal year, the amount necessary to provide not fewer than 20,000 vouchers for rental assistance under this subsection.

“(C) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF HOMELESS VETERAN FAMILIES.—If any veteran member of a household for which rental assistance is being provided under this paragraph, including the sole veteran member of the household, dies, such household may not be considered, due to such death, to lose its status as the household of a homeless veteran for purposes of—

“(i) eligibility for continued assistance under this paragraph; or

“(ii) continued occupancy in the dwelling unit in which such family is residing using such assistance at the time of such death.

“(D) FUNDING.—The budget authority made available under any other provisions of law for rental assistance under this subsection for fiscal year 2009 and each fiscal year thereafter is authorized to be increased in each such fiscal year by such sums as may be necessary to provide the number of vouchers specified in subparagraph (B) for such fiscal year.”

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF VETERANS IN HOUSING PLANNING.

(a) PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY PLANS.—Section 5A(d)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1(d)(1)) is amended by striking “and disabled families” and inserting “, disabled families, and veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)”.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code),” after “acquired immunodeficiency syndrome,”;

(B) in subsection (b)(20), by striking “and service” and inserting “veterans service, and other service”;

(C) in subsection (e)(1), by inserting “veterans (as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code),” after “homeless persons.”

(2) CONSOLIDATED PLANS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall revise the regulations relating to submission of consolidated plans (part 91 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations) in accordance with the amendments made by paragraph (1) of this subsection to require inclusion of appropriate information relating to veterans and veterans service agencies in all such plans.

SEC. 6. EXCLUSION OF VETERANS BENEFITS FROM ASSISTED HOUSING RENT CONSIDERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of determining the amount of rent paid by a family for occupancy of a dwelling unit assisted under a federally assisted housing program under subsection (b) or in housing assisted under any other federally assisted housing program, the income and the adjusted income of the family shall not be considered to include any amounts received by any member of the family from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as—

(1) compensation, as such term is defined in section 101(13) of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) dependency and indemnity compensation, as such term is defined in section 101(14) of such title.

(b) FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAM.—The federally assisted housing programs under this subsection are—

(1) the public housing program under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.);

(2) the tenant-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), including the program under subsection (o)(19) of such section for housing rental vouchers for low-income veteran families;

(3) the project-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(4) the program for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS under subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

(5) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

(6) the supportive housing for persons with disabilities program under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

(7) the supportive housing for the homeless program under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.);

(8) the program for moderate rehabilitation of single room occupancy dwellings for occupancy by the homeless under section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401);

(9) the shelter plus care for the homeless program under subtitle F of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11403 et seq.);

(10) the supportive housing for very low-income veteran families program under section 3 of this Act;

(11) the rental assistance payments program under section 521(a)(2)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490a(a)(2)(A));

(12) the rental assistance program under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1);

(13) the rural housing programs under section 515 and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485, 1490p-2);

(14) the HOME investment partnerships program under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.);

(15) the block grant programs for affordable housing for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians under titles I through IV and VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq., 4221 et seq.);

(16) any other program for housing assistance administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Agriculture under which eligibility for occupancy in the housing assisted or for housing assistance is based upon income;

(17) low-income housing credits allocated pursuant to section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(18) tax-exempt bonds issued for qualified residential rental projects pursuant to section 142(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent amounts are made available in appropriation Acts for grants under this section, make grants to eligible entities under subsection (b) to provide to nonprofit organizations technical assistance appropriate to assist such organizations in—

(1) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered

by the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(2) fulfilling the planning and application processes and requirements necessary under such programs administered by the Department; and

(3) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An eligible entity under this subsection is a nonprofit entity or organization having such expertise as the Secretary shall require in providing technical assistance to providers of services for veterans.

(c) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish criteria for selecting applicants for grants under this section to receive such grants and shall select applicants based upon such criteria.

(d) FUNDING.—Of any amounts made available in fiscal year 2009 or any fiscal year thereafter to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for salaries and expenses, \$1,000,000 shall be available, and shall remain available until expended, for grants under this section.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL REPORT ON HOUSING ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit a report on the activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans during such year to the following:

(1) The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(5) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(7) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include the following information with respect to the year for which the report is submitted:

(1) The number of very low-income veteran families provided assistance under the program of supportive housing for very low-income veteran families under section 3, the socioeconomic characteristics of such families, the types of assistance provided such families, and the number, types, and locations of owners of housing assisted under such section.

(2) The number of homeless veterans provided assistance under the program of housing choice vouchers for homeless veterans under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) (as amended by section 4), the socioeconomic characteristics of such homeless veterans, and the number, types, and locations of entities contracted under such section to administer the vouchers.

(3) A summary description of the special considerations made for veterans under public housing agency plans submitted pursuant to section 5A of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1) and under comprehensive housing affordability strategies submitted pursuant to section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705).

(4) A description of the technical assistance provided to organizations pursuant to grants under section 7.

(5) A description of the activities of the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs.

(6) A description of the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development

to coordinate the delivery of housing and services to veterans with other Federal departments and agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Veterans Affairs, Interagency Council on Homelessness, and the Social Security Administration.

(7) The cost to the Department of Housing and Urban Development of administering the programs and activities relating to veterans.

(8) Any other information that the Secretary considers relevant in assessing the programs and activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF HOUSING NEEDS OF VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the first report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and every fifth report thereafter, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(A) conduct an assessment of the housing needs of very low-income veteran families (as such term is defined in section 3); and

(B) shall include in each such report findings regarding such assessment.

(2) CONTENT.—Each assessment under this subsection shall include—

(A) conducting a survey of, and direct interviews with, a representative sample of very low-income veteran families (as such term is defined in section 3) to determine past and current—

(i) socioeconomic characteristics of such veteran families;

(ii) barriers to such veteran families obtaining safe, quality, and affordable housing;

(iii) levels of homelessness among such veteran families; and

(iv) levels and circumstances of, and barriers to, receipt by such veteran families of rental housing and homeownership assistance; and

(B) such other information that the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and national nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans, homelessness, and very low-income housing, may be useful to the assessment.

(3) CONDUCT.—If the Secretary contracts with an entity other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct the assessment under this subsection, such entity shall be a nongovernmental organization determined by the Secretary to have appropriate expertise in quantitative and qualitative social science research.

(4) FUNDING.—Of any amounts made available pursuant to section 501 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1701z-1) for programs of research, studies, testing, or demonstration relating to the mission or programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for any fiscal year in which an assessment under this subsection is required pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, \$1,000,000 shall be available until expended for costs of the assessment under this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 403.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative CAPITO. She is an active member of the Financial Services Committee, and I thank her for managing today.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Representative MICHAUD—also known as MICHAUD, depending on where you're from—for his outstanding work in helping with this bill. He is a cosponsor. I thank the ranking member, SPENCER BACHUS. Of course I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BARNEY FRANK. I also would like to thank the Housing Subcommittee Chair who has worked closely with me on this project, Representative MAXINE WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, the question may be posed in the mind of someone as to why we should pass the Homes for Heroes Act. I would like to answer this question. We need to pass this bill because, while many of us are sleeping in the sweats of life, too many of our veterans are sleeping in the streets of life. We need to pass it because, while many of us have homes and good jobs, too many of our veterans are homeless, with no jobs at all. We must pass this piece of legislation because America can't continue to be the home of the free and the land of the brave if too many of our brave veterans continue to be homeless.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics are shocking; they literally shock the conscience. Veterans are 9 percent of the population and more than 25 percent of the homeless. On any given night, 131,000 veterans are homeless, and 300,000 veterans will experience homelessness at some point in the course of 1 year. One-half of the veterans who are homeless suffer from mental illness, two-thirds suffer from alcohol or substance abuse. About 47 percent of homeless veterans are Vietnam veterans.

In Texas, there are about 16,000 homeless veterans. In my city of Houston, Texas, we have about 2,500 homeless veterans. Per the National Alliance to End Homelessness, 467,000 veterans spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent; 1.5 million veterans have incomes below the poverty line; and 643,000 veterans have incomes below 50 percent of the poverty line. Mr. Speaker, America needs to pass Homes for the Heroes because our veterans need homes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 403 would establish a Special Assistant for Veteran Affairs within HUD. It would give this person the authority to coordinate services for homeless veterans. And this would be with the States, with local authorities, and with nonprofit organizations as well.

This bill establishes a \$200 million assistance program in HUD for veterans

for supportive housing and services for low-income veterans. It expands the very popular and very successful HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program, authorizing 20,000 vouchers annually when funded. It authorizes \$1 million in HUD grants to assist housing providers to help them provide the supportive services and the planning necessary to fulfill the needs of our veterans.

This bill would require HUD to submit an annual comprehensive report to Congress on homelessness among the veteran population. And this bill will do what is necessary as a great first step to ending homelessness among our veterans population. This bill is supported by 12 anti-homelessness and veterans organizations.

Mr. Speaker, if America is to continue to be the land of the free, America must provide homes for the brave.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. GREEN, for his passion and his devotion to this bill, Homes for Heroes Act, as he has been shepherding this now for several Congresses. I appreciate his support, and I want to lend my support as well.

As we know, the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have placed new pressures on veterans services and housing. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that it has served approximately 916 returning veterans in its homeless programs and has identified over 2,900 more as being at risk of homelessness. The Congressional Research Service, in its report entitled "Veterans and Homelessness," explains why both male and female veterans are overrepresented in the homeless population.

This country simply must do a better job of providing for our veterans. For this reason, I rise in strong support of H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009.

As my colleague explained, this legislation will help to expand the supply of housing for very low-income veterans and increase the number of vouchers for homeless veterans. It establishes a Special Assistant for Veteran Affairs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development to ensure veterans receive proper access to HUD's housing assistance programs, coordinate all HUD programs and activities pertaining to veterans, and would act as a liaison between HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In an effort to expand the supply of veterans housing, the bill authorizes appropriations for housing assistance for very low-income and homeless veterans. A very low-income veteran family has an income not exceeding 50 percent of an area's median income. A \$200 million authorization would provide capital advances and planning grants to private nonprofits and consumer cooperatives for the construction and rehabilitation of permanent supportive

housing for very low-income veterans. The \$200 million authorization may also be used for project rental assistance.

□ 1245

The bill also authorizes appropriations necessary to provide 20,000 additional housing choice vouchers for homeless veterans for fiscal year 2009 and each year thereafter.

Other provisions in the bill include the exclusion of veterans benefits amounts from rental subsidy calculations for all federally funded housing programs and an authorization of \$1 million in technical assistance grants to nonprofits who provide veterans housing or provide assistance to veterans seeking housing.

All in all this bill, I believe, will help to address an area or an issue of homelessness in our veterans population, one that we must not allow to continue. H.R. 403 is similar to H.R. 3329, which passed the House in the 110th Congress by a vote of 412-9.

I urge my colleagues' support.

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

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

I thank the gentlelady for her generous comments and her appeal to colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 16 organizations that are supporting this piece of legislation.

JUNE 12, 2009.

Hon. AL GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: We are writing to express our overwhelming support for H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009, legislation that would provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans. We urge the House of Representatives to pass this bill on Tuesday, June 16, 2009.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) officials recently reported on any given night, 131,000 veterans are homeless. Veterans are at a greater risk of becoming homeless due to health problems (post traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse issues, mental health disorders), economic issues (extremely low or no livable income), and a shortage of affordable housing.

While most currently homeless veterans served during prior conflicts or in peacetime, the newest generation of combat veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom (OEF-OIF), both men and women, are returning home and suffering from war related conditions that may put them at risk for homelessness. A growing trend in homelessness among these new veterans points to a need to develop a coordinated approach to reduce and ultimately eliminate homelessness among all veterans.

Your bill, H.R. 403, the "Homes for Heroes Act of 2009," will provide shelter for homeless veteran families and help prevent low-income families from falling into homelessness. The undersigned organizations are pleased the following legislative actions are contained in this bill:

1. Establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within the Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

2. Establish permanent supportive housing and services for very low-income veterans and their families through a \$200 million assistance program.

3. Authorize HUD to provide housing assistance to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives to expand the supply of permanent affordable housing.

4. Require HUD to coordinate with the VA to provide supportive services tailored to the needs of the very low-income veteran families occupying supportive housing.

5. Expand the highly successful HUD-VA Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Program, authorizing 20,000 vouchers annually and making the program permanent.

6. Place additional priority on veterans and require all local public housing agencies to develop plans to address the needs of homeless veterans.

7. Authorize \$1 million in HUD grants to assist housing and service providers to execute their housing projects for very low-income veteran families.

8. Require HUD to submit a comprehensive annual report to Congress on the housing needs of homeless veterans.

To meet the current and future needs of our Nation's most vulnerable veterans, we ask the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009. Supporting this historic veteran homelessness prevention initiative will be a giant step forward towards ending veteran homelessness in America.

Corporation for Supportive Housing
Goodwill Industries International
Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Military Officers Association of America
National Alliance to End Homelessness
National Association for Black Veterans
National Coalition for Homeless Veterans
National Coalition for the Homeless
National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty

National Leased Housing Association
National Low Income Housing Coalition
National Policy and Advocacy Council on Homelessness
Vietnam Veterans of America
American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging
Services For the Aging
National Association of Affordable Housing Lenders
National Equity Fund

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield 2 minutes to Ms. BROWN-Waite from Florida, an advocate for veterans all across the board and certainly housing for our veterans.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 403, the Homes For Heroes Act of 2009.

For our Nation's veterans, the fight does not end when they return from battle. Readjusting to civilian life and coping with the physical and psychological effects of war can be a daunting task. Current reports estimate that about 154,000 veterans are homeless on any given night. This statistic is a tragedy. However, Congress is now taking a step in the right direction.

The Homes For Heroes Act creates a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within HUD, provides at least 20,000 low-income veterans with rental vouchers, and aids veterans in applying

for and obtaining assistance. Additionally, I'm proud that this bill includes help for veterans with mental health disorders and assists low-income veterans and their families with personal and financial planning, obtaining veterans benefits, and vocational training.

As a former member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I am aware of the many unique issues that our veterans face. The Homes For Heroes Act will supply our veterans with the tools that they need to reintegrate into society, and I thank Representative Green for introducing this bill.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues to support this piece of legislation and to please consider the fact that our veterans have been there for us; this is an opportunity for us to be there for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 403, which will increase support for our veterans by providing them with housing benefits. I thank my colleague Representative AL GREEN for introducing this important legislation, as well as the many cosponsors for their support. I thank Arthur D. Sidney for his assistance on this matter.

I stand in support of this legislation because it assists those men and women who have sacrificed so much for this country. This bill will establish a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In doing so, the office will ensure that veterans and their families that are most in need will receive housing benefits and get them off the streets. The office will build upon the existing infrastructure already in place among public and private institutions by granting housing vouchers, providing public housing, and coordinating efforts across HUD programs and activities.

Nearly a quarter of the homeless population in the United States is comprised of veterans and their families. The National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and clients found that 18% of homeless male veterans participating in homeless assistance programs reported that their latest episode of homelessness lasted 3 months or less, compared to 28% of their male nonveteran counterparts. This disproportionate burden on the men and women that have served in the Armed Forces is a grave injustice. We must continue working to increase support for our veterans in recognition of their ultimate sacrifice—risking their lives to serve this great country. Please join me in supporting our veterans by voting for this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 403, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2009. I am proud to be a cosponsor and would like to recognize the leadership of Representative AL GREEN who introduced this very important bill last Congress, which passed the House Floor. This bill upholds the principle that those who served our Nation honorably should not have to live on the streets or in shelters.

According to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, approximately 150,000 to 200,000 American veterans are living on the

streets or in shelters. And nearly 300,000 veterans may experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year.

The Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, which I chair, held a hearing on this bill during the 110th Congress and heard from witnesses how the return of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan would greatly increase demand for affordable housing and social services in communities across the country.

Since then, the economy has only worsened and the number of veterans returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan continues to increase. Furthermore, many veterans are at greater risk of becoming homeless because they struggle with health and economic issues, while facing a shortage of affordable housing.

That is why H.R. 403 is so important. This bill would create a new program where none existed before to develop permanent supportive housing for the homeless veterans who need it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 403.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 614) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots ("WASP").

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 614

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Women Airforce Service Pilots of WWII, known as the "WASP", were the first women in history to fly American military aircraft;

(2) more than 60 years ago, they flew fighter, bomber, transport, and training aircraft in defense of America's freedom;

(3) they faced overwhelming cultural and gender bias against women in nontraditional roles and overcame multiple injustices and inequities in order to serve their country;

(4) through their actions, the WASP eventually were the catalyst for revolutionary

reform in the integration of women pilots into the Armed Services;

(5) during the early months of World War II, there was a severe shortage of combat pilots;

(6) Jacqueline Cochran, America's leading woman pilot of the time, convinced General Hap Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, that women, if given the same training as men, would be equally capable of flying military aircraft and could then take over some of the stateside military flying jobs, thereby releasing hundreds of male pilots for combat duty;

(7) the severe loss of male combat pilots made the necessity of utilizing women pilots to help in the war effort clear to General Arnold, and a women's pilot training program was soon approved;

(8) it was not until August 1943, that the women aviators would receive their official name;

(9) General Arnold ordered that all women pilots flying military aircraft, including 28 civilian women ferry pilots, would be named "WASP", Women Airforce Service Pilots;

(10) more than 25,000 American women applied for training, but only 1,830 were accepted and took the oath;

(11) exactly 1,074 of those trainees successfully completed the 21 to 27 weeks of Army Air Forces flight training, graduated, and received their Army Air Forces orders to report to their assigned air base;

(12) on November 16, 1942, the first class of 29 women pilots reported to the Houston, Texas Municipal Airport and began the same military flight training as the male Army Air Forces cadets were taking;

(13) due to a lack of adequate facilities at the airport, 3 months later the training program was moved to Avenger Field in Sweetwater, Texas;

(14) WASP were eventually stationed at 120 Army air bases all across America;

(15) they flew more than 60,000,000 miles for their country in every type of aircraft and on every type of assignment flown by the male Army Air Forces pilots, except combat;

(16) WASP assignments included test piloting, instructor piloting, towing targets for air-to-air gunnery practice, ground-to-air anti-aircraft practice, ferrying, transporting personnel and cargo (including parts for the atomic bomb), simulated strafing, smoke laying, night tracking, and flying drones;

(17) in October 1943, male pilots were refusing to fly the B-26 Martin Marauder (known as the "Widowmaker") because of its fatality records, and General Arnold ordered WASP Director, Jacqueline Cochran, to select 25 WASP to be trained to fly the B-26 to prove to the male pilots that it was safe to fly;

(18) during the existence of the WASP—

(A) 38 women lost their lives while serving their country;

(B) their bodies were sent home in poorly crafted pine boxes;

(C) their burial was at the expense of their families or classmates;

(D) there were no gold stars allowed in their parents' windows; and

(E) because they were not considered military, no American flags were allowed on their coffins;

(19) in 1944, General Arnold made a personal request to Congress to militarize the WASP, and it was denied;

(20) on December 7, 1944, in a speech to the last graduating class of WASP, General Arnold said, "You and more than 900 of your sisters have shown you can fly wingtip to wingtip with your brothers. I salute you . . . We of the Army Air Force are proud of you. We will never forget our debt to you.";

(21) with victory in WWII almost certain, on December 20, 1944, the WASP were quietly and unceremoniously disbanded;

(22) there were no honors, no benefits, and very few "thank you's";

(23) just as they had paid their own way to enter training, they had to pay their own way back home after their honorable service to the military;

(24) the WASP military records were immediately sealed, stamped "classified" or "secret", and filed away in Government archives, unavailable to the historians who wrote the history of WWII or the scholars who compiled the history text books used today, with many of the records not declassified until the 1980s;

(25) consequently, the WASP story is a missing chapter in the history of the Air Force, the history of aviation, and the history of the United States of America;

(26) in 1977, 33 years after the WASP were disbanded, the Congress finally voted to give the WASP the veteran status they had earned, but these heroic pilots were not invited to the signing ceremony at the White House, and it was not until 7 years later that their medals were delivered in the mail in plain brown envelopes;

(27) in the late 1970s, more than 30 years after the WASP flew in World War II, women were finally permitted to attend military pilot training in the United States Armed Forces;

(28) thousands of women aviators flying support aircraft have benefitted from the service of the WASP and followed in their footsteps;

(29) in 1993, the WASP were once again referenced during congressional hearings regarding the contributions that women could make to the military, which eventually led to women being able to fly military fighter, bomber, and attack aircraft in combat;

(30) hundreds of United States service-women combat pilots have seized the opportunity to fly fighter aircraft in recent conflicts, all thanks to the pioneering steps taken by the WASP;

(31) the WASP have maintained a tight-knit community, forged by the common experiences of serving their country during war;

(32) as part of their desire to educate America on the WASP history, WASP have assisted "Wings Across America", an organization dedicated to educating the American public, with much effort aimed at children, about the remarkable accomplishments of these WWII veterans; and

(33) the WASP have been honored with exhibits at numerous museums, to include—

(A) the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC;

(B) the Women in Military Service to America Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia;

(C) the National Museum of the United States Air Force, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio;

(D) the National WASP WWII Museum, Sweetwater, Texas;

(E) the 8th Air Force Museum, Savannah, Georgia;

(F) the Lone Star Flight Museum, Galveston, Texas;

(G) the American Airpower Museum, Farmingdale, New York;

(H) the Pima Air Museum, Tucson, Arizona;

(I) the Seattle Museum of Flight, Seattle, Washington;

(J) the March Air Museum, March Reserve Air Base, California; and

(K) the Texas State History Museum, Austin, Texas.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of

the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of the Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design in honor of the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) collectively, in recognition of their pioneering military service and exemplary record, which forged revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Smithsonian Institution shall make the gold medal received under this Act available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations associated with the WASP.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dyes, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, an amount not to exceed \$30,000 to pay for the cost of the medal authorized under section 2.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge and compliment the Member from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and commend her on what she has done to get this piece of legislation to the floor. She has worked with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, who has had this piece of legislation pass the Senate. She had 75 cosponsors; hence, the legislation is now before us in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a compendium of knowledge, if you will, styled "The Greatest Stories Never Told." Perhaps therein would be the story of the Buffalo Soldiers, a story rarely told of how they had to fight their way into the military so they could fight for their country. Perhaps contained therein there would be the story of the Filipino soldiers who died in the struggle at the Bataan March.

Such a collection would not be complete, however, without the story of the WASP. These are the first women to fly military aircraft. They are the women in the Air Force, the Women Airforce Service Pilots known as the WASP. It's a story of gender bias, Mr. Speaker, the notion that flying is a man's work. It's a story of culture bias, the belief that a woman's place is in the home. It's a story of injustice, the notion that women could apply but never qualify. It's a story of inequalities and inequities, the notion that women could have rank but not always have their rank respected. Mr. Speaker, it's a story of never say never, a story of persistence pays off, a story of success because of some, and a story of success in spite of others.

It's a story of how a famous pilot, Jacqueline "Jackie" Cochran, became the first commander of the WFO in 1942. That's the Women's Flying Training Detachment. It's a story of how a test pilot, Nancy Love, became the commander of the WAF, the Women's Auxiliary Flying Ferrying Squadron in 1942. It's a story of how the WFO and the WAF merged in 1943 to become the WASP.

The WASP would go on and fly 60 million miles. They would fly every type of aircraft. They would be stationed at 120 bases across the country. And on December 20, 1944, when victory was at hand, the WASP were quietly and unceremoniously disbanded. Thirty-eight lost their lives in the course of serving their country; however, families and friends had to pay for their burial expenses. Survivors had to pay their way back home because they were not considered a part of the military in an official capacity. Many of their records were sealed and unavailable to historians until the 1980s. They didn't get veteran status until 1977, and this was done without a White House ceremony, and it was done without the kind of fanfare that we would expect them to receive in this day and time.

The story, Mr. Speaker, is one of few being honored, and their honors being accorded them too late, and not enough thank yous having been accorded them at all. The story of the WASP is one that is, in my opinion, the greatest story never told and one which we should acknowledge with this bill when it is passed today.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the House sponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support

of Senate bill 614, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots of World War II, WASP. And here is a picture, Mr. Speaker, of the WASP, one of the many pictures, but as the previous speaker pointed out, not enough recognition was paid to them.

Special thanks for this bill go to Financial Service Chairman BARNEY FRANK and Ranking Member SPENCER BACHUS and their staff as well for their assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

I would also like to thank my staff, Mr. Speaker, particularly Captain Deanna Nieves, right behind me, United States Marine Corps, who's serving as a defense fellow in my office for the remainder of the year. Her efforts were instrumental in achieving the required number of cosponsors for this bill in record time. And Sarah Gamino, sitting next to her, worked so hard on all of our office projects. Thanks to all of the great staff work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, the bill before us today honors a special sisterhood of women, most of them in their 80s, who share a unique place in American history. These women have been mothers and grandmothers, teachers and office workers, nurses, business owners, photographers, and dancers. One was even a nun. But before that they were pilots for the United States Army Corps during World War II. They are heroines.

Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASP, were the first women in history to fly America's military aircraft. Between the years of 1942 and 1944, these courageous women volunteered to fly noncombat missions so that every available male pilot could be deployed into combat. More than 25,000 women applied for the program, but only 1,830 qualified women pilots were accepted. Unlike their male counterparts, women applicants were required to be qualified pilots before they could even apply for the Army Air Force military flight training program. Altogether, 1,102 women earned their wings and went on to fly over 60 million miles for the Army Air Forces, equal to some 2,500 times around the globe. Their performance was equal in every way to that of male pilots. With the exception of direct combat missions, the WASP flew the same aircraft and the same missions as male pilots.

Women pilots were used to tow targets for male pilots who were using live ammunition, for searchlight missions, chemical missions, engineering test flying, and countless other exercises.

In 1944 the WASP were disbanded, their service records sealed and classified. By the time the war ended, Mr. Speaker, 38 women pilots had lost their lives while flying for our country. Their families were not allowed to have an American flag placed on their coffins. And although they took the military oath and were promised military status, the WASP never were recognized as military personnel nor were

they ever recognized as veterans at the war's end.

In 1977, more than 30 years after the WASP had served, another woman pioneer, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, introduced legislation to grant the WASP veterans status. Speaking of the day when women would be fully integrated into the military, WASP Byrd Howell Granger noted: "If the Nation ever again needs them, American women will respond. Never again will they have to prove they can do any flying job the military has. Not as an experiment. Not to fill in for men. They will fly as commissioned officers in the future Air Force of the United States with equal pay, hospitalization, insurance, veterans' benefits. The WASP have earned it for these women of the future."

And the WASP were indeed and continue to be true pioneers whose example paved the way for the Armed Forces to lift the ban on women attending military flight training in the 1970s. Today women in the military fly every type of aircraft, from the F-15 to the space shuttle.

My daughter-in-law, Lindsay Nelson, a Marine Corps pilot, is part of the lasting legacy of WASP. Lindsay, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, served two combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, where she flew the F/A-18 fighter jet. I'm so proud of Lindsay and of all our servicewomen, past and present, who continue to inspire young women to achieve the unfathomable.

By definition, the Congressional Gold Medal is the highest expression of Congress of national appreciation for the most heroic, courageous, and outstanding individuals.

□ 1300

Given the overwhelming support for this legislation, as evidenced by the bipartisan support of 334 cosponsors in the House companion legislation, I am confident that Members of this Chamber deem the WASP as deserving of this honor. Of the 1,102 WASP, more than 300 are still alive today and are residing in almost every State of our country. Join me in paying homage to these trailblazers and these patriots who served our country without question and with no expectation of recognition or praise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this bill, to award the WASP the Congressional Gold Medal, and request its prompt signing into law.

For history's sake, I will submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the 1,102 WASP.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank the gentlelady for the outstanding work that she has done on this piece of legislation. She has worked tirelessly to bring it to the floor; and I compliment the gentlelady,

along with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for the outstanding job that she has done as well. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) whose district covers Sweetwater, Texas, which is home to the WASP. This is where they trained, and that is where their museum is.

Mr. CONAWAY. It is my great pleasure today to recognize the invaluable service rendered to our country by the Women's Air Force Service Pilots during World War II. Their history is one of many surprising and impressive stories that helped define a generation.

In the early 1940s, as it became apparent that the United States could not avoid the war that was plaguing Europe and the Far East, many accomplished pilots volunteered their services to our country. They were thanked for their offer, but were refused because they were women. Their argument, that female pilots could free up male pilots to serve in combat roles, was initially dismissed by the Army Air Force's leadership. Yet two of our Nation's most famous female pilots, Jacqueline Cochran and Nancy Harken Love, persevered and continued to lobby for the ability to use their exceptional skills in service of our country.

As the Nation mobilized, it became clear there were simply not enough male pilots in the country to fight the war and man the home front. As the iconic Rosie the Riveter began to build her tanks and her planes, the Army set up two squadrons of women pilots to assist in the war effort. In 1942 Ms. Love became the commanding officer of Women's Auxiliary Ferry Squadron in New Castle, Delaware, which ferried planes around the country from factories to air bases. Not long after that, Ms. Cochran became commanding officer of 319th Women's Flying Training Detachment in Houston, Texas, which provided basic flight instruction for the Army Air Forces. On August 5, 1943, these squadrons were combined to form the Women's Air Force Service Pilots. Over 25,000 women applied to become pilots, and only some 1,900 were selected for training. Of these, almost 1,100 eventually earned their wings, many at Avenger Field in the town of Sweetwater, Texas. That is in the district that I get to represent.

The women who volunteered to fly planes faced a world that we can scarcely imagine. While complaints of sexism in the workplace still exist today, in the 1940s, sexism was not the exception but the standard operating practice. The women of the WASP were paid less, were trained with inferior equipment, refused the status of officers, and faced an openly hostile work environment. They also had to buy their own uniforms and pay for their room and board each month at their training facilities. Yet through all of

that, the WASP pilots were stationed at over 120 air bases across the United States, flying every type of aircraft and performing almost every duty of pilots in the Army Air Forces. They logged 60 million miles, ferrying planes, transporting cargo and personnel, towing targets, instructing new cadets, and acting as test pilots.

Of the almost 1,100 women who flew as the WASP, 38 gave their lives. In what remains a blot on our country, these women were returned home not with military honors but at the expense of their families because, although they flew military planes at the direction of military commanders, they were not considered to be members of the Army.

In October 1944, the program ended abruptly, and many of the records surrounding the program were filed away and classified in government archives. It was not until the Air Force announced that it would train the military's "first" female pilots in the 1970s that a renewed interest in the WASP allowed them to be granted veteran status and the campaign ribbons which they earned through their service.

While it might be tempting to see today's Congressional Gold Medal as a way to right the injuries done to the women of WASP, to do so would be to neglect the true significance of their contributions to winning a war and advancing women's equality. The legacy of the WASP is unmistakable. At a time when women were routinely assumed to be less capable than men, these individuals stood up and asked for the right to prove themselves. These women did not just answer the call of their country, they called themselves to service. And in doing so, forever upended the notion of what women could and should do in our Armed Forces.

I would like to commend the leadership and the board of the National WASP World War II Museum in Sweetwater, Texas, for preserving the unique history of these women and preparing educational materials to share their story with countless students throughout the country.

I would recommend to the leadership, the Speaker and to my colleagues to swing by Sweetwater, Texas—it's on I-20, an easy drive from Fort Worth or El Paso, 300 miles in either direction—to see this museum and get a flavor for what these women endured during training. It was a very austere training base in a pretty rough part of Texas, and you would be impressed with what they did and what they accomplished.

Additionally, I would like to thank Air Force Major Nicole Malachowski who worked tirelessly to secure this tribute for the service of these women. Major Malachowski was a Thunderbird pilot.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to grant an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. The Thunderbirds, of course, are the elite performance team for the Air Force; and Nicole was a member of that team in the early nineties. As a female test pilot, no one understands WASP's legacy better than her. As she explained in her letter to me, "I am convinced that every opportunity I've been afforded, from flying combat patrols over Iraq to representing the military as a fellow, is because of these pioneering WASP. Countless servicemen during World War II, and every airman since, have reaped the benefits of their courage, determination, and sacrifice."

It is with great enthusiasm that I ask my colleagues for their support on Senate bill 614 and that we recognize the contribution of these women for their service with our highest congressional award.

I thank you for the time.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume for a very brief closing.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the WASP is, without question, among the stories that are rarely, if ever, told. In fact, I have contended and continue to contend it's among the greatest stories never told. But for this reason, we should accord this Congressional Gold Medal. I beg all of my friends to support it if a vote is called for. I shall not call for one.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 614.

This legislation awards a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) in honor of their dedicated service during World War II.

I am a cosponsor of the House version of this bill (H.R. 2014), which recognizes the first women in the history of our country to fly American military aircraft. The Women Airforce Service Pilots volunteered to fly over 60 million miles in every type of aircraft available to them, participating in all missions other than direct combat missions. They towed targets for air-to-air and ground-to-air gunnery practice, ferried planes, transported cargo and personnel, instructed, flew weather missions, and test flew repaired aircraft. They even flew aircraft that male pilots refused to fly.

In spite of their service, the Women Airforce Service Pilots were not given active duty military status and never received any kind of commissioning, rank, or military benefits. In November 1977, Congress narrowly approved legislation to give the WASP the veteran status that they had earned, but they were not invited to the bill signing and received their medals in the mail.

Today we recognize the 1,102 women who trained to serve as Women Airforce Service Pilots, 300 of whom are still living today, including three from my home State of Hawaii: Betty Joiner, Elaine Jones, and Mildred Marshall.

As a result of the heroism exemplified by the Women Airforce Service Pilots, the U.S. Armed Forces lifted the ban on women attending military flight training in the 1970s, and women now fly on every type of aircraft imag-

inable, from combat fighter aircraft to space shuttles. This legislation at long last commemorates their service to our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S. 614, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots, and to honor all the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASP, especially three who live in Lancaster, California in my district. Flora Belle Reece, Irma "Babe" Story, and Marguerite "Ty" Killen are perfect examples of why this intrepid group of women deserve the honor they are receiving today.

I was privileged to join the Mojave Chamber of Commerce in honoring these three women at a special May 11th luncheon. It was a pleasure to recognize these three amazing pilots who dedicated themselves to a dangerous mission when their country needed them.

Flora Belle Reece learned to fly before she could drive so she could join the WASP. Reece primarily flew the AT-6, but also the PT-19, PT-17, BT-13, and B-26, and she often tested aircraft that had been repaired. She was assigned to Foster Field, Texas, and there she discovered an affinity for the P-38 Lightning, often visiting with the aircraft's crew chief; she was able to fly in one in 2004 during a commemorative flight.

Irma "Babe" Story grew up in the Antelope Valley with her brother, Tom, hanging out at the local airport running errands, and eventually learning to fly at Antelope Valley College. Story received her pilot's license at the age of 19 in June 1941, and worked at Lockheed's Vega aircraft factory in Burbank until joining the WASP program in 1943. She flew the AT-6 and Cessna UC-78, and later the B-26.

Marguerite "Ty" Killen learned to fly as a 15-year-old in high school and received her commercial and flight instructor ratings when she was 19. Killen was a student at the University of Arizona when she found out that the WASP age requirement was dropped to 19, and so she signed up for WASP training and graduated in August 1944. She flew a variety of aircraft, including the Stearman PT-17, AT-6 advanced trainer, Beechcraft AT-11, the Vultee BT-13, and was a copilot in a B-24.

These women, and all those who stepped up to serve when their country needed them, are deserving of our thanks and admiration. I am pleased to support this legislation to recognize their efforts with a Congressional Gold Medal.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 614, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots of World War II.

As an original cosponsor of a similar measure in the House, I would like to give special recognition to Betty Cozzens, one of my constituents from Cody—and one of the 300 remaining Women Airforce Service Pilots.

We all owe these heroic women a debt of gratitude. In the 16 months that the Women Airforce Service Pilots existed, over 1,000 of them served their country with pride.

The Congressional Gold Medal is one of the most distinguished forms of recognition that Congress can bestow. It is an expression of public gratitude on behalf of the nation—to these women, for their service in a time of need.

The Women Airforce Service Pilots forged reform in the U.S. Armed Forces in regard to

women in service, flying on every type of assignment flown by the male Army Air Forces pilots, except combat. I would like to express my gratitude to Betty and her fellow pilots for their trailblazing service, being the first women in history to fly American military aircraft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 614.

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.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 366) recognizing the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI) and expressing support for designation of 2010 through 2020 as the "Decade of Vision".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 366

Whereas vision impairment and eye disease is a major public health problem, especially due to the aging of the population, a disproportionate incidence of eye disease in minority populations, and vision loss as a result of diabetes and other chronic diseases, which costs the Nation \$68,000,000,000 annually in health care costs, lost productivity, reduced independence, diminished quality of life, increased depression, and accelerated mortality;

Whereas 38,000,000 people in the United States age 40-plus currently experience blindness, low-vision, or an age-related eye disease, and this number is expected to grow to 50,000,000 by 2020, a year mid-way in the tidal wave of 78,000,000 baby boomers who will begin turning age 65 in 2010, and many of whom will continue working well beyond age 65;

Whereas, in public opinion polls over the past 40 years, people in the United States have consistently identified fear of vision loss as second only to fear of cancer and, as recently as a 2008 NEI study, 71 percent of respondents indicated that a loss of their eyesight would have the greatest impact on their life;

Whereas, with wisdom and foresight, Congress passed the National Eye Institute (NEI) Act (Public Law 90-489), which was signed into law by President Johnson on August 16, 1968, with the NEI holding the first meeting of its National Advisory Eye Council (NAEC) on April 3, 1969;

Whereas the NEI leads the Nation's Federal commitment to basic and clinical research, research training, and other programs with respect to blinding eye diseases, visual disorders, mechanisms of visual function, preservation of sight and the special health problems and needs of individuals who are visually-impaired or blind, and to disseminate information aimed at the prevention of blindness, specifically with public and professional education facilitated through its National Eye Health Education Program (NEHEP);

Whereas the NEI maximizes Federal funding by devoting 85 percent of its budget to

extramural research that addresses the breadth of eye and vision disorders, including “back of the eye” retinal and optic nerve disease, such as age-related macular degeneration (AMD), glaucoma, and diabetic retinopathy, and concomitant low vision, and “front of the eye” disease, including corneal, lens, cataract, and refractive errors;

Whereas the NEI research benefits children, including premature infants born with retinopathy and school children with amblyopia (“lazy eye”);

Whereas the NEI benefits older citizens in the United States by predicting, preventing, and preempting aging eye disease, thereby enabling more productive lives and reducing Medicare costs;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in basic research, working with the NIH’s Human Genome Project to translate discoveries of genes related to eye disease and vision impairment, which comprises one quarter of genes discovered to date, into diagnostic and treatment modalities;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in clinical research, funding more than 60 clinical trials, including a series of Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Trials Networks, in association with the National Institute for Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disorders (NIDDK), which have developed treatment strategies that have been determined by the NEI to be 90 percent effective and save an estimated \$1,600,000,000 per year in blindness and vision impairment disability costs;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in prevention research, having reported from the first phase of its Age-Related Eye Disease Study (AREDS) that high levels of dietary zinc and anti-oxidant vitamins reduced vision loss in individuals at high risk for developing advanced AMD by a magnitude of 25 percent, and in its second phase, is now studying the impact of other nutritional supplements;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in epidemiologic research, identifying the basis and progression of eye disease and its disproportionate incidence in minority populations such that informed public health policy decisions can be made regarding prevention, early diagnosis, and treatment;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative, trans-NIH Institute research, working with the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) on factors that promote or inhibit new blood vessel growth that has resulted in the first generation of Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved ophthalmic drugs to inhibit abnormal blood vessel growth in the “wet” form of AMD, thereby stabilizing and often restoring vision;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with other Federal entities, such that its bioengineering research partnership with the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy has resulted in a retinal chip implant, referred to as the “Bionic Eye”, that has enabled individuals who have been blind for decades to perceive visual images;

Whereas the NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with private funding entities, such that its human gene therapy trial with the Foundation Fighting Blindness for individuals with Leber Congenital Amaurosis (LCA), a rapid retinal degeneration that blinds infants in their first year of life, has demonstrated measurable vision improvement even within the initial safety trials;

Whereas in the decade 2010 through 2020, the Nation will face unprecedented public health challenges associated with aging, health disparities, and chronic disease; and

Whereas Federal support at the NEI and related Department of Health and Human Services agencies is essential for the prevention and early detection, access to treatment and rehabilitation, and research associated with vision impairment and eye disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI), commends it for its leadership, and supports its mission to prevent blindness and to save and restore vision;

(2) supports the designation of the “Decade of Vision” to maintain a sustained awareness in the next decade of the unprecedented public health challenges associated with vision impairment and eye disease and to emphasize the need for Federal support for prevention and early detection, access to treatment and rehabilitation, and research; and

(3) commends the National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research (NAEVR), which serves as the “Friends of the National Eye Institute”, for its efforts to expand awareness of the incidence and economic burden of eye disease through its Decade of Vision 2010–2020 Initiative.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This resolution recognizes the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health and designates the years 2010 through 2020 as the Decade of Vision.

Eye disease is a significant public health problem. Those disproportionately affected by eye disease are our aging population, the African American and Hispanic communities, and those who suffer from chronic diseases, especially diabetes. The National Eye Institute estimates that eye disease and vision impairment currently cost the Nation \$68 billion in health care costs, lost productivity, reduced independence, diminished quality of life, and accelerated mortality.

The NEI leads our Nation’s efforts to prevent blindness and to save and restore vision. The NEI has been a leader in both basic and translational research. Its researchers have been able to associate one-quarter of all genes discovered to date with eye disease and vision impairment. The NEI has conducted more than 60 clinical trials that have resulted in treatments and therapies to save sight and, in some cases, actually reverse vision loss.

The National Eye Institute estimates that over the decade of 2010 to 2020, the number of individuals over age 40 who

experience blindness, low vision or age-related eye disease, such as age-related macular degeneration, glaucoma, diabetic retinopathy and cataracts, will grow from today’s level of 38 million cases to 50 million cases. As a result, the National Eye Institute’s leadership, in directing vital vision research over the next decade, will be more important than ever.

I have been pleased to work on this resolution with my coauthor Mr. SESSIONS of Texas. He has been a terrific coauthor and has worked very hard with me to bring this matter to the floor and to the attention of this Congress. I commend this resolution to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman’s amendment. I want to thank TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin for not only working with me but also other members of my conference, the Republican Conference, on important issues related to eye and retinal health. I appreciate her recognizing today as the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute, H. Res. 366. Also I appreciate her dedication to people that are suffering with retinal and eye diseases; and these visions issues that we speak about today, as a result of our support and the support of the National Eye Institute, make a difference to thousands of people who have these eye diseases in their families.

I am very proud of this resolution. Last Congress we, meaning Ms. BALDWIN and I, joined together in support of National Glaucoma Day, and today we’re here to recognize the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute and to express support for the designation of 2010 through 2020 as the Decade of Vision.

The National Eye Institute, also known as NEI, was established by Congress in 1968 to protect and prolong the vision of the American people. NEI research leads to sight-saving treatments, reduces visual impairment and blindness, and improves the quality of life of people of all ages.

□ 1315

Vision research has been supported through the NEI by over 600 research grants and training awards made to scientists at more than 250 medical centers, hospitals, universities, and other institutions across the country and around the world. With congressional and public support, the national investment in vision research has yielded substantial dividends to treat many potentially blinding eye diseases and visual disorders.

Vision impairment and eye disease is a major public health problem for the world to face. As you have heard, vision-related costs here in the United States approach \$68 billion annually. There are some 38 million people in the United States over the age of 40 currently experiencing blindness, low vision, or age-related eye disease. This

number is estimated to increase to 50 million people by 2020.

NEI benefits children born with eye diseases and vision loss, as well as older citizens and everyone else that fits in between. NEI actively works to predict, prevent, and preempt aging eye disease and visual impairment thereby enabling more productive lives and reducing vision costs.

The National Eye Institute is the world leader in basic research with the National Institutes of Health's Human Genome Project to translate discoveries of genes related to eye disease and vision impairment which compromises one-quarter of genes, discovered to date, into diagnostic and treatment modalities.

The NEI has been a leader in collaborative research with so many private funding entities such as the human gene therapy trial with the Foundation Fighting Blindness, or this lead organization known as FFB, for individuals with Leber congenital amaurosis, a rapid retinal degeneration that blinds infants in their first year of life. This trial has demonstrated measurable visual improvement even with initial safety trials.

I am a big supporter of the Foundation Fighting Blindness, and the work that they have done in the past continues to carry out in our daily lives. This resolution recognizes the 40 years of service from the National Eye Institute and commends them for their leadership while supporting their mission to prevent blindness and save and restore vision.

Additionally, this resolution designates 2010 through 2020 as the "Decade of Vision" to maintain awareness in the next decade of public health challenges associated with vision impairment and eye disease, as well as to emphasize the need for prevention and early detection, access to treatment, and rehabilitation.

Lastly, we commend the National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research for its efforts to expand awareness of the incidence and economic burden of eye diseases through this Decade of Vision initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of supporting not only this 40th anniversary but also to say that the United States Congress has what I believe is a realistic opportunity to work with the National Institutes of Health to make sure that we continue to push the envelope for people who are in this country and around the world who are counting on research and development to cure blindness during this Decade of Vision. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her concentrated and special support of blindness issues. I look forward to working with her.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a champion of vision issues, Mr. GREEN of Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I would like to thank my colleague, who is a diligent and hardworking member of our Energy and Commerce Committee, for sponsoring H.R. 366, celebrating the Decade of Vision and the National Eye Alliance's 40th anniversary.

As co-Chair of the Congressional Vision Caucus with a particular interest in vision health, I strongly support the National Eye Institute, which serves as the lead NIH institute that manages our Nation's commitment to save and restore vision.

NEI research has contributed to the development of several critical therapies and interventions that are helping to slow the progression of vision impairment. In some cases, these therapies are helping to restore sight for individuals who may otherwise have lost their vision. Treatments for diabetic retinopathy that were developed by NEI researchers save our health care system more than \$1.6 billion annually. Other NEI-funded research is resulting in treatments and therapies that are slowing the progression of vision impairment; in some cases, vision loss is even restored.

Starting next year, the first wave of the 78 million baby boomers will begin turning 65 years old, an age of elevated risk for aging eye disease. Coupled with the disproportionate incidences of eye disease in the African American and Hispanic populations and the increased incidence of diabetic eye disease, the NEI will be challenged more than ever to fund basic and clinical research that results in treatment and therapies.

As demonstrated by its past history, I am confident that the NEI will rise to this challenge, and, of course, we in Congress must work to ensure that it is adequately funded so that it can continue its research that benefits the health—and vision health—of all Americans.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to close by recognizing just a few of the champions of eye health and the warriors against eye disease from the district that I have the privilege of representing. And I know, like my co-author, Congressman SESSIONS, we were drawn to this issue because of pioneering things that are happening in each of our respective districts.

Dr. Paul Kaufman is a leading eye researcher at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and a major partner of the National Eye Institute. And I want to commend and recognize his groundbreaking research.

Also, a technology called BrainPort is being developed in my district by a company called Wicab with the support of National Eye Institute funding, and this technology is helping the blind to find new ways to process visual information. These sort-of breakthroughs are so exciting and really go back to the importance of celebrating the accomplishments to date and the future potential through the National Eye Institute with our support.

Again, I commend my colleagues' support of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366.

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. BALDWIN. 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.

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.R. 2470, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 780, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 2247, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 403, de novo.

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

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ROY H. BOEHM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2470, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2470.

This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Adler (NJ)	Blackburn	Buyer
Akin	Blumenauer	Calvert
Altmire	Blunt	Camp
Andrews	Bocchieri	Campbell
Arcuri	Boehner	Cantor
Austria	Bono Mack	Cao
Baca	Boozman	Capito
Bachmann	Boren	Capps
Bachus	Boswell	Capuano
Baird	Boucher	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boustany	Carnahan
Barrett (SC)	Boyd	Carney
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Carter
Barton (TX)	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Bean	Bright	Castle
Becerra	Broun (GA)	Castor (FL)
Berman	Brown (SC)	Chaffetz
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Chandler
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Childers
Bilbray	Ginny	Clarke
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Clay

Cleaver	Hoekstra	Mollohan	Snyder	Thornberry	Wasserman	Davis (IL)	Kagen	Olson
Clyburn	Holden	Moore (KS)	Souder	Tiahrt	Schultz	Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Oliver
Coble	Holt	Moore (WI)	Space	Tiberi	Watson	Davis (TN)	Kaptur	Ortiz
Coffman (CO)	Honda	Moran (KS)	Speier	Tierney	Watt	Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pallone
Cohen	Hunter	Moran (VA)	Spratt	Titus	Waxman	DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascarell
Cole	Inglis	Murphy (CT)	Stark	Tonko	Weiner	DeGette	Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)
Conaway	Inslee	Murphy (NY)	Stearns	Towns	Welch	Delahunt	Kind	Paul
Conyers	Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak	Tsongas	Westmoreland	DeLauro	King (IA)	Paulsen
Cooper	Issa	Murphy, Tim	Sutton	Turner	Wexler	Dent	King (NY)	Payne
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Tanner	Upton	Whitfield	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Pence
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Myrick	Tauscher	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Perlmutter
Crenshaw	(TX)	Nadler (NY)	Taylor	Velázquez	Wittman	Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello
Crowley	Jenkins	Napolitano	Teague	Visclosky	Wolf	Dingell	Kissell	Peters
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Terry	Walden	Woolsey	Doggett	Klein (FL)	Peterson
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)	Walz	Wu	Donnelly (IN)	Kline (MN)	Petri
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Yarmuth	Doyle	Kosmas	Pingree (ME)
Dahlkemper	Johnson, Sam	Nye	Thompson (PA)	Wamp	Young (AK)	Dreier	Kratovil	Pitts
Davis (AL)	Jones	Oberstar				Driehaus	Kucinich	Platts
Davis (CA)	Jordan (OH)	Obey				Duncan	Lamborn	Poe (TX)
Davis (IL)	Kagen	Olson	Alexander	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda	Edwards (MD)	Lance	Polis (CO)
Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Oliver	Berkley	Larson (CT)	T.	Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Kaptur	Ortiz	Bonner	Lewis (GA)	Sullivan	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Posey
Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pallone	Connolly (VA)	Lummis	Waters	Ellison	Latham	Price (GA)
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascarell	Costello	Putnam	Wilson (OH)	Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)	Hoyer		Young (FL)	Emerson	Latta	Putnam
Delahunt	Kind	Paul				Engel	Lee (CA)	Quigley
DeLauro	King (IA)	Paulsen				Eshoo	Lee (NY)	Radanovich
Dent	King (NY)	Payne				Etheridge	Levin	Rahall
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Pence	Mr. FOSTER changed his vote from			Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Perlmutter	“nay” to “yea.”			Farr	Linder	Rehberg
Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello	So (two-thirds being in the affirma-			Fattah	Lipinski	Reichert
Dingell	Kissell	Peters	tive) the rules were suspended and the			Filner	LoBiondo	Reyes
Doggett	Klein (FL)	Peterson	bill was passed.			Flake	Loeb sack	Richardson
Donnelly (IN)	Kline (MN)	Petri	The result of the vote was announced			Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Rodriguez
Doyle	Kosmas	Pingree (ME)	as above recorded.			Forbes	Lowey	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Kratovil	Pitts	A motion to reconsider was laid on			Fortenberry	Lucas	Rogers (AL)
Driehaus	Kucinich	Platts	the table.			Foster	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)
Duncan	Lamborn	Poe (TX)				Fox	Luján	Rohrabacher
Edwards (MD)	Lance	Polis (CO)				Frank (MA)	Lummis	Rooney
Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Pomeroy				Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Posey				Frelinghuysen	E.	Roskam
Ellison	Latham	Price (GA)	STUDENT INTERNET SAFETY ACT			Fudge	Lynch	Ross
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (NC)	OF 2009			Gallegly	Mack	Rothman (NJ)
Emerson	Latta	Quigley	The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-			Garrett (NJ)	Maffei	Royal-Allard
Engel	Lee (CA)	Radanovich	finished business is the vote on the mo-			Gerlach	Maloney	Royce
Eshoo	Lee (NY)	Rahall	tion to suspend the rules and pass the			Giffords	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Levin	Rangel	bill, H.R. 780, as amended, on which the			Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Rush
Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	yeas and nays were ordered.			Gohmert	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Linder	Reichert	The Clerk read the title of the bill.			Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)
Fattah	Lipinski	Reyes	The SPEAKER pro tempore. The			Goodlatte	Marshall	Salazar
Filner	LoBiondo	Richardson	question is on the motion offered by			Gordon (TN)	Massa	Sanchez, Loretta
Flake	Loeb sack	Rodriguez	the gentleman from the Northern Mar-			Granger	Matheson	Sarbanes
Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)	iana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the			Graves	Matsui	Scalise
Forbes	Lowey	Rogers (AL)	House suspend the rules and pass the			Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Fortenberry	Lucas	Rogers (KY)	bill, H.R. 780, as amended.			Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Schauer
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)	This will be a 5-minute vote.			Green, Gene	McCaul	Schiff
Fox	Luján	Rohrabacher	The vote was taken by electronic de-			Griffith	McClintock	Schmidt
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Rooney	vice, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0,			Grijalva	McCollum	Schock
Franks (AZ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen	not voting 17, as follows:			Guthrie	McCotter	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Roskam	[Roll No. 341]			Gutierrez	McDermott	Schwartz
Fudge	Mack	Ross	YEAS—416			Hall (NY)	McGovern	Scott (GA)
Gallegly	Maffei	Rothman (NJ)				Hall (TX)	McHenry	Scott (VA)
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Royal-Allard				Halvorson	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Gerlach	Manzullo	Royce				Hare	McIntyre	Serrano
Giffords	Marchant	Ruppersberger				Harman	McKeon	Sessions
Gingrey (GA)	Markey (CO)	Rush				Harper	McMahon	Sestak
Gohmert	Markey (MA)	Ryan (OH)				Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Shadegg
Gonzalez	Marshall	Ryan (WI)				Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Shea-Porter
Goodlatte	Massa	Salazar				Heinrich	Rodgers	Sherman
Gordon (TN)	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta				Heller	McNerney	Sherman
Granger	Matsui	Sarbanes				Heller	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Graves	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise				Hensarling	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky				Herger	Melancon	Shuster
Green, Al	McCaul	Schauer				Herseth Sandlin	Mica	Simpson
Green, Gene	McClintock	Schiff				Higgins	Michaud	Sires
Griffith	McCollum	Schmidt				Hill	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Grijalva	McCotter	Schock				Himes	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Guthrie	McDermott	Schrader				Hinchev	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Gutierrez	McGovern	Schwartz				Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hall (NY)	McHenry	Scott (GA)				Hirono	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Scott (VA)				Hodes	Minnick	Smith (WA)
Halvorson	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner				Hoekstra	Mitchell	Snyder
Hare	McKeon	Serrano				Holden	Mollohan	Souder
Harman	McMahon	Sessions				Holt	Moore (KS)	Space
Harper	McMorris	Sestak				Honda	Moore (WI)	Speier
Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Shadegg				Hunter	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Shea-Porter				Inglis	Moran (VA)	Stark
Heinrich	Meek (FL)	Sherman				Inslee	Murphy (CT)	Stearns
Heller	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus				Israel	Murphy (NY)	Stupak
Hensarling	Melancon	Shuler				Issa	Murphy, Patrick	Sutton
Herger	Mica	Shuster				Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim	Tanner
Herseth Sandlin	Michaud	Simpson				Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Tauscher
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Sires				(TX)	Myrick	Taylor
Hill	Miller (MI)	Skelton				Jenkins	Nadler (NY)	Teague
Himes	Miller (NC)	Slaughter				Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Terry
Hinchev	Miller, Gary	Smith (NE)				Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (NJ)				Cummings	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)
Hirono	Minnick	Smith (TX)				Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hodes	Mitchell	Smith (WA)				Jones	Nye	Thornberry
						Jordan (OH)	Oberstar	Tiahrt

Tiberi	Walden	Wexler
Tierney	Walz	Whitfield
Titus	Wamp	Wilson (SC)
Tonko	Wasserman	Wittman
Towns	Schultz	Wolf
Tsongas	Watson	Woolsey
Turner	Watt	Wu
Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Welch	
Visclosky	Westmoreland	

NOT VOTING—17

Alexander	Hoyer	Sánchez, Linda
Baldwin	Kennedy	T.
Berkley	Larson (CT)	Sullivan
Bonner	Lewis (GA)	Waters
Connolly (VA)	Obey	Wilson (OH)
Costello	Roe (TN)	Young (FL)

□ 1355

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the safe use of the Internet by students, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from California, served from 1997 to 2002 as Ranking Democratic Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence;

Whereas Representative Pelosi currently serves as Speaker of the House, a position of considerable power and influence within the Congress;

Whereas title 3 of the United States Code designates the Speaker of the House as third in line of succession to the Presidency;

Whereas Speaker Pelosi has publicly challenged the truthfulness of what she and other congressional leaders were told by Central Intelligence Agency officials about the agency's use of enhanced interrogation techniques on suspected terrorists;

Whereas in an MSNBC interview on February 25, 2009, Speaker Pelosi stated, "I can say flat-out, they never told us that these enhanced interrogation techniques were being used";

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's public statements allege a sustained pattern of deception by government intelligence officers charged by law with informing Congress about the agency's activities;

Whereas when asked at a press conference on May 15, 2009 widely reported by the news media, "Madam Speaker, just to be clear, you're accusing the CIA of lying to you in September?" Speaker Pelosi stated, "Yes";

Whereas during the same press conference the Speaker subsequently stated, "So yes, I'm saying they are misleading, the CIA was misleading the Congress" and further, "they mislead us all the time" and "they misrepresented every step of the way";

Whereas in a memorandum to CIA employees released publicly on May 15, 2009, Leon Panetta, the CIA Director, stated, "It is not our policy or practice to mislead Congress. That is against our laws and our values. As the Agency indicated previously in response to Congressional inquiries, our contemporaneous records from September 2002 indicate that CIA officers briefed truthfully on the interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, describing the enhanced interrogation techniques that had been employed";

Whereas when asked in a press conference held June 4, 2009, "Madam Speaker, are you still receiving intelligence briefings?" Speaker Pelosi responded by saying, "Yes, I am; yes, I am.";

Whereas a June 5, 2009 article on Human Events.com entitled, "Pelosi Still Receives CIA Briefings, But Won't Say If They're Truthful" stated, "She refused to answer when asked whether or not she believes intelligence professionals are still lying to her.";

Whereas national and international media reports on this controversy have damaged the reputation of the House by raising questions about whether the effectiveness of congressional oversight may have been undermined through false or misleading statements by intelligence officials; and

Whereas in order to safeguard the reputation of the House it is imperative to reconcile as soon as possible the aforementioned contradictory statements by Speaker Pelosi and CIA Director Panetta: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) a Select Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall be established to review and verify the accuracy of the Speaker's aforementioned public statements;

(2) the Select Subcommittee shall be comprised of four members of the full committee, two appointed by the chairman of the committee and two by its ranking minority member;

(3) The subcommittee shall have the same powers to obtain testimony and documents pursuant to subpoena authorized under clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House; and,

(4) the Select Subcommittee report its findings and recommendations to the House not later than sixty calendar days after adoption of this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, that is the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates now as the time that the gentleman may offer his resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I therefore offer the resolution. I assume it has to be read, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, a Representative from California, served from 1997 to 2002 as Ranking Democratic Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence;

Whereas Representative Pelosi currently serves as Speaker of the House, a position of considerable power and influence within the Congress;

Whereas title 3 of the United States Code designates the Speaker of the House as third in line of succession to the Presidency;

Whereas Speaker Pelosi has publicly challenged the truthfulness of what she and other congressional leaders were told by Cen-

tral Intelligence Agency officials about the agency's use of enhanced interrogation techniques on suspected terrorists;

Whereas in an MSNBC interview on February 25, 2009, Speaker Pelosi stated, "I can say flat-out, they never told us that these enhanced interrogation techniques were being used";

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's public statements allege a sustained pattern of deception by government intelligence officers charged by law with informing Congress about the agency's activities;

Whereas when asked at a press conference on May 15, 2009 widely reported by the news media, "Madame Speaker, just to be clear, you're accusing the CIA of lying to you in September?" Speaker Pelosi stated, "Yes";

Whereas during the same press conference the Speaker subsequently stated, "So yes, I'm saying they are misleading, the CIA was misleading the Congress" and further, "they mislead us all the time" and "they misrepresented every step of the way";

Whereas in a memorandum to CIA employees released publicly on May 15, 2009, Leon Panetta, the CIA Director, stated, "It is not our policy or practice to mislead Congress. That is against our laws and our values. As the Agency indicated previously in response to Congressional inquiries, our contemporaneous records from September 2002 indicate that CIA officers briefed truthfully on the interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, describing the enhanced interrogation techniques that had been employed";

Whereas when asked in a press conference held June 4, 2009, "Madame Speaker, are you still receiving intelligence briefings?" Speaker Pelosi responded by saying, "Yes, I am; yes, I am.";

Whereas a June 5, 2009 article on Human Events.com entitled, "Pelosi Still Receives CIA Briefings, But Won't Say If They're Truthful" stated, "She refused to answer when asked whether or not she believes intelligence professionals are still lying to her.";

Whereas national and international media reports on this controversy have damaged the reputation of the House by raising questions about whether the effectiveness of congressional oversight may have been undermined through false or misleading statements by intelligence officials; and

Whereas in order to safeguard the reputation of the House it is imperative to reconcile as soon as possible the aforementioned contradictory statements by Speaker Pelosi and CIA Director Panetta: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) a Select Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall be established to review and verify the accuracy of the Speaker's aforementioned public statements;

(2) the Select Subcommittee shall be comprised of four members of the full committee, two appointed by the chairman of the committee and two by its ranking minority member;

(3) The subcommittee shall have the same powers to obtain testimony and documents pursuant to subpoena authorized under clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House; and,

(4) the Select Subcommittee report its findings and recommendations to the House not later than sixty calendar days after adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This is very similar—it is not exactly the same, but it is similar to a resolution we presented a few weeks ago. It is presented again for one simple reason. The reason that this is before here is still that there is no cloture on this particular issue.

In “A Man for All Seasons,” Sir Thomas More may have used silence as his legal argument that silence denotes consent; but in a political setting as we are here, silence is not a solution. In an era in which perception is the same thing as reality, silence does not solve the problem, and indeed, harms are still there.

If an agency of government intentionally misleads Congress—and the CIA has denied they did that. If they intentionally mislead Congress or a Member, an important or a significant Member of Congress, it creates a problem for the integrity of the House as a whole.

If the data we are to receive is in question, then the solutions and the arguments we derive are equally in question, and that becomes an untenable decision. All of our decisions, therefore, become suspect. There is only one solution to this, and it is the same solution that we have said before:

If we don't want this issue to simply be subject to political maneuverings, establish a bipartisan committee—two Republicans, two Democrats. Make that committee a subset of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, so they understand the verbiage, so they understand the questions, so they don't have to have a lot of time to be brought up to speed.

If you have that kind of committee, their report will, by the very nature of the makeup of that committee, not be subject to political spin, and we may be able to move on. That's the important part. It is the integrity of the House that is in question here, and that needs to be answered so decisions of this House will be considered without any other kind of question or implication.

Now, as we are starting the appropriations process, it becomes an ideal time in which any kind of solution we may wish to impose on this particular situation should be before the House and should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I do this as a former speaker in Utah where several times you had to stand up to defend the integrity of the institution. This is about the integrity of the institution, to make sure we were not intentionally misled by an agency of government.

I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The resolution proposes to direct a select subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence “to review and verify the accuracy of” certain public statements of the Speaker concerning communications to the Congress from an element of the executive branch.

Such a review necessarily would include an evaluation not only of the statements of the Speaker but also of the executive communications to which those statements related. Thus, the review necessarily would involve an evaluation of the oversight regime that formed the context for those communications as well. In reviewing and verifying the accuracy of “the aforementioned public statements,” the select subcommittee would be assessing not only the probity of the Speaker's actions but also the probity of the actions of executive branch officials.

On these premises, the Chair finds that the instant resolution is not materially different from House Resolution 470, which was held on May 21, 2009, not to present a question of privilege. The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged under rule IX. Instead, as was the case with House Resolution 470, the instant resolution may be submitted through the hopper.

The gentleman from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend with respect to H.R. 2247 and H.R. 403.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)
Ackerman	Butterfield	Davis (IL)
Adler (NJ)	Capps	Davis (TN)
Altmire	Capuano	DeFazio
Andrews	Cardoza	DeGette
Arcuri	Carnahan	Delahunt
Baca	Carney	DeLauro
Baird	Carson (IN)	Dicks
Baldwin	Dingell	Dingell
Barrow	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Bean	Chandler	Donnelly (IN)
Becerra	Childers	Doyle
Berman	Clarke	Droehaus
Berry	Clay	Edwards (MD)
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Edwards (TX)
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Ellison
Blumenauer	Cohen	Ellsworth
Boccieri	Conyers	Engel
Boren	Cooper	Eshoo
Boswell	Costa	Etheridge
Boucher	Courtney	Farr
Boyd	Crowley	Fattah
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Filmer
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Foster
Bright	Dahlkemper	Frank (MA)
	Davis (AL)	

Fudge	Maffei	Rothman (NJ)
Giffords	Maloney	Royal-Ballard
Gonzalez	Markey (CO)	Ruppersberger
Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Rush
Grayson	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Green, Al	Massa	Salazar
Green, Gene	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
Griffith	Matsui	Sarbanes
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Hall (NY)	McCollum	Schauer
Halvorson	McDermott	Schiff
Hare	McGovern	Schrader
Harman	McIntyre	Schwartz
Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Scott (GA)
Heinrich	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Sestak
Hill	Melancon	Shea-Porter
Himes	Michaud	Sherman
Hinchee	Miller (NC)	Shuler
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Sires
Hirono	Minnick	Skelton
Hodes	Mitchell	Slaughter
Holden	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Holt	Moore (KS)	Snyder
Honda	Moran (VA)	Space
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Speier
Inslee	Murphy (NY)	Spratt
Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Stark
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Nadler (NY)	Sutton
(TX)	Napolitano	Tanner
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Tauscher
Johnson, E. B.	Nye	Taylor
Jones	Oberstar	Teague
Kagen	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tierney
Kildee	Pallone	Titus
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascrell	Tonko
Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)	Towns
Kind	Paul	Tsongas
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Payne	Van Hollen
Kissell	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Klein (FL)	Perrillo	Visclosky
Kosmas	Peters	Walz
Kratovil	Peterson	Wasserman
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Langevin	Polis (CO)	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Watson
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Watt
Levin	Quigley	Waxman
Lipinski	Rahall	Weiner
Loeb sack	Rangel	Welch
Lofgren, Zoe	Reyes	Wexler
Lowey	Richardson	Woolsey
Luján	Rodriguez	Wu
Lynch	Ross	Yarmuth

NAYS—171

Aderholt	Conaway	Jenkins
Akin	Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)
Austria	Culberson	Johnson, Sam
Bachmann	Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)
Bachus	Deal (GA)	King (IA)
Barrett (SC)	Dent	King (NY)
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk
Biggert	Dreier	Kline (MN)
Bilbray	Duncan	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Latham
Blackburn	Fallin	LaTourrette
Boehner	Flake	Latta
Bono Mack	Fleming	Lee (NY)
Boozman	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Fortenberry	Linder
Brady (TX)	Fox	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Brown-Waite,	Gallely	Lummis
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel
Buchanan	Gerlach	E.
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Manzullo
Buyer	Goodlatte	Marchant
Calvert	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Graves	McCaul
Campbell	Guthrie	McClintock
Cantor	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Cao	Harper	McHenry
Capito	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Carter	Heller	McKeon
Cassidy	Hensarling	McMorris
Castle	Herger	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Hoekstra	Mica
Coble	Hunter	Miller (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Inglis	Miller (MI)
Cole	Issa	Miller, Gary

Moran (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Pomeroy	Welch	Wilson (SC)	Wu
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Posey	Westmoreland	Wittman	Yarmuth
Myrick	Rogers (MI)	Souder	Ellison	Latham	Price (GA)	Wexler	Wolf	Young (AK)
Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Stearns	Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (NC)	Whitfield	Woolsey	
Nunes	Rooney	Terry	Emerson	Latta	Putnam			
Olson	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)	Engel	Lee (CA)	Quigley			
Paulsen	Roskam	Thornberry	Esho	Lee (NY)	Radanovich	Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	Sánchez, Linda
Pence	Royce	Tiahrt	Etheridge	Levin	Rahall	Barton (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Petri	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi	Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Berkley	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Pitts	Scalise	Turner	Farr	Linder	Reichert	Bonner	Larson (CT)	Sullivan
Platts	Schmidt	Upton	Fattah	Lipinski	Reyes	Broun (GA)	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (OH)
Poe (TX)	Schock	Walden	Filner	LoBiondo	Richardson	Connolly (VA)	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Wamp	Flake	Loebsack	Rodriguez	Costello	Rangel	
Price (GA)	Sessions	Westmoreland	Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)			
Putnam	Shadegg	Whitfield	Forbes	Lowey	Rogers (AL)			
Radanovich	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)	Fortenberry	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)			
Rehberg	Shuster	Wittman	Foster	Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher			
Reichert	Simpson	Wolf	Fox	Rohrabacher	Rooney			
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)	Frank (MA)	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen			

NOT VOTING—19

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1433

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 403.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 403.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—417

Abercrombie	Boehner	Carney
Ackerman	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Aderholt	Boozman	Carter
Adler (NJ)	Boren	Cassidy
Akin	Boswell	Castle
Altmire	Boucher	Castor (FL)
Andrews	Boustany	Chaffetz
Arcuri	Boyd	Chandler
Austria	Brady (PA)	Childers
Baca	Brady (TX)	Clarke
Bachmann	Braley (IA)	Clay
Bachus	Bright	Cleaver
Baird	Broun (GA)	Clyburn
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Coble
Barrett (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Coffman (CO)
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Cohen
Bartlett	Ginny	Cole
Bean	Buchanan	Conaway
Becerra	Burgess	Conyers
Berman	Burton (IN)	Cooper
Berry	Butterfield	Costa
Biggart	Buyer	Courtney
Bilbray	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Camp	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Campbell	Cuellar
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Cao	Cummings
Blackburn	Capito	Dahlkemper
Blumenauer	Capps	Davis (AL)
Blunt	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Boccheri	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Boehner	Carnahan	Davis (KY)

NOT VOTING—15

Alexander	Gutierrez	Sánchez, Linda
Berkley	Kennedy	T.
Blunt	Larson (CT)	Sullivan
Bonner	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (OH)
Connolly (VA)	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Costello		

□ 1427

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2247, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2247, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Boustany	Clyburn
Ackerman	Boyd	Coble
Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Coffman (CO)
Adler (NJ)	Brady (TX)	Cohen
Akin	Braley (IA)	Cole
Altmire	Bright	Conaway
Andrews	Brown (SC)	Conyers
Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Austria	Brown-Waite,	Costa
Baca	Ginny	Courtney
Bachmann	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Bachus	Burgess	Crowley
Baird	Burton (IN)	Cuellar
Baldwin	Butterfield	Culberson
Barrett (SC)	Buyer	Cummings
Barrow	Calvert	Dahlkemper
Bartlett	Camp	Davis (AL)
Bean	Campbell	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Berman	Cao	Davis (KY)
Berry	Capito	Davis (TN)
Biggart	Capps	Deal (GA)
Bilbray	Capuano	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Cardoza	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Carnahan	Delahunt
Bishop (NY)	Carney	DeLauro
Bishop (UT)	Carson (IN)	Dent
Blackburn	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blumenauer	Cassidy	Dicks
Blunt	Castle	Dingell
Boccheri	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Boehner	Chaffetz	Donnelly (IN)
Bono Mack	Chandler	Doyle
Boozman	Childers	Dreier
Boren	Clarke	Driehaus
Boswell	Clay	Duncan
Boucher	Cleaver	Edwards (MD)

Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Pomeroy	Welch	Wilson (SC)	Wu
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Posey	Westmoreland	Wittman	Yarmuth
Ellison	Latham	Price (GA)	Wexler	Wolf	Young (AK)
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (NC)	Whitfield	Woolsey	
Emerson	Latta	Putnam			
Engel	Lee (CA)	Quigley			
Esho	Lee (NY)	Radanovich	Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	Sánchez, Linda
Etheridge	Levin	Rahall	Barton (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Berkley	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Farr	Linder	Reichert	Bonner	Larson (CT)	Sullivan
Fattah	Lipinski	Reyes	Broun (GA)	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (OH)
Filner	LoBiondo	Richardson	Connolly (VA)	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Flake	Loebsack	Rodriguez	Costello	Rangel	
Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)			
Forbes	Lowey	Rogers (AL)			
Fortenberry	Lucas	Rogers (KY)			
Foster	Luettkemeyer	Rogers (MI)			
Fox	Luján	Rohrabacher			
Frank (MA)	Lummis	Rooney			
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen			
Frelinghuysen	E.	Roskam			
Fudge	Lynch	Ross			
Gallegly	Mack	Rothman (NJ)			
Garrett (NJ)	Maffei	Roybal-Allard			
Gerlach	Maloney	Royce			
Giffords	Manzullo	Ruppersberger			
Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Rush			
Gohmert	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)			
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)			
Goodlatte	Marshall	Salazar			
Gordon (TN)	Massa	Sanchez, Loretta			
Granger	Matheson	Scalise			
Graves	Matsui	Schakowsky			
Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Schauer			
Green, Al	McCaul	Schiff			
Green, Gene	McClintock	Schmidt			
Griffith	McCollum	Schock			
Grijalva	McCotter	Schrader			
Guthrie	McDermott	Schwartz			
Gutierrez	McGovern	Scott (GA)			
Hall (NY)	McHenry	Scott (VA)			
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner			
Halvorson	McIntyre	Serrano			
Hare	McKeon	Sessions			
Harman	McMahon	Sestak			
Harper	McMorris	Shadegg			
Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Shea-Porter			
Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Sherman			
Heimrich	Meek (FL)	Shimkus			
Heller	Meeke (NY)	Shuler			
Hensarling	Melancon	Shuster			
Herger	Mica	Simpson			
Herseth Sandlin	Michaud	Sires			
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Skelton			
Hill	Miller (MI)	Slaughter			
Himes	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)			
Hinchee	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)			
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (TX)			
Hirono	Minnick	Smith (WA)			
Hodes	Mitchell	Snyder			
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Souder			
Holden	Moore (KS)	Space			
Holt	Moore (WI)	Speier			
Honda	Moran (KS)	Spratt			
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Stark			
Hunter	Murphy (CT)	Stearns			
Inglis	Murphy (NY)	Stupak			
Inslee	Murphy, Patrick	Sutton			
Israel	Murphy, Tim	Tanner			
Issa	Murtha	Tauscher			
Jackson (IL)	Myrick	Taylor			
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Nadler (NY)	Teague			
Jenkins	Napolitano	Terry			
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)			
Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)			
Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Thompson (PA)			
Johnson, Sam	Nye	Thornberry			
Jones	Oberstar	Tiahrt			
Jordan (OH)	Obey	Tiberi			
Kagen	Olson	Tierney			
Kanjorski	Oliver	Titus			
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tonko			
Kildee	Pallone	Towns			
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascrell	Tsongas			
Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)	Turner			
Kind	Paul	Upton			
King (NY)	Paulsen	Van Hollen			
Kingston	Payne	Velázquez			
Kirk	Perlmutter	Viscosky			
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello	Walden			
Kistelle	Peters	Walz			
Klein (FL)	Peterson	Wamp			
Kline (MN)	Petri	Wasserman			
Kosmas	Pingree (ME)	Schultz			
Kratovil	Pitts	Waters			
Kucinich	Platts	Watson			
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Watt			
Lance	Polis (CO)	Waxman			
		Weiner			

Davis (TN) Kildee
Deal (GA) Kilpatrick (MI)
DeFazio Kilroy
DeGette Kind
Delahunt King (IA)
DeLauro King (NY)
Dent Kingston
Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk
Diaz-Balart, M. Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Dicks Kissell
Dingell Klein (FL)
Doggett Kline (MN)
Donnelly (IN) Kosmas
Doyle Kratovil
Dreier Kucinich
Driehaus Lamborn
Duncan Lance
Edwards (MD) Langevin
Edwards (TX) Larsen (WA)
Ehlers Latham
Ellison LaTourette
Ellsworth Latta
Emerson Lee (CA)
Engel Lee (NY)
Eshoo Levin
Etheridge Lewis (CA)
Fallin Linder
Farr Lipinski
Fattah LoBiondo
Filner Loeb sack
Fleming Lofgren, Zoe
Forbes Lowey
Fortenberry Lucas
Foster Luetkemeyer
Foxy Luján
Frank (MA) Lummis
Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
Frelinghuysen E.
Fudge Lynch
Gallegly Mack
Garrett (NJ) Maffei
Gerlach Maloney
Giffords Manzullo
Gingrey (GA) Marchant
Gohmert Markey (CO)
Gonzalez Markey (MA)
Goodlatte Marshall
Gordon (TN) Massa
Granger Matheson
Graves Matsui
Grayson McCarthy (CA)
Green, Al McCarthy (NY)
Griffith McCaul
Grijalva McClintock
Guthrie McCollum
Gutierrez McCotter
Hall (NY) McDermott
Hall (TX) McGovern
Halvorson McHenry
Hare McHugh
Harman McIntyre
Harper McKeon
Hastings (FL) McMahon
Hastings (WA) McMorris
Heinrich Rodgers
Heller McNeerney
Hensarling Meek (FL)
Herger Meeks (NY)
Herseth Sandlin Melancon
Higgins Mica
Hill Michaud
Himes Miller (FL)
Hinche Miller (MI)
Hinojosa Miller (NC)
Hirono Miller, Gary
Hodes Miller, George
Hoekstra Minnick
Holden Mitchell
Holt Mollohan
Honda Moore (KS)
Hoyer Moore (WI)
Hunter Moran (KS)
Inglis Moran (VA)
Inlee Murphy (CT)
Israel Murphy (NY)
Issa Murphy, Patrick
Jackson (IL) Murphy, Tim
Jackson-Lee Murtha
(TX) Myrick
Jenkins Nadler (NY)
Johnson (GA) Napolitano
Johnson (IL) Neal (MA)
Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer
Johnson, Sam Nunes
Jones Nye
Jordan (OH) Oberstar
Kagen Obey
Kanjorski Olson
Kaptur Oliver

Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—2

Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander
Berkley
Bonner
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Green, Gene
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Peterson
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sullivan
Wilson (OH)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1440

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 344, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 545

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the conference report to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 545.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Res. 545 provides for consideration of the supplemental conference report, legislation that supports our military in the field in both Iraq and Afghanistan. This spending plan provides our troops with everything they will need during the remainder of this fiscal year, and the President has said this will be the last supplemental spending request he will send to Congress. I hope this will be the case.

I, along with a majority of my colleagues, share the President's goal of winding down the war in Iraq and leaving behind an Iraq run by Iraqis. This conference report takes a step towards that goal by providing for the training of security forces, economic development, and diplomatic operations.

We are also looking to secure Afghanistan, and this conference report provides for training of Afghan security forces and counterinsurgency measures in bordering Pakistan.

Although there are no deadlines or timelines in this conference report, I think we share in the desire to have troops wrap up their missions abroad and return home to their families. It's my hope that we will see the beginning of that troop drawdown this year.

This report also provides for a few key domestic economic priorities like the Cash For Clunkers program, which will allow Americans to trade in old vehicles for new ones with higher fuel efficiency.

This conference report also includes \$1.5 billion for response to the swine flu pandemic to help State and local governments but also to fund global efforts to track, contain, and slow down the spread of this flu.

Although it is not perfect legislation, it provides some essential funding, and I will support it and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Let me begin by thanking my friend from Utica for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to say that it's with extreme disappointment and sadness that I rise in opposition to this rule, having been very supportive of it when we had it just, it seemed, a few weeks ago.

The underlying measure of the supplemental appropriations bill that's supposed to fund our troops began auspiciously as a wonderfully bipartisan effort. In fact, when the House first considered the funding measure last month, Republicans were very proud to have what was our first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, our first opportunity of this 111th Congress to consider a major bill that had been developed in a bipartisan way.

□ 1445

I noted on that occasion that the President's call for bipartisan action had previously been completely thwarted by the Democratic majority; and, frankly, the record proves that to be the case. But finally when it came to the issue of funding our troops, even the Democratic leadership that had thwarted efforts to follow the Obama directive for bipartisanship, we had concluded that they weren't about to politicize the process of funding our troops. While the bill that we considered last month was not perfect, it did accomplish the key issue at hand, adequately providing for the protection and welfare of our troops. And as I said, we were very proud to do it in a bipartisan way, something the President wants, something that the American people want, and frankly, it's something that I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House want. But unfortunately the Democratic leadership does not seem to have that same goal.

Now the Democratic leadership is, unfortunately, back to what has very unfortunately been determined to be business as usual, which is concerning a measure which should have been as depoliticized as possible, considering it in an extraordinarily partisan way.

The conference report before us actually cuts troop funding in order to pay for billions of dollars of additional non-troop non-emergency spending. This includes \$5 billion for the International Monetary Fund in order to provide additional global bailouts. Now any country, Mr. Speaker, can apply for this money. So there's nothing to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars don't go to countries like Iran or Venezuela. The question of whether to provide this new IMF funding is a controversial one; and it may end up being a right decision; but it's one that should be fully debated, not airdropped into a conference report. Again, whatever the outcome of that debate on IMF funding, it is clearly something that should not be considered as emergency funding. It should be part of the regular appropriations process, which we're in the midst of right now, where tough decisions are made, priorities are set, and a proposal to send \$5 billion to the International Monetary Fund can be weighed against other priorities that Members of this House may have, like transportation funding or some other issue that it may be determined through the deliberative process is a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, our military is on the verge of running out of money. We all know that. That, frankly, is why we're here. The resources needed for our troops to conduct their mission and return home safely are nearly depleted. This, the issue of troop funding, is a true emergency. This is what this supplemental appropriations bill is all about—to protect and support the men and women in harm's way defending our country. The Democratic leader-

ship, instead, chose to cut troop funding and load this bill up with other very controversial funding that does not support our troops. Republicans made it clear that we could not support a troop funding bill that does not, in fact, fully fund our troops. So the leadership on the other side of the aisle found itself in a dilemma. They had lost Republican support with their partisanship, their controversial programs and their cuts for troop funding. So what could they do? How could they win the votes necessary to pass this conference report?

The obvious solution would have been to return to bipartisanship. It's what the President of the United States has called for; it's what the American people want; and it's what I believe a majority of Democrats and Republicans in this House would like. But instead, the Democratic leadership chose to push the contents of this bill as far to the left as they possibly could in the hopes of picking up support from the fringes of their own party. Having left the middle ground, the fringe was the only place left to go.

So how did they appeal to the very, very extreme left? First they watered down language related to moving terrorists to U.S. soil from Guantanamo Bay. Well, Republicans have supported much stronger language to ensure that no terrorists are ever moved to or set free on American soil. The original language would have at least required consultation with Congress and slowed down the process until we could act definitively to ensure the protection of our communities. But inexplicably, as Democrats, Republicans and Independents across the country have voiced their outrage over the prospect of having terrorists potentially released on American soil, today's conference report further weakens the already weakened language. It leaves our neighborhoods even more vulnerable to the movement of Gitmo terrorists. Furthermore, the Democratic leadership removed protections to ensure that information that could put our troops in danger would not be released. Many on the far left opposed these protections, so the Democratic leadership bartered for their support of this bill by stripping them out completely. Without those protections in place, our troops in the field will be subject to even greater harm. This was the price the Democratic leadership paid in order to negotiate with the far left rather than return to the bipartisanship and common sense that had guided earlier debates on this funding bill.

To see just how far out of the mainstream this approach is, Mr. Speaker, look no further than the vote on the motion to instruct conferees that we had just this past Friday. It was a Republican motion which handily passed the House by a vote of 267-152. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 267-152, this House called for a clean bill that restores full funding for the troops and keeps in place the protections to pre-

vent the release of information that could potentially endanger our troops. That strong bipartisan vote just this past Friday in favor of this motion indicates how much support there is in this House for a clean, bipartisan full troop funding bill. For those of us who naively thought that the funding of our troops was the one issue that could not be politicized, this is a very, very sobering moment. Clearly the Democratic leadership cannot help themselves. Even when bipartisanship would be the easy choice, they were compelled to move in the exact opposite direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, demand a clean troop funding bill, one that fully provides the resources they need, one that is stripped of all extraneous controversial non-emergency funding and one that includes full protections for American communities as well as our troops in the field.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that this bill does provide for the troops; and it provides very well for our troops because that is the most important thing that we, as Members of Congress, can do. It provides \$1.9 billion more than requested for MRAPs and \$2.5 billion above the President's request for U.S. troops. Those are the kinds of things that we need to do as a Congress to make sure that our troops are provided for.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I have a question to my friends, and that is: How do we support the troops by keeping them in a war that's based on lies? How do we support the troops by keeping them in another war which keeps expanding and they're getting shot at from all sides? How do we support the troops by festering a war on the Afghan border with Pakistan and putting them in even more peril because they don't have the support?

How do we support the troops? We support them by bringing them home. That's what we should be appropriating money for, not to keep them there. Beyond that, isn't it interesting—we've got another \$80 billion here for war, but we don't have money to keep people in their homes because there are still 13 million Americans who are losing their homes; we don't have money for the 50 million Americans who don't have any health care; we don't have money to save jobs; we don't have money to save our steel mills and our auto plants. What we have is, we have money for war.

Support the troops indeed. America has to start taking care of things here at home, and we can't do it by continuing to support wars that are based on lies. The Democrats took control of the Congress based on an opposition to the war. We should be opposing this

war instead of deferring to the President. We have the constitutional obligation under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to decide whether a war should continue or not. We should end it here. We shouldn't be continuing it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend from Utica who made it very clear that he believes that troop funding is their priority; but yet this measure reduces by \$4.7 billion the level of troop funding that we had in the bipartisan bill passed just last month and transfers it to the IMF. So, in fact, this measure does cut troop funding.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 3 minutes to the new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the very distinguished gentleman from Santa Clarita, California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding the time.

As the ranking member on Armed Services, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the war supplemental conference report for one simple reason. It will endanger our troops in harm's way. Compared with the clean troop funding bill that passed the House with bipartisan support in May, this package cuts \$4.7 billion from defense that we passed at that time to create room for a \$105 billion global bailout loan program.

What should be a clean military funding bill has become a means for the President's promise to provide more foreign aid to the International Monetary Fund. Those funds will eventually make their way to countries that are less than friendly to the United States at the expense of programs to support our troops. And even more disturbing is the decision by conferees to reject the motion offered by Republicans to prohibit the release of detainee photos that could exacerbate tensions in the very regions our troops are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let me read to you a statement about those photos by General Petraeus, commander of U.S. Armed Forces throughout the Middle East:

"The release of images depicting U.S. servicemen mistreating detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan, or that could be construed as depicting mistreatment, would likely deal a particularly hard blow to U.S. CENTCOM and U.S. inter-agency counterinsurgency efforts in these key nations, as well as further endanger the lives of U.S. soldiers, marines, airmen, sailors, civilians and contractors presently serving there."

General Petraeus is correct, and we should stand with our troops in the field and prohibit the release of these photos. We should not leave it in the hands of ACLU lawyers or at the mercy of activist judges.

I urge my colleagues to reject this package and insist that it be brought back immediately with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator GRAHAM's lan-

guage to prohibit release of these photos.

Finally, the Senate-passed troop bill included language prohibiting release or transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to U.S. soil. Unfortunately this conference report does not prohibit the transfer or release of detainees after October 1 of this year. This is a huge mistake. I fear we're already beginning to open Pandora's box. We've already begun importing terrorists. These Guantanamo detainees are trained to foment dissent among Americans, and we should do everything possible to keep them away from our local military bases and our prisons.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and the conference report so we can quickly make these necessary changes to protect our troops in the field and bring back a clean troop funding bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. I want to talk about a clearly necessary provision in this bill, the fleet modernization provision; but I do want to say just two things briefly to comment on what has been said here by the minority.

I really think they are looking for reasons to vote "no" no matter how illegitimate they are.

□ 1500

Regarding this issue of the release of photos, the President has said, "I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure the DOD detainee photographs are not released."

Secondly, on the IMF, a commitment was made at the G-20, and this carries out the U.S. commitment. It is not a believable position to vote "no" on this bill for that reason.

But I want to say a few words about the fleet modernization proposal that Representative SUTTON, who is here, has worked so hard on with a large number of people.

There is clearly a crisis in the automotive industry. The administration has stepped up to the plate with a plan. That plan is being implemented. It's very difficult. There is a lot of pain involved. It's being carried out.

What hasn't happened effectively is work on the demand side. That's what's lagging here. Sales were down very substantially these last several years. There was an uptick in May, but still the annualized level is far below even a few years ago. And the sales are down not only for the domestic industry but also for the transplants: for Toyota, down 41 percent from last May; Honda, 42 percent; Nissan, 33 percent. So there is an effort to make sure there is effective restructuring for the domestic industry.

We have to work on the demand side, and this today answers that need: a

voucher for consumers worth \$3,500 to \$4,500 to help them pay for more fuel-efficient cars and trucks. It will incentivize approximately 1 million new car and truck purchases. So anybody who votes "no" on this supplemental is voting "no" on this provision, and that would be a serious mistake.

It is critical that this Nation retain a strong domestic auto industry, and this effort on the demand side is a critical piece of that effort.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. This has not been an easy effort. There have been disagreements in different ways to go about it. And I simply want to say to those who have been in the lead, and especially to Representative SUTTON, this would not have happened without the dedication of herself and others who have been determined that there be continued, in this country, a strong domestic auto industry. It's that clear. Other countries have stepped up to the plate. They have provided support. This is now a necessary implementation of this effort.

So I plead with people on the minority side to listen, to step up to the plate, to not look for arguments or excuses to duck. There is no ducking the need for a strong domestic automotive industry, not only for Ohio, not only for Michigan, not only for Illinois, not only for Indiana, but for the entire United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I don't have any further requests for time. I would inquire of my friend whether he has any further speakers?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, I have an additional speaker.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman for his leadership and really thoughtful conversation on what is a challenging time for America.

I rise to support the rule and want to express both my support and concerns for aspects of this legislation. But I will speak to the seeming overall opposition of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and I would hope that in their deliberation they have given a thoughtful assessment of the analysis of opposition.

We are dealing with some very difficult times. I opposed the war in Iraq and remain opposed. I do, however, want the opportunity to be able to stand down in order to safely have our soldiers redeploy. I want to see the standing up of the Iraqis and resources to allow them to proceed in their own

defense and to bring our soldiers home as heroes.

I also want us to make good on the promise we made to Afghanistan. America is good at keeping her promise. Her soldiers have never stepped away from promoting the ideals of democracy and liberty and freedom, and the Afghan people are in need. They need the collaboration of the NATO forces and the United States. They also need to have reconstruction and the empowerment of women and the protection of their children.

And so the part of this legislation addresses that question. It is a recognition that many of us opposed the Iraq war and are asking, as we have been asking for so long since the horrific tragedy of 9/11 when we found that those terrorists, horrific terrorists came from the inner parts of Afghanistan, and we abandoned Afghanistan. We did not pay attention to them. And so it is important now to ensure that we do it in the right way, that we don't maintain an extended force in Afghanistan but we help in a collaborative way for the Afghan people to stand up and to fight the terrorists and to reestablish institutions that will help them build their society, both with respect to education and social services. And so part of this legislation does include that funding.

Our eyes have been on Pakistan. There is a regional effort. Secretary of State Clinton and the President have worked to appoint Ambassador Holbrooke to be an envoy, and he has been in those camps where you have seen 2½ million people be displaced. We cannot abandon them now. We must provide the opportunity for them to return to a rebuilt region. These are individuals who have fought for their freedom, who left the Swat area because they did not want to be overtaken by insurgents, the Taliban, who want to undermine a system of democracy and, yes, terrorists.

One man fled with 13 of his children, living in a tent. He said now his home is occupied by Pakistan soldiers. He's willing to sacrifice and live homeless because he wants freedom. The resources that we now have will allow that to happen, and that is vital.

We also realize that there are areas like Chad, the Congo, and places that are near collapse that we are providing for peace-keeping dollars that are so very important in helping the U.N. Chad is near collapse because it is near Sudan, and many of those who have fled the persecution are there.

From the gulf coast region we have fought consistently to provide reimbursement for Galveston and Houston and the regions that have still been struck and still sacrificing and still living under the shadow of Hurricane Ike. We have the resources to put people in housing and to be able to correct the wrong of that terrible storm but yet the inability to move as fast as we like pursuant to the work that was not done in the last administration.

I think it is important that we are supporting the International Monetary Fund because we cannot stand by while we speak the language of reconstruction and rebuilding and not provide that for particular support. So there is a value in the hard work of our colleagues.

But I do believe it is important to revisit an issue that impacts many States: the sidestepping of the President's mission on stimulus dollars. And the State of Texas is a poster child for that. \$3.2 billion was taken from the moneys that should have been utilized for the education of our children. One of my school districts alone has lost \$155 million because it has been replaced or reordered or snuck under or left somewhere in what we call a "rainy day fund." We need to fix this. We have an opportunity going forward to be able to fix it, but I would like to fix it now.

So I hope that we will be in the midst of discussion, the congressional delegation of Texans who believe that our children must come first. And we must follow the vision of President Obama, who said, Save a job and create a job. And so we are saving teachers' jobs and helping them if we fight to get that \$3.2 billion from Texas where it needs to be.

The underlying bill is an important bill, but the Texas children are important as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just plan to close debate if the gentleman has concluded debate.

Mr. ARCURI. I have one more speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on the Rules Committee and for the time.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill. But as we prepare to send the war supplemental to President Obama, I would be remiss not to express the deep concerns I have about the bill not including an exit strategy for military operations in Afghanistan.

And while I support the supplemental, I am also strongly supporting Representative MCGOVERN's bill to require an exit strategy from Afghanistan. Fairness requires it. Our brave soldiers need to know that we have a plan and that we're looking out for them. And out of fairness to the 185,000 soldiers who have been subject to the stop-loss policy since September 11, 2001, the supplemental that we're about to pass today will provide \$500 per month in monthly payments.

And the use of stop-loss has prevented mothers and fathers from returning home to their children, from families and friends from gathering for the momentous occasions that mark their lives. They have gone above and beyond the expectations of their country. So I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues to create the Stop Loss

Compensation program and to ensure its funding in this bill.

And I am pleased that we are also funding the bipartisan CARS Act program which Representative LEVIN spoke of a moment ago. That bill was passed overwhelmingly by this House just last week. And while it's called the CARS Act, it's about far more than just cars. It's about the environment and it's about people. It's about consumers, and it's about the millions of families in this great Nation who depend on the strength of our auto and related industries for their livelihood, to put food on the table, to get health care for their children. It's about our friends and our neighbors, and it's about our communities that depend on auto jobs for their tax base, to support schools and police, firefighters and other city services.

And I'm also proud to say that we have worked on language in the bill to allow that SAFER grants that are used to hire firefighters can be used now to rehire and retain much-needed firefighters.

This bill provides stop-loss payments for those who protect us bravely overseas. It funds the consumer-environmental beneficial CARS Act to help shore up the 3 to 5 million jobs in our auto industry that Americans depend upon for a living, and it provides for more adequate staffing for firefighters who bravely protect us at home.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that deserves support. And with that, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a fascinating debate that has taken place. It began with some very thoughtful comments from my friend from Utica talking about the need for funding for our troops, and I laude him for referring to the fact that that is the priority of this measure.

We then listened to, on our side, the distinguished new ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, my friend from Santa Clarita (Mr. McKEON), talk about the priority of funding for our troops.

And then we listened to speeches made by our colleagues, and there was barely a mention of the issue of troop funding.

We just heard our colleague talk about firefighters. Hey, I'm from southern California where we have fires, and we have horrible fires. Loss of life and property is something that regularly takes place there. It's a very, very important issue. It's an issue that should be considered under the regular appropriations process under the leadership of my California colleagues, Mr. LEWIS and Mr. OBEY, not in a troop funding bill.

Then we listened to our very good friend from Detroit talk about the automobile industry, a serious challenge that we, as a Nation, are trying to address. I personally believe that the notion of continuing to see the government more and more involved in

this area is not the right thing to do, but it's a debate that will go on. And yet our friend, Mr. LEVIN, was talking about the issue of the automobile industry in this troop funding bill.

□ 1515

Then I listened to our friend from Houston, Texas, talk about Darfur, one of the most troubled spots on the face of the Earth, an issue that does need to be addressed, and the challenges of meeting the needs of children in Texas, a very, very important issue, but not as part of a troop funding measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, through the very thoughtful work of the Appropriations Committee last month, we came to this floor with what President Obama and I believe a majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House would like to see us achieve, and I know the American people would like to see us achieve, and that is bipartisanship.

Bipartisanship is a word that is used all the time around here, all the time. Everyone talks about the need for bipartisanship, how important it is. The Speaker in her opening address here to the Congress as we began the 111th Congress talked about how she wanted to work in a bipartisan way. We Republicans say we want to work in a bipartisan way.

But this bill that emerged from the House Appropriations Committee was the first time, the very first time in this 111th Congress that we were able to see a bipartisan work product emerge from the Democratic leadership, and I congratulated them on that, and I have done that when we considered the bill, and I would like to be able to do it today.

But, unfortunately, this bill has crumbled from what it was intended to be, a bill to support funding for our troops. It in fact included a reduction by transferring money that was intended in the House-passed bill to be funding for our troops to the International Monetary Fund.

Now, I will say that that may be a worthwhile cause as we deal with the economic challenges that exist here in the United States and around the world. But, again, Mr. Speaker, that is something that should not be considered as an emergency funding measure. It is something that should be considered under the normal appropriations process, so that we can make a determination whether increasing by \$5 billion the funding for the International Monetary Fund is more important than transportation priorities here in the United States or other priorities that we have.

So, some might like to say that this bill is just a continuation of what we considered last month. But, Mr. Speaker, it unfortunately has gone a long way down from where we were, creating the potential, the potential for us to not be able to prevent with absolute certainty the terrorists from Gitmo ending up in the United States. There is no guarantee that that will happen.

On the IMF, on the IMF, there is no guarantee, no guarantee in this measure that funding requests could not be made for countries like Iran or Venezuela.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that this troop funding bill has ended up addressing, and it was made very clear by an overwhelming majority of the remarks that came from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, so that we can come back and pass in this House what 267 Members last Friday said that they wanted to have passed, and that is a clean bill that funds our troops and ensures that we won't have terrorists in the United States, that ensures that we will not be dramatically expanding a wide range of other programs.

So vote "no" on this rule, and, if by chance it passes, I urge a "no" vote on the conference report itself, because we can do better.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee for his management of this rule and also for talking about what I think is ultimately the most important thing with respect to this bill, and that is, of course, our troops.

There are many of us who opposed the war in Iraq. I was one of them. I continue to oppose it. There are many of us who believe that the funding that this bill contains should be greater. I think on both sides of the aisle there is agreement that we should do as much as we possibly can. And there are things about this bill that clearly are not perfect. But we can't allow the perfect to get in the way of the good.

This bill is a good bill. Let's not deprive our brave sons and our daughters, their husbands and their wives, of what they need to return to their families safely. This is not about what is right or what is wrong. This is about what we as a country, what we as a Congress, need to do, and that is to make sure that our troops, our sons and our daughters, the people who put their lives on the line each and every day, have all and each and every thing they need.

Some people may argue it is not enough, but we need to give them everything that we possibly can. Voting "no" simply because you think it is not enough is not a solution. That absolutely is not a solution. We need to do everything we can to ensure that our soldiers have what they need.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is much good in this conference report on the FY09 supplemental. I support the IMF monies and I certainly support the funding to respond to the H1N1 flu virus.

But I will vote "no" today on the final bill for the same reason I voted "no" on the original supplemental. This supplemental is primarily a war funding bill. It includes a huge escalation

of our military involvement in Afghanistan: an escalation without benchmarks, conditions, or most importantly, without an exit strategy.

I hope all my concerns about Afghanistan are wrong. There is a different team in the White House now—who I believe are trying very hard not to repeat the mistakes of the previous Administration.

President Obama and others have said there is no military solution in Afghanistan, only a political solution. I believe this, too. So I am very concerned when we put billions of dollars building up the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan without a clear mission and without an exit strategy.

Just as I insisted that the Bush Administration provide Congress with clear benchmarks and an exit strategy for Iraq, then we should the same with this Administration for Afghanistan.

I am not advocating an immediate withdrawal of our military forces in Afghanistan. I understand that our humanitarian mission may have to be protected in the near term. All I am asking for is a plan. If there's no military solution for Afghanistan, then please, tell me how we will know when our military contribution to the political solution has concluded.

I suspect that the votes are in place to pass this supplemental conference report. But I am deeply concerned. I'm concerned that we are moving ahead with a significant military escalation in Afghanistan without any real debate or any sense for how we will eventually bring our troops home.

Some have suggested that we have that debate at some point in the future. I respectfully disagree. I am not and never will be an advocate for "cutting and running" from Afghanistan. But we need to provide the American people and the people of Afghanistan a clearly defined mission, which includes a clearly defined plan for departure.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009 (or earlier) designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII; and (2) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Clause 9(b)(2) of rule XXI is amended by inserting "such" after "no".

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 544.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 544 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2847, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking member for reporting out this bill that does not pay mere lip service to making communities safer, but makes critical investments in our Nation's communities.

The bill provides \$802 million for Community Oriented Policing Services, which we know as the COPS program, 45 percent above the current funding level. As a former prosecutor, I know how vitally important these programs are in assisting local law enforcement to hire and train new offi-

cers, to participate in community policing, purchase and deploy new crimefighting techniques and technologies, and develop and test new and innovative policing strategies.

So often State and local governments are critical of the Federal Government's programs because they pass down mandates without funding them. But this bill appropriates money to put more police on the street, funds successful drug court programs, and increases Byrne funding to help develop new and innovative law enforcement techniques which put violent criminals in jail and keep our streets safe for our children.

This funding includes \$298 million for the COPS hiring grants program, which help our local law enforcement agencies put more police on the street. When combined with the \$1 billion provided in the Recovery Act for the COPS hiring grants, the funding in H.R. 2847 will enable the hiring of more than 7,000 police officers. Those are officers in each and every State in this country.

Increasing the number of police on the street will help local law enforcement agencies to reduce violence and get illegal guns off the street. As a former prosecutor, I know that the vast majority of the violent crimes committed with guns in this country are committed with illegal guns, not legal guns. By putting more police officers on the street, it will give officers the ability to better enforce the laws on the books, not by creating new laws, but by reducing the number of illegal guns, which is the cause of the majority of gun violence in this country.

This bill provides \$15 million for the Weed and Seed program. Weed and Seed helps localities develop programs to weed out and deter crime and then take the all-important step often left out, that is, seeding the formerly high crime areas with programs to promote neighborhood revitalization. The funds will be used to carry out this mission in sites and communities such as my home in Utica and Rome, New York, cities which I represent.

H.R. 2847 also includes \$384 million for Juvenile Justice programs, \$11 million above the 2009 level. This underscores the strong Federal commitment to supporting States and communities in their efforts to develop and implement prevention and intervention programs and to improve the juvenile justice system so that it protects public safety and holds offenders accountable while also providing rehabilitative services that are tailored to meet the needs of juveniles and their families.

Additionally, the underlying bill includes \$45 million for grants, technical assistance, and training to State and local governments to develop dedicated drug courts that subject nonviolent offenders to an integrated mix of treatment, drug testing, incentives and sanctions.

As a district attorney, I quickly learned that no matter what initiatives

law enforcement took to reduce the supply of drugs, it never really affected the demand for drugs, which never seemed to go down and therefore created a market for drug dealers. One thing I saw is that reducing the supply can work, but reducing the demand for drugs always works.

When my office established a drug court program, I realized the powerful effect that the program had on helping enrolled participants get control of their addiction, thereby freeing them and their families from their awful addiction and reducing the demand for drugs. The appropriation of \$45 million for drug courts provided by H.R. 2847 is 12.5 percent more than the current level, and I congratulate the committee on that increase.

The bill also includes funding for upgrades to emergency communications systems around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed only a handful of the important programs for which H.R. 2847 would appropriate funds. My remarks are focused on the criminal justice aspects of this bill, but there are many other important areas addressed in this legislation.

It provides funding for critical scientific research, including programs to keep America on the cutting edge of technology, innovation and those that study climate change as well as funding the Department of Commerce and Economic Development Administration. The Appropriations Committee has approved a bill which would provide funding for these critical programs, and I once again thank them for their work and welcome the chance to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), for the time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to this unorthodox rule brought forth by the majority. It continues the precedent the majority set last year when they decided to no longer allow the House to consider appropriations rules with open rules and instead use a restrictive rule that requires Members to preprint any proposed amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

□ 1530

So this is a restrictive rule, even though the majority calls it an open rule with a preprinting requirement. It was not long ago when the majority felt quite differently. At the end of 2004, the current distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, then a member of the minority and ranking member of the Rules Committee, released a report called, "Broken Promises: The Death of Deliberative Democracy." On Page 26 of the report the chairwoman said that she considers rules with preprinting requirements, like today's rule, restrictive and not

open. Why exactly is this a restrictive rule? Let, me, again, quote the chairwoman's 2004 report. "A preprinting requirement blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of debate."

For example, Mr. Speaker, Members will be blocked from offering germane changes to their own amendments if an issue surfaces during debate, or if there is a minor drafting error. That is why, during yesterday's rules hearing, I made a motion to modify the rule to allow Members who have preprinted their amendments, as specified in this rule, to make germane modifications to such amendments. My commonsense amendment was defeated by a straight party-line vote.

I will provide you an example, Mr. Speaker, why I believe my amendment was important. During last year's consideration of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, Representative BUYER submitted an amendment for consideration. However, the amendment had a drafting error and did not comply with one of the rules of the House.

Once Congressman BUYER realized the problem, he asked unanimous consent to change his amendment to achieve its original purpose, and also to comply with the rules of the House. However, the majority blocked his unanimous consent request.

If the bill had been considered under an open rule, Representative BUYER could simply have introduced a new amendment. But, just like the bill being brought to the floor today, that bill was not considered under an open rule, and Members were blocked from making germane changes to their amendments, unless they received concurrence of every Member through a unanimous consent agreement.

Yesterday, during the hearing on the supplemental appropriations bill, the Rules Committee ranking member, Mr. DREIER, attempted to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, how the majority would handle another occurrence like occurred last year with the Buyer amendment.

But when Mr. DREIER began asking his question, the Rules Committee chairwoman did not allow Mr. DREIER from going forward with the question. The Rules Committee chairwoman explained her ruling by saying, the hearing on the underlying legislation was complete, and the committee was now considering the supplemental funding bill; a bill that is an appropriations bill just like the underlying legislation. And yet, the chairwoman found that asking the Appropriations chairman about the upcoming appropriations process during a hearing on an appropriations bill was inappropriate. I think that was unfortunate.

Please let me quote Chairwoman SLAUGHTER's report from 2004. Restrictive rules block "duly elected Members of Congress the opportunity to shape legislation in a manner that they believe is in the best interest of their

constituents and the Nation as a whole." They also block, and I continue quoting, "the full and free airing of conflicting opinions."

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the relevant parts of the chairwoman's report into the RECORD.

If the rule was restrictive under the majority's definition in 2004, why is it not the same today?

What makes this restrictive rule more unfortunate is that the House has a long tradition of allowing open rules on appropriations bills in order to allow each Member the ability to offer germane amendments without having to preprint their amendment or receive approval from the Rules Committee.

Other than the recent use by the majority to restrict debate on appropriations bills, we have to look back nearly 15 years to the last time a restrictive rule was used. So this is not a one-time aberration but, in fact, the way the majority plans to continue to consider all of the appropriations bills this year.

So I believe that the majority is really not only subverting the rights of every Member, and also bipartisan and open debate on appropriations bills, but I think they're setting a dangerous precedent that is unfortunate. Excessive partisanship is unnecessary and unfortunate.

BROKEN PROMISES: THE DEATH OF
DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT ON THE UNPRECEDENTED
EROSION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS IN THE 108TH CONGRESS.

Compiled by the House Rules Committee
Minority Office

The Honorable Louise M. Slaughter,
Ranking Member

4. Rules with Pre-Printing Requirements are
not "Open Rules"

During the 108th Congress, the Rules Committee reported out four rules with a so-called "pre-printing" requirement. This provision requires Members to submit their amendments for publication in the Congressional Record, in accordance with clause 8 of Rule XVIII, on the day preceding floor debate of the legislation. While the majority optimistically calls such rules "modified open rules," we consider them "restrictive" rules and have scored them as such in the appendices attached to this report.

While we concede that considering a bill with a pre-printing requirement is less restrictive than the more common tactic of limiting amendments to those printed in the Rules Committee report;³¹ there is a significant difference between an open rule and a rule with a pre-printing requirement. A pre-

³¹ According to our records, 50% (64) of the non-conference report/non-procedural rules reported by the Committee in the 108th Congress were rules restricting debate to amendments printed in the Committee report. In the "Additional Views" they filed in the *102nd Congress Survey of Activities* Republican Rules Committee members, including Chairman Dreier, complained this type of restrictive rule had become "a favored method of the majority." Under this procedure, the Rules Committee "selectively determines which [amendment] to make in order and which may not be offered on the floor. Usually, the amendments made in order are subject to strict time limits, as opposed to open debate under the five-minute rule, and are not subject to amendment. On rare occasions the Rules Committee has allowed all amendments submitted to be offered, but this is the exception, not the rule." *H. Rept. 102-1101, 102nd Survey*, p. 109.

printing requirement forces Members to reveal their amendments in advance of floor consideration, something that may assist the floor managers, but can disadvantage the Member offering it. In addition, a pre-printing requirement blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of the debate. When Chairman Dreier was in the minority, he made the following statement about the preprinting requirement during debate on a rule on national, service legislation:

"This rule also requires amendments to be printed in the Congressional Record. That might not sound like much, but it is another bad policy that belittles the traditions of House debate. If amendments must be preprinted, then it is impossible to listen to the debate on the floor, come up with a new idea to improve the bill, and then offer an amendment to incorporate that idea. Why do we need this burdensome preprinting process? Shouldn't the committees that report these bills have a grasp of the issues affecting the legislation under their jurisdiction? Again, Mr. Speaker, I think we can do better."³²

We agree with Chairman Dreier's statement that the purpose of the amendment process on the floor is to give duly elected Members of Congress the opportunity to shape legislation in a manner that they believe is in the best interest of their constituents and the nation as a whole. It is not to help the floor manager with his or her job. A majority interested in allowing "the full and free airing of conflicting opinions" would allow at least some House business to occur in an open format—in a procedural framework that allows Members to bring their amendments directly to the floor for discussion and debate under the five-minute rule.³³

II. REPUBLICANS EXPANDED THE CONSIDERATION
OF SUSPENSION BILLS TO CROWD OUT REAL
DELIBERATION IN THE HOUSE

Another aspect of the disturbing trend towards curtailing real deliberation on controversial issues in the House has been the Republican leadership's tendency to devote more and more floor time to debating bills under the suspension of the rules. In the 108th Congress, standing House Rule XV permitted the House to consider bills under suspension of the rules on Mondays and Tuesdays, and during the last six days of a session of Congress. The suspension procedure allows for 40 minutes of debate, requires a two-thirds vote for a bill to pass, and allows no amendments except by the floor manager.

The ostensible purpose of the suspension day procedure is, as the Republican majority describes it in one of its Parliamentary Outreach newsletters, "to dispose of non-I reserve."

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to express my concern about the ability of this House to get its crucial work done under the circumstances in which we're operating.

As I think every Member of the House understands, President Obama inherited an economic crisis and a foreign policy mess, and so the Congress

³² *Congressional Record* July 20, 1993, p. H4820.

³³ As we have noted above, most appropriations bills are debated under technically open rules, but amendments are subject not just to the normal restrictions of germaneness, but also a number of other restrictions set out in rule XXI and in the Congressional Budget Act.

first had to turn our attention to dealing with that economic crisis, and we finally got that out of the way in the form of the Recovery Act. We then had to finish all of last year's domestic appropriation bills, which took a considerable amount of time, and then we had to turn to the supplemental appropriation bill which we will be debating later today to finish funding the Middle Eastern war efforts for the remainder of the fiscal year, because the previous administration had a practice of only asking for funding for that endeavor 6 months at a time.

And now we are trying to bring up the first of 12 appropriation bills. And in order to stay on schedule so we can do the people's business by the end of the fiscal year, we need to deal with all 12 of those bills in the next 6 weeks. I think that means that we have a problem.

In fiscal '03 there were no amendments offered to this bill. In fiscal '04 there were 10 amendments offered by Republicans and 6 by Democrats. In fiscal '05 there were 19 amendments offered by Republicans and 11 by Democrats. In fiscal '06 the number increased to 19 and 27, and in '07 we had 38 amendments offered by Republicans and 37 offered by Democrats. Today, we have had filed on this bill 127 amendments.

Now, in the schedule that I announced last week for appropriation bills, we announced a schedule that would allow us to finish all of these appropriation bills by the August recess, provided that we were able to stick to that schedule. That schedule allocates about 7 to 8 hours of debate on all amendments on average for each bill.

The problem that I see here with this bill is that we already have amendments filed that will take at least 23 hours, and even if amendments are considered out of order, it still takes 10 minutes or so to dispose of each of those amendments.

So last week the majority leader and I met with my friend, the ranking member of the committee, and the minority leader, asking whether or not it would be possible to reach agreement on time and on the number of amendments offered so that we could finish this bill along the schedule that we had outlined; and at that time, the prospect did not seem too promising, if I can be polite about it.

And I would simply like to ask my friend from California at this point, before we get into this bill, whether, in light of the time squeeze that we have, whether the gentleman would be in a position to agree to a proposition that would, in fact, limit the number and the time of amendments to that amount of, or to that number and to that amount of time, that would enable us to cut that 23 hours down to about 7 or 8 hours?

And I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In exchange with my colleague, I was interested in

his commentary regarding the number of amendments in the past on this bill and other bills like it. I too am very concerned about the time difficulty that we are having. I'd much prefer to have us get back to regular order where we'd have open rules on these bills.

But at this point in time, because of the requirements of the majority, the preprinting requirements, et cetera, there are a lot of Members who are very frustrated by this bill, and they'd like to make some serious changes, but they find themselves in a position where they can't provide amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We can continue this exchange. There is, as a result of the change in the rules and the way we can provide amendments, there had been as many as 127 amendments preprinted on this bill, 104 of them by the minority who feel they've essentially been cut out of the process. And because of that, and because of the importance of the issues that are a part of this bill, I cannot agree to a time limitation.

I think the time limitation you were discussing was like for 8 hours or something. I'm afraid my conference might very well have a revolution on its hands, and you might have a new ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I thank the gentleman for his frankness. I regret the content of his response, but I do appreciate the fact that he is forthright and honest in laying out what the prospects would be.

And Mr. Speaker, I think that that presents a dilemma to the House, because we want to finish our business, and I would point out that the schedule that we've set out can be adhered to only if we can work out reasonable time limits with each of these bills.

And I would point out that what we're trying to do with that schedule is to allow ample time for discussion of these appropriation bills and also still leave time on the calendar to deal with the crucial issues of health care, of climate change and the military authorization bill, among others.

So I think at this point the House has a problem. And I hope that we will face up to it forthrightly, because I think we do have an obligation to try to get the people's business done on time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns about the bill before us today and about the lack of sufficient funding for NASA's next-generation human space flight.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us has a \$6.7 billion increase in spending over last year. That's a 12 percent increase over last year's spending.

And while the overall NASA budget gets a slight increase from last year, the budget for our Nation's next generation-human space flight vehicle constellation is cut by \$566 million.

While lawmakers can talk about supporting space exploration, the bottom line is that the United States will soon yield its preeminence in space to Russia after the last shuttle flight, currently scheduled for 2010. This legislation does nothing to avert America's human space flight gap.

Those who follow our Nation's space budget realize what's at risk. Soaring rhetoric and good intentions of playing financial catch-up later with space funding can easily surrender to other competing initiatives. Delays and studies are the road to the graveyard for many legislative proposals.

□ 1545

The bill's \$566 million cut for our next generation human spaceflight vehicle sends the wrong message to the hardworking men and women who are developing Constellation now. It sends the wrong message to college students who are seeking advanced engineering and science degrees. It tells them that human spaceflight is not really a priority in this country. This message will not go unnoticed in Beijing or in Moscow.

This Congress passed the stimulus bill in February, including an additional \$400 million for the Constellation program. Yet, today, the bill before us essentially takes all of that funding back and then some—poof—like a shell game. If the inadequate funding level for NASA that is contained in this bill is allowed to stand as it is, then our Nation's human spaceflight program will be dealt a very, very serious blow.

For a comparison, let's look at several of the spending items in the bill. The bill would increase funds for the COPS program by \$252 million over 2009, and this is on top of over \$1 billion in the stimulus bill. The bill spends \$7.4 billion on the census, an increase of \$4.2 billion over last year. The bill increases funding for the National Science Foundation by \$446 million over 2009 to promote scientific research by students. Yet it cuts funding for human spaceflight, a fountainhead of patents and scientific discovery.

I would say to the chairman of the subcommittee, I appreciate the work that you do and the challenges before you. Without a robust manned space program, the United States cannot maintain our leadership in space nor can we carry crews beyond low Earth orbit. It is for this reason that we must work to restore the funding that was cut from this program.

I look forward to working with you and with my colleagues over the next several months to restore the funding so that we can get our Nation's next human spaceflight vehicle back on track. A cut of this magnitude at this critical stage cannot and absolutely must not be allowed to stand.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, a former colleague from the Rules Committee (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from New York, for the time and for his leadership.

I also want to thank Chairman OBEY for all of the hard work he has put into developing this bill that will fund some of our Nation's most critical needs, including the funding for prisons, for law enforcement and for initiatives related to the southwest border, along with promoting important scientific research and development.

This bill provides \$30.6 billion for investments in science, technology and innovation, including \$6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation, whose grants in the past have allowed researchers in our colleges and universities to discover fundamental particles of matter, to develop carbon-14 dating of ancient artifacts and to decode the genetics of viruses, to name just a few.

It provides \$1 billion to science, technology and math education for our students, from graduate students all the way down through kindergarten. So we're going to educate our students for the future and will continue to be leaders in innovation in this global world.

It also invests \$781 million in the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is very important for the area that I represent. It provides for scientific and technical research services. Along with \$125 million for the manufacturing extension partnerships, we will be investing \$125 million to help small- and mid-sized manufacturers compete globally by providing them with technical advice and access to technology. As well, we will be leveraging private funds to save and create jobs. This program has been vital to the 13th District of Ohio, resulting in jobs that can be directly linked to it. We are also investing \$70 million to fund high-risk, high-reward research into areas of critical national need done by U.S. businesses, colleges and universities, and labs. That is through the Technology Innovation Program.

In addition, this bill provides much-needed funding for the Bureau of Prisons to protect American citizens. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in a 15-State study, over two-thirds of the released prisoners were re-arrested within 3 years. Now, with this in mind, the Bureau of Prisons is provided with \$6.2 billion to address long-standing critical shortages in corrections staffing, education and drug treatment, as well as an investment for Second Chance Act offender reentry programs.

The bill also provides the much-needed \$298 million for the COPS hiring program, which, when combined with the \$1 billion provided in the Recovery Act for the program, will put 7,000 new po-

lice officers on the streets of American communities, improving the safety for our constituents.

The ongoing drug violence on our southwest border is also addressed in this bill by providing funds for the DEA to combat the flow of illegal drugs across the border, for the ATF to reduce violent crime and to enforce Federal firearm and explosive laws, and for the department-wide Southwest Border Initiative to secure our border against violence and drug trafficking.

With all of that in mind, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues—and I know I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that I revere this institution.

220 years ago this summer, James Madison, following the urging of his constituents, came back to the House of Representatives, doing something that he actually opposed when he penned the U.S. Constitution: that being the implementation of the very important Bill of Rights, which is something that we as Americans spend a lot of time thinking about and which is something that the rest of the world looks to. There are people in Iran today who are looking at our Bill of Rights as they think about the need to pursue democracy and as they choose their leaders in their country. Peoples all over the world continue to look to our Bill of Rights. It was 220 years ago this summer that James Madison moved the Bill of Rights through this institution. I'm going to, next month, spend some time talking about that historic summer 220 years ago.

I say that simply to underscore the fact that I have such great regard for the precedents and for the rules of the House of Representatives, and I consider it a great privilege to serve with Mr. DIAZ-BALART, with Mr. ARCURI and with the other members who serve on the House Rules Committee. I take the work there very, very seriously.

I believe that we're at a troubling moment when it comes to the deliberative nature of this institution. We had the exchange that took place between the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on this process of filing amendments. We had a rigorous debate that took place in the Rules Committee yesterday about the fact that appropriations bills are considered as privileged.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, what that means is there is no need for a special rule for the consideration of appropriations bills. Constitutionally, it is a very important part of the process. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution makes it very clear that spending doesn't emanate from the White House; it emanates from the United States

Congress. By tradition, it begins here in the House of Representatives.

As I stand here, I'm thinking about conversations that I had with one of the greatest Members to ever serve here, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Natcher), who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee and who was the long-time chairman of the Health Subcommittee. I remember his saying to me that he believed appropriations bills should come to the floor without being considered with a special rule because they are considered as privileged; but the tradition over the past several decades has been that the need for a special rule would allow for the protection of the bill, meaning that points of order could not be raised against the work product of the Appropriations Committee and that we would then allow for an open amendment process, meaning that any Member could stand up here in the House and offer a germane amendment to the appropriations bill.

It is true that the appropriations process can be prolonged, and it has been in the past; but when we were in the majority, having presided regularly over the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill, I remember witnessing the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee or of the subcommittee come together and have an agreement that amendments would be addressed and that they would put an outside time limit for the consideration of those amendments.

Over my nearly three decades here, Mr. Speaker, I've seen that happen on a regular basis. Guess what? It has worked out pretty doggone well. Now, there are people who are disturbed over the fact that 127 amendments were filed yesterday at the Rules Committee to the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. That was not necessary. That was not necessary, and it would not have happened had we had the standard open amendment process for the consideration of measures.

Yes, there are a number of very important issues that I and my colleagues believe should be addressed in this appropriations bill. I will say that it could be done under an open amendment process, but unfortunately, the majority has decided to not only have a preprinting requirement but to set an arbitrary deadline so that, if appropriations bills may be considered more than a day or so later, one could not file additional amendments for the consideration of the measure. In our attempt to get a commitment that we would simply be able to allow Members to make germane modifications to their amendments, we have been denied that.

In fact, we had a vote in the Rules Committee last night. I know, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. This is very inside baseball. I know I may not be quite on message, but I think the message is a very clear one: It's fairness in dealing with the challenges that the American people are facing. So we had

a party-line vote, Mr. Speaker. We had this vote, and we were denied the opportunity to allow Members to even make germane modifications to amendments that had been submitted to the Rules Committee.

Now, Mr. DIAZ-BALART is going to make an attempt to defeat the previous question. This vote on the previous question is one that will simply say that we, as an institution, want the American people, through their elected Representatives, to have the chance to think about, to deliberate and to vote on the measures included in this appropriations bill and we hope in the other I guess it is 11 now appropriations bills, in addition to the one that we're considering here today.

It is a troubling pattern which undermines deliberative democracy. Now, it's not unusual, but it is very troubling. I don't know how many amendments would have been offered if we'd had an open amendment process; but guess what? I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, for a second that 127 amendments would have been offered. I think there would have been many, many fewer than that. When the Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, are told that they can't even make germane modifications to their amendments, there is little choice other than to have Members file many, many, many different amendments so that we will at least be able to allow this process to proceed.

Chairman OBEY referred to the fact that the issue of global climate change and the issue of health care are both issues that the Democratic majority wants to bring to the forefront in the next couple of months. We understand that elections have consequences, and those are issues that they clearly have a right to bring up. I want to address those issues. On our side, we want to address those issues in a slightly different way, but we don't believe that we should be addressing those issues at the expense of the very important process enshrined in article I, section 9 of the U.S. Constitution, and that is the power of the purse: the appropriations process.

□ 1600

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to join Mr. DIAZ-BALART, the gentleman from Miami, in attempting to defeat the previous question in the name of deliberative democracy so that we can allow elected representatives to in fact represent their constituents. And if by chance the previous question is passed, I am going to urge my colleagues to join in opposition to the rule because we can do a better job.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for sharing with us his thoughts. Clearly, his institutional knowledge of this grand institution is second to none. But there is one point that I think is important to clear up, and that is the fact that this bill has a preprinting requirement that

in no way, shape, fashion, or form means that anyone is precluded or prevented from filing an amendment. What it does, however, mean is that any amendment that an individual Representative files has to be filed by a certain period of time, and that was yesterday. That does one thing. And I would submit that that enables our constituents to have the very, very best legislation that they can because it does one thing, it gives the Representatives an opportunity to read that amendment to see what that amendment means and to have an opportunity to interpret it and determine whether or not it is the best thing for the bill or, in fact, whether it should be pulled.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCURI. If I could finish my thought.

So I would submit that, in fact, it is a good thing to have a preprinting requirement in this particular bill, and I would yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I appreciate his kind remarks. And I will say that the gentleman is relatively new to the institution. And I would say that, frankly, since the gentleman has been here, we have not really had as many open rules as we should. I know that there has been an attempt made to define a modified open rule as an open rule—

Mr. ARCURI. If I may reclaim my time—

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I look forward to getting some time from my friend from Miami.

Mr. ARCURI. The point of it is that this allows individuals to file. In fact, the fact that we have 127 amendments filed, much more than we've had in the past, certainly indicates that in fact Representatives have had an opportunity to file.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the Commerce, Justice and Science Subcommittee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to express my strong support for the Commerce, Justice and Science Appropriation bill and at the outset want to congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN for the extraordinary job that he has done in putting this bill together.

In particular, I want to highlight a couple of key investments in the bill in the areas of law enforcement and science.

In particular, we invest over \$800 million in the COPS program that has been very successful in putting additional cops on the beat and deterring criminal activity and keeping our communities safe. That is a vital investment. The legislation also makes a very important investment to those of us that live in the border States in a program called SCAP, which provides assistance to States that have to incarcerate illegal immigrants and bear the

costs of flaws in our Federal immigration policy.

Furthermore, the bill makes a very key investment, very substantial investments in DNA technology and backlog reduction. To the degree we can eliminate backlogs of DNA evidence, we can take murderers and rapists off the streets. Of this there is no question: you can tell from a statistical certainty that when you reduce backlogs, you take murderers and rapists off the streets and prevent them from committing further offenses. This is another key investment.

And, finally, let me speak to a science investment in the bill which I think is also very important and that is this legislation keeps some of our most important space science efforts, like the Mars program, on track, which has brought us new, unprecedented information about the world we live in that has led to scientific improvements and innovation here on the ground and is a vital investment in our Nation's future.

So I want to thank you, Chairman MOLLOHAN, for your extraordinary work on this bill, for the key investments in law enforcement and science, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my California colleague, the gentleman from Glendale, Mr. SCHIFF, for his thoughtful remarks. And I want to say that he and I share our commitment to NASA and the very important programs that take place at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. And that's the point. I mean, there are many important items in this bill which continue to be priorities.

I would like to say to my friend from Utica, who, again, is working very hard, he is very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, he has never had to serve in the United States House of Representatives as a member of the minority. My dream is that one day he might be able to serve as a member of the minority, and who knows how that will come out. I mean, it's always up to the voters to make that determination.

But I would say that those 127 amendments about which my friend referred and then I referred when I was in the well are amendments that I had to encourage our colleagues to file. Why? First, there were only 2 days, 2 legislative days, that this bill was out there. And if we had had an open amendment process, as I said, I can say with absolute certainty there would not be 127 amendments filed to this measure; again, maybe half that, maybe many fewer than that. And many of those amendments are duplicative. And the reason is that Members might find themselves in the same position as Mr.

BUYER did. And that's why I say my friend has served exclusively as a member of the majority; but if one day he is serving here as a member of the minority and were to receive the word that he could not make a minor, germane modification to his amendment, I think that he would understand the concern that we have.

Members on this side of the aisle represent just a little less than half of the American people. And they all have just as much right to be heard as Members of the majority. I recognize that the majority does rule in this place, but that does not mean that we should prevent Members from being able to participate in this process.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART has entered into the RECORD a document that was put forward in the 108th Congress by the now-chairwoman of the Committee on Rules, the then-ranking minority member. She, at that time, held the position that I have. And the document describes what we are using as our procedure for consideration of this measure as a "restrictive process."

Now, traditionally, Democrats and Republicans alike have called it a modified open rule. But the preprinting requirement, according to this document, blocks any amendment proposal that might emerge during the course of the debate. Now, those are not my words; those are the words of Ms. SLAUGHTER when she was ranking minority member on the Committee on Rules.

And so all I'm arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that in the name of deliberative democracy, this notion of saying that every Member has had an opportunity to look at this—2 legislative days—and the fact that 127 amendments were filed meant that there was this exhaustive analysis of the bill, I think, is not an accurate way to characterize it.

The 127 amendments were filed—I believe that many of those 127 amendments were filed because we are not having what has been the longstanding tradition allowed to Members of this House, and that is an open amendment process for consideration of the measure. And that's why, again, I urge my colleagues to vote with Mr. DIAZ-BALART in opposition to the previous question. And when that is defeated, make in order his amendment that would simply allow Members to have the right to make germane modifications to their amendments.

I also submit for the RECORD a copy of the announcement I posted on the Committee on Rules Republican web site, instructing Members of the restrictions created by a restrictive pre-printing rule and giving them guidance about how best to preserve their right to have amendments considered.

MAJORITY RESTRICTS AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Earlier today, the Majority announced that next week the House will consider H.R. _____, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

However, unlike consideration of virtually all of appropriations bills during the years of

the Republican Majority, the Democratic Majority has announced its intention to restrict the amendment process by requiring all amendments to be pre-printed in the Congressional Record by the end of the legislative day on June 15, 2009. Members should be aware that this deadline allows barely 2 legislative days to draft and submit amendments for printing.

This is a subtle—yet extremely significant—departure from the long-standing, bipartisan tradition of considering most of the regular appropriations bills under completely open rules. This change means—

Members must file their amendments by the deadline announced by the Majority, or they will not be able to offer their amendments;

If the amendment is not printed in the Congressional Record by the deadline (perhaps due to space limitations imposed by the Government Printing Office or other printing problems), Members will not be able to offer their amendments;

If the Office of Legislative Counsel is unable to keep up with the demand for drafting amendments by the deadline, those Members will be unable to offer their amendments;

If Members need to change their amendments during the process (for instance, if an offset is stricken by an earlier amendment), they will not be permitted to do so;

If a bill is considered over multiple days, Members will not be able to offer amendments if they are printed after the deadline announced by the Majority, even if the bill is still being debated;

In many cases, Members will have to file amendments without the benefit of a review by the Office of the Parliamentarian or the Congressional Budget Office, and may not receive early notice on possible points of order; and,

If Members need to change their own amendments to correct technical errors or reflect a negotiated change, they will not be permitted to do so, except through unanimous consent. The Majority has demonstrated that it is openly hostile to allowing Members to make technical corrections on the floor after an amendment has been printed.

Members and staff are encouraged to watch the video on our website entitled "The Problem with Pre-Printing" which demonstrates some of the problems that can arise from a pre-printing rule. You may also wish to review the materials dealing with appropriations bills which are part of our Parliamentary Boot Camp educational series and our fact sheet on pre-printing amendments in the Congressional Record.

In order to assist Members in bringing their ideas to the floor even with this restrictive amendment process, the Rules Committee Republicans suggest the following:

1. Make sure the amendments are printed by the deadline. This is the most important element of a pre-printing rule. Unlike years past, where the rule simply required that the amendment be printed in the Congressional Record at any point during consideration of the bill, the Democratic Majority has set hard deadlines for pre-printing, meaning that you may be deprived of the opportunity to offer your amendment if you miss the deadline, even when the bill is considered on multiple days.

2. Coordinate with the Republican staff of the Appropriations Committee. They will do their best to advise you on possible procedural problems (including compliance with the Budget Act), even if they disagree with the substance of your amendment.

3. File multiple versions of amendments. If you are concerned about possible points of order that may lie against your amendment,

such as budget act violations, violations of "legislating on appropriations bills," or other similar points of order, you should file multiple versions of the amendment to give yourself options if you want to offer it. If it is not printed, it cannot be offered.

4. In a pinch, don't be afraid to draft your own amendment. While the Office of Legislative Counsel provides excellent, nonpartisan advice and drafting services, they are not always able to provide drafted amendments by the printing deadline. If they are unable to provide assistance by the deadline, prepare the amendment in your own office and submit it. While it is advisable, there is no requirement that amendments be drafted by the Office of Legislative Counsel.

5. Amendments should be drafted with relative references instead of page and line numbers. The Majority has posted the text of the bill on the Rules Committee's website, but this is not the final version of the bill. When printed by GPO, the page and line numbers will likely change. By drafting references relative to the rest of the bill (i.e., "In the second sentence of the paragraph captioned . . .") you will protect yourself against changes resulting from the printing process.

6. Consult with the Parliamentarians, CBO, and the Budget Committee. Even if an amendment is printed in the Record by the deadline, it is still subject to potential points of order or Budget Act violations. However, if you cannot get an answer from these offices by the deadline, you should still file the amendment for pre-printing and continue to pursue your inquiries.

The Republican staff of the Committee on Rules stands ready to assist your offices in dealing with this restrictive amendment process. Should you have any questions, please contact the Republican staff of the Committee on Rules at x5-9191.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce, Justice and Science Subcommittee, Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I think it is a fair rule and comprehensive. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the effort that went into fashioning this bill, which was very exhaustive and very inclusive of all parties.

During the review process, Mr. Speaker, for this bill, the fiscal year 2010 budget request for the Commerce, Justice and Science and Related Agencies Appropriation bill, the subcommittee had a total of 24 budget hearings. I understand that we didn't get the budget request until late this year, but we had budget hearings even before we got the request and budget hearings even after we got the request.

The subcommittee received testimony from Members of Congress—many Members of Congress inducted this process early on before we marked up—and some 68 outside witnesses. This testimony was crucial to our fashioning the bill, and the thoughts and the concerns of those who contributed are incorporated in this bill. In addition, officials of the administration representing all of the Departments in the bill one way or another inducted the legislation by testimony or otherwise.

And this year in particular, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee focused on a series of hearings on investments for all facets of the scientific enterprise—climate science and mitigation—as well as prisoner reentry programs, recidivism reduction, and criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, we focused on some of those areas because we felt that in the past there had been neglect, and that we needed, for our economy and also for just appropriate operation of these agencies, that additional funding was needed.

In brief, the bill totals \$64.4 billion, which is an increase of \$6.7 billion over last year, and it's \$200 million below the President's request. The bill provides \$30.6 billion for investments in science, technology, and innovation, an increase of \$1 billion over comparable levels from last year.

I think there is a consensus that investments in science technology and investments in innovation are comparable to economic development necessary for us as we prepare for the new economy, as we work our way out of the recession that we find ourselves in. Investments in the new economy are crucial, and this committee that funds science is at the center in the critical path of that effort.

Within this level, the bill provides \$6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation and \$18.2 billion for NASA. For NIST, the bill provides \$781 million, and NOAA is recommended at \$4.6 billion. The committee's recommendation continues to provide the resources consistent with the doubling path identified.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. It also considers the science and research conducted at NOAA and NASA as critical to the Nation's science enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for fashioning a rule that recognizes, first, the welcoming input that this committee has had from our colleagues throughout the process. The minority has been fully a part of the process. We very much appreciate Mr. WOLF's contribution to the bill. Many of his thoughts—I can't think of one that's not incorporated in the legislation one way or another. He was a former chairman of this subcommittee, and therefore his contribution and his insight is particularly beneficial, and we appreciate that contribution.

I support the rule, Mr. Speaker, and hope that our colleagues will as well.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Again, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his ongoing leadership, and that of the Rules Committee.

I join with the chairman of the Subcommittee on CJS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, in congratulating the Rules Committee for constructing this rule, but I also congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF for a constructive overview of important issues that, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have great concern about.

And so I rise to support the rule, but I also want to offer my underlying support for the Community Oriented Policing bill. I was an original cosponsor on the COPS bill out of Judiciary, led by Mr. WEINER. This is an important stopgap for crime across America helping our law enforcement.

As an original long-standing supporter of the Office on Violence Against Women and the VAWA Act, starting with Chairman Hyde, who served so ably in this body, I am delighted to see that we have \$11 million more than 2009, with \$400 million.

□ 1615

In addition, it is important to note the Second Chance Act. Wherever I go, Mr. Speaker, I'm having ex-offenders who want to straighten their life out, who want to get back with their families, who need mental health services, and they truly need to have the second chance. I hope that we can ensure that this makes it through the Senate, comes into conference, and we get this money out so that we can redeem Americans who want to get back on the right track. This is an important issue to be involved in.

I also want to speak about an issue that is very near and dear. I am a member of the NASA Action Team. And we note that the space exploration, human spaceflight, has gotten a mark out of this committee of \$400 million less than the President's mark. First, I'm delighted that the President has nominated General Bolden, who is in line to be the next NASA Director. But to my colleagues, it is important to note that we're not just talking about money going into space; we're talking about the International Space Station, which I have watched being built in my 12 years as a member of the Health Science Committee.

We have an opportunity now to be at the cutting edge of climate research, the cutting edge of health care research and heart disease, HIV, and cancer on the International Space Station. The only way we can communicate visibly and reasonably to provide that kind of human component, human resources, is to have human spaceflight.

So I ask my colleagues, as we consider this bill, to consider the fact that it is not, in essence, money that flies into space but real investment in America's genius and America's science, America's innovation, America's job creation, the very message of this President.

I'm disappointed that this mark is less than the President's mark and would hope to be able to present my

side of the story, if you will, to this august body. But I want to work with my colleagues to ensure that we know that this is out of sincerity and recognition of the vitality of science. I'm very pleased with the money that has been put into climate measures, money put into NOAA because I come from the gulf region.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I realize how important it is to have these other elements of science. As I indicated, the \$1.3 billion, including \$150 million to deal with space-based climate measurements, is important. For those of us who are in the gulf region, the issues dealing with hurricanes and climate control and NOAA are very important, and the National Science Foundation.

But let us work together as we look at science in its totality to view the International Space Station as something we created, something we built. This massive football field that is in space is a miracle, in essence. Let's utilize it in a vital way by supporting our human spaceflight.

I thank my colleagues and I ask my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Mr. ARCURI for his courtesy and all who have participated in the debate on the rule for bringing this appropriations bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow Members who have preprinted their amendments, as specified in the rule, to make germane modifications to their amendments.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, this restrictive rule we are considering today will not allow Members from amending their own amendments, even if they are simply trying to correct a minor drafting error or make changes to the amendment to comply with the rules of the House. One of the reasons we have so many amendments filed is because Members have filed duplicative amendments to avoid the possibility of errors such as this.

In order to make sure an amendment complies with the rules of the House, Members must consult with four different offices: the Office of the Legislative Counsel, the Parliamentarian, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Budget Committee. If any of those offices find an issue with an amendment, then the Member has to make changes to the amendment. This becomes particularly difficult when Members are only given an average of 2 legislative days to draft their amendments and consult all the relevant offices and make changes and then consult with the offices again. Given this scenario, it is quite plausible that a Member didn't have enough time and included a

minor drafting error and that, for example, is not caught until it is too late. We saw it last year with an amendment by Mr. BUYER on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. So as to not have a repeat of that unfortunate incident, I propose to change the rule to allow Members to make germane changes to their amendments.

I remind Members that by voting "no" on the previous question, Members will not be voting to kill or to delay the underlying Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question so that Members will be given the opportunity to make changes to their amendments if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for his courtesies in this debate and for his very able management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, on my opening remarks, I chose to focus on the criminal justice programs that are funded under H.R. 2847, but there are many other important areas addressed in this legislation, and we have heard about many of those during the debate. In closing, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss another of these that is of utmost importance to America.

The bill includes \$293 million for the Economic Development Administration, which is \$20 million above the amount enacted in 2009. The EDA administers several economic programs, including public works grants for upgrading infrastructure, planning, and trade adjustment assistance for communities that bear the burden of jobs outsourced to other countries.

H.R. 2847 includes more than \$158 million for the Economic Development Administration's Public Works Program, \$25 million more than last year. H.R. 2847 also makes critical investments in scientific research and NASA's space program. The bill includes \$6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation. This level of funding will support the doubling of NSF's budget over the next 10 years and represents a true commitment to investment in basic research and development which will provide for innovation and future technologies to help the United States be competitive.

H.R. 2847 includes over \$18.2 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's unique mission is to pioneer the future in space

exploration, scientific discovery in aeronautics research, and this appropriation enables them to accomplish this mission. This recommendation also provides for the continued efforts of NASA's Mars exploration and provides funds for the completion of the Mars science laboratory to launch in 2011. Exploration has always been critical to mankind. We live in America today because of exploration. We must continue to explore the new frontier for future generations.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that so far we have discussed only a handful of the important programs that are funded by the fiscal year 2010 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2847. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 544 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

On page 2, line 21, after "if printed," insert the following new sentence, "The proponent of each such amendment may make germane modifications to such amendment."

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the

Rules Committee in the 109th Congress (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 545, by the yeas and nays;

ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544, by the yeas and nays;

adoption of House Resolution 544, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 545, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie	Green, Al	Oberstar
Ackerman	Green, Gene	Obey
Adler (NJ)	Griffith	Olver
Altmire	Grijalva	Ortiz
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pallone
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Pascrell
Baca	Halvorson	Pastor (AZ)
Baird	Hare	Payne
Baldwin	Harman	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Perriello
Becerra	Herseeth Sandlin	Peters
Berman	Higgins	Peterson
Berry	Hill	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Polis (CO)
Bishop (NY)	Hinchev	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bocieri	Hirono	Quigley
Boren	Hodes	Rahall
Boswell	Holden	Rangel
Boucher	Holt	Reyes
Boyd	Honda	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Inslee	Ross
Bright	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Capps	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Kagen	Sarbanes
Carney	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Schauer
Castor (FL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schiff
Chandler	Kilroy	Schrader
Childers	Kind	Schwartz
Clarke	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Scott (GA)
Clay	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Clyburn	Kosmas	Sestak
Cohen	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Costa	Lipinski	Skelton
Costello	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lowe y	Snyder
Cuellar	Lujan	Space
Cummings	Lynch	Speier
Dahlkemper	Maffei	Spratt
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Stark
Davis (CA)	Markey (CO)	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Markey (MA)	Sutton
Davis (TN)	Marshall	Tanner
DeFazio	Massa	Tauscher
DeGette	Matheson	Taylor
Delahunt	Matsui	Teague
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Tierney
Doggett	McIntyre	Titus
Donnelly (IN)	McMahon	Tonko
Doyle	McNerney	Towns
Driehaus	Meek (FL)	Tsongas
Edwards (MD)	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Edwards (TX)	Melancon	Velázquez
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Ellsworth	Miller, George	Walz
Engel	Mollohan	Wasserman
Eshoo	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Etheridge	Moore (WI)	Watson
Farr	Moran (VA)	Watt
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Foster	Murphy (NY)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Murphy, Patrick	Welch
Fudge	Murtha	Wexler
Giffords	Nadler (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Neal (MA)	Wu
Grayson	Nye	Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Akin	Bartlett	Bishop (UT)
Austria	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Bachmann	Biggert	Blunt
Bachus	Bilbray	Boehner

Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Bono Mack	Heinrich	Neugebauer
Boozman	Heller	Nunes
Boustany	Hensarling	Olson
Brady (TX)	Herger	Paul
Broun (GA)	Hoekstra	Paulsen
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Petri
Brown-Waite,	Inglis	Pitts
Ginny	Issa	Platts
Buchanan	Jenkins	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Buyer	Jones	Putnam
Calvert	Jordan (OH)	Radanovich
Camp	Kaptur	Rehberg
Campbell	King (IA)	Reichert
Cantor	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Cao	Kingsston	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Kirk	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Kratovil	Rohrabacher
Carter	Kucinich	Rooney
Cassidy	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Castle	Lance	Roskam
Chaffetz	Latham	Royce
Coble	LaTourette	Rush
Coffman (CO)	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Lee (NY)	Scalise
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Linder	Schock
Culberson	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Sessions
Deal (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Shadegg
Dent	Lummis	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Simpson
Dreier	Mack	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Souder
Fallin	Flake	Stearns
Filner	McClintock	Terry
Flake	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McHenry	Thornberry
Forbes	McHugh	Tiahrt
Fortenberry	McKeon	Tiberi
Foxo	McMorris	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walden
Gallegly	Michaud	Wamp
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Waters
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Gohmert	Minnick	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Granger	Wittman
Graves	Graves	Mitchell
Guthrie	Guthrie	Moran (KS)
Harper	Harper	Murphy, Tim
		Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Bean	Lewis (GA)	T.
Berkley	McDermott	Sullivan
Hall (TX)	Pence	Young (FL)
Kennedy		

□ 1648

Messrs. McHUGH, McKEON, KINGSTON, SESSIONS, and RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 345, H. Res. 545, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 544, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 176, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Griffith	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Grijalva	Nye
Adler (NJ)	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Altmire	Hall (NY)	Obey
Andrews	Halvorson	Olver
Arcuri	Hare	Ortiz
Baca	Harman	Pallone
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Baldwin	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Herseeth Sandlin	Payne
Bean	Higgins	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hill	Perriello
Berman	Himes	Peters
Berry	Hinchev	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Hodes	Pomeroy
Bocieri	Holden	Price (NC)
Boren	Holt	Quigley
Boswell	Honda	Rahall
Boucher	Hoyer	Rangel
Boyd	Inslee	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Bright	Jackson-Lee	Rothman (NJ)
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Capuano	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Salazar
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Kildee	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kilroy	Schauer
Chandler	Kind	Schiff
Childers	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schrader
Clarke	Kissell	Schwartz
Clay	Klein (FL)	Scott (GA)
Cleaver	Kosmas	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kratovil	Serrano
Cohen	Kucinich	Sestak
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Costa	Levin	Sires
Costello	Lipinski	Skelton
Courtney	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowe y	Snyder
Dahlkemper	Lujan	Space
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Speier
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Stark
Davis (TN)	Markey (CO)	Stupak
DeFazio	Markey (MA)	Sutton
DeGette	Marshall	Tanner
Delahunt	Massa	Tauscher
DeLauro	Matheson	Taylor
Dicks	Matsui	Teague
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Titus
Driehaus	McIntyre	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McMahon	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McNerney	Tsongas
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Melancon	Visclosky
Eshoo	Michaud	Walz
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Mitchell	Watson
Filner	Mollohan	Watt
Foster	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Fudge	Moran (VA)	Welch
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murphy (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Grayson	Murtha	Wu
Green, Al	Nadler (NY)	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Napolitano	

NAYS—176

Aderholt	Austria	Bachus
Akin	Bachmann	Barrett (SC)

Bartlett	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Baca	Hare	Oberstar	Dreier	LaTourette	Putnam
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Myrick	Baird	Harman	Obey	Duncan	Latta	Radanovich
Biggart	Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Oliver	Ehlers	Lee (NY)	Rehberg
Bilbray	Granger	Nunes	Barrow	Heinrich	Ortiz	Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Reichert
Bilirakis	Graves	Olson	Bean	Herseht Sandlin	Pallone	Fallin	Linder	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Paul	Becerra	Higgins	Pascrell	Flake	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Paulsen	Berman	Hill	Pastor (AZ)	Fleming	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Blunt	Harper	Pence	Berry	Himes	Payne	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Petri	Bishop (GA)	Hinchoy	Perlmutter	Fortenberry	Lummis	Rohrabacher
Bonner	Heller	Pitts	Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Perriello	Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Rooney
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Platts	Blumenauer	Hirono	Peters	Franks (AZ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Hergert	Poe (TX)	Bocieri	Hodes	Peterson	Frelinghuysen	Mack	Roskam
Boustany	Hoekstra	Posey	Boren	Holden	Pingree (ME)	Gallely	Manzullo	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Price (GA)	Boswell	Holt	Polis (CO)	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Broun (GA)	Inglis	Putnam	Boucher	Honda	Pomeroy	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Brown (SC)	Issa	Radanovich	Boyd	Hoyer	Price (NC)	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Schmidt
Brown-Waite,	Jenkins	Rehberg	Brady (PA)	Inslee	Quigley	Gohmert	McClintock	Schock
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Reichert	Braley (IA)	Israel	Rahall	Goodlatte	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	Bright	Jackson (IL)	Granger	Granger	McHenry	Sessions
Burgess	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Reyes	Graves	McHugh	Shadegg
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Butterfield	(TX)	Richardson	Guthrie	McKeon	Shimkus
Buyer	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)	Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez	Hall (TX)	McMorris	Shuster
Calvert	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Ross	Harper	Rodgers	Simpson
Camp	Kingston	Rooney	Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)	Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NE)
Campbell	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen	Carney	Kagen	Roybal-Allard	Heller	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Roskam	Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger	Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Cao	Lamborn	Roskam	Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rush	Hergert	Miller, Gary	Souder
Capito	Lance	Royce	Chandler	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	Hoekstra	Minnick	Stearns
Carter	Latham	Ryan (WI)	Chidlers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar	Moran (KS)	Moran (KS)	Terry
Cassidy	LaTourette	Scalise	Clarke	Kilroy	Sanchez, Loretta	Inglis	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (PA)
Castle	Latta	Schock	Clay	Kind	Sarbanes	Issa	Myrick	Thornberry
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Sensenbrenner	Cleaver	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schakowsky	Jenkins	Neugebauer	Tiaht
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Sessions	Clyburn	Kissell	Schauer	Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Tiberi
Coffman (CO)	Linder	Shadegg	Cohen	Klein (FL)	Schiff	Jones	Olson	Turner
Cole	LoBiondo	Shimkus	Connolly (VA)	Kosmas	Schrader	Jordan (OH)	Paul	Upton
Conaway	Lucas	Shuster	Conyers	Kratovil	Schwartz	King (IA)	Paulsen	Walden
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Simpson	Cooper	Kucinich	Scott (GA)	King (NY)	Pence	Wamp
Culberson	Lummis	Smith (NE)	Costa	Langevin	Scott (VA)	Kingston	Petri	Westmoreland
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NJ)	Costello	Larsen (WA)	Serrano	Kirk	Pitts	Whitfield
Deal (GA)	E.	Smith (TX)	Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sestak	Kline (MN)	Platts	Wilson (SC)
Dent	Mack	Souder	Crowley	Levin	Shea-Porter	Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Wittman
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Stearns	Cuellar	Lipinski	Sherman	Lance	Posey	Wolf
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Terry	Cummings	Loeb sack	Shuler	Latham	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)	Dahlkemper	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires			
Duncan	McCaul	Thornberry	Davis (AL)	Lowey	Skelton			
Ehlers	McClintock	Tiaht	Davis (CA)	Lujan	Slaughter	Alexander	Kennedy	Sullivan
Emerson	McCotter	Tiberi	Davis (IL)	Lynch	Smith (WA)	Berkley	Larson (CT)	Walz
Fallin	McHenry	Turner	Davis (TN)	Maffei	Snyder	Boozman	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)
Flake	McHugh	Upton	DeFazio	Maloney	Space	Carnahan	Sánchez, Linda	
Fleming	McKeon	Walden	DeGette	Markey (CO)	Speier	Green, Gene	T.	
Forbes	McMorris	Wamp	Delahunt	Markey (MA)	Spratt			
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Westmoreland	DeLauro	Marshall	Stark			
Fox	Mica	Whitfield	Dicks	Massa	Stupak			
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Dingell	Matheson	Sutton			
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wittman	Doggett	Matsui	Tanner			
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wolf	Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher			
Garrett (NJ)	Minnick	Young (AK)	Doyle	McCollum	Taylor			
Gerlach	Moran (KS)		Drie haus	McDermott	Teague			
			Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Thompson (CA)			
			Edwards (TX)	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)			
			Ellison	McMahon	Tierney			
			Ellsworth	McNerney	Titus			
			Engel	Meek (FL)	Tonko			
			Eshoo	Meeke (NY)	Towns			
			Etheridge	Melancon	Tsongas			
			Farr	Michaud	Van Hollen			
			Fattah	Miller (NC)	Velázquez			
			Filner	Miller, George	Visclosky			
			Foster	Mitchell	Wasserman			
			Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Schultz			
			Fudge	Moore (KS)	Waters			
			Giffords	Moore (WI)	Watson			
			Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Watt			
			Gordon (TN)	Murphy (CT)	Waxman			
			Grayson	Murphy (NY)	Weiner			
			Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick	Welch			
			Griffith	Murtha	Wexler			
			Grijalva	Nadler (NY)	Wilson (OH)			
			Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey			
			Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)	Wu			
			Halvorson	Nye	Yarmuth			

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Berkley	Lewis (GA)	T.
Cuellar	Reyes	Sullivan
Kennedy		Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1656

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 174, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Adler (NJ)	Andrews
Ackerman	Altmire	Arcuri

Baca	Hare	Oberstar	Dreier	LaTourette	Putnam
Baird	Harman	Obey	Duncan	Latta	Radanovich
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Oliver	Ehlers	Lee (NY)	Rehberg
Barrow	Heinrich	Ortiz	Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Reichert
Bean	Herseht Sandlin	Pallone	Fallin	Linder	Roe (TN)
Becerra	Higgins	Pascrell	Flake	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Berman	Hill	Pastor (AZ)	Fleming	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Berry	Himes	Payne	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Hinchoy	Perlmutter	Fortenberry	Lummis	Rohrabacher
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Perriello	Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Rooney
Blumenauer	Hirono	Peters	Franks (AZ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Bocieri	Hodes	Peterson	Frelinghuysen	Mack	Roskam
Boren	Holden	Pingree (ME)	Gallely	Manzullo	Royce
Boswell	Holt	Polis (CO)	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Boucher	Honda	Pomeroy	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Boyd	Hoyer	Price (NC)	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Schmidt
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Quigley	Gohmert	McClintock	Schock
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rahall	Goodlatte	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Bright	Jackson (IL)	Granger	Granger	McHenry	Sessions
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Reyes	Graves	McHugh	Shadegg
Butterfield	(TX)	Richardson	Guthrie	McKeon	Shimkus
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez	Hall (TX)	McMorris	Shuster
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Ross	Harper	Rodgers	Simpson
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)	Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NE)
Carney	Kagen	Roybal-Allard	Heller	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger	Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rush	Hergert	Miller, Gary	Souder
Chandler	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	Hoekstra	Minnick	Stearns
Chidlers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar	Moran (KS)	Moran (KS)	Terry
Clarke	Kilroy	Sanchez, Loretta	Inglis	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (PA)
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes	Issa	Myrick	Thornberry
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schakowsky	Jenkins	Neugebauer	Tiaht
Clyburn	Kissell	Schauer	Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Tiberi
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Schiff	Jones	Olson	Turner
Connolly (VA)	Kosmas	Schrader	Jordan (OH)	Paul	Upton
Conyers	Kratovil	Schwartz	King (IA)	Paulsen	Walden
Cooper	Kucinich	Scott (GA)	King (NY)	Pence	Wamp
Costa	Langevin	Scott (VA)	Kingston	Petri	Westmoreland
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Serrano	Kirk	Pitts	Whitfield
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sestak	Kline (MN)	Platts	Wilson (SC)
Crowley	Levin	Shea-Porter	Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Wittman
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sherman	Lance	Posey	Wolf
Cummings	Loeb sack	Shuler	Latham	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Dahlkemper	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires			
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Skelton			
Davis (CA)	Lujan	Slaughter	Alexander	Kennedy	Sullivan
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Smith (WA)	Berkley	Larson (CT)	Walz
Davis (TN)	Maffei	Snyder	Boozman	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)
DeFazio	Maloney	Space	Carnahan	Sánchez, Linda	
DeGette	Markey (CO)	Speier	Green, Gene	T.	
Delahunt	Markey (MA)	Spratt			
DeLauro	Marshall	Stark			
Dicks	Massa	Stupak			
Dingell	Matheson	Sutton			
Doggett	Matsui	Tanner			
Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher			
Doyle	McCollum	Taylor			
Drie haus	McDermott	Teague			
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Thompson (CA)			
Edwards (TX)	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)			
Ellison	McMahon	Tierney			
Ellsworth	McNerney	Titus			
Engel	Meek (FL)	Tonko			
Eshoo	Meeke (NY)	Towns			
Etheridge	Melancon	Tsongas			
Farr	Michaud	Van Hollen			
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Velázquez			
Filner	Miller, George	Visclosky			
Foster	Mitchell	Wasserman			
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Schultz			
Fudge	Moore (KS)	Waters			
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Watson			
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Watt			
Gordon (TN)	Murphy (CT)	Waxman			
Grayson	Murphy (NY)	Weiner			
Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick	Welch			
Griffith	Murtha	Wexler			
Grijalva	Nadler (NY)	Wilson (OH)			
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey			
Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)	Wu			
Halvorson	Nye	Yarmuth			

NAYS—174

Bono Mack	Capito
Boustany	Carter
Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Broun (GA)	Castle
Brown (SC)	Chaffetz
Brown-Waite,	Coble
Ginny	Coffman (CO)
Buchanan	Cole
Burgess	Conaway
Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Buyer	Culberson
Calvert	Davis (KY)
Camp	Deal (GA)
Campbell	Dent
Cantor	Diaz-Balart, L.
Cao	Diaz-Balart, M.

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander	Kennedy	Sullivan
Berkley	Larson (CT)	Walz
Boozman	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)
Carnahan	Sánchez, Linda	
Green, Gene	T.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1702

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So 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. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 347, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

REPORT ON H.R. 2892, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-157) on the bill (H.R. 2892) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346,
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 545, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 12, 2009, at page H6683.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last of last year's business. We have a huge amount of work that we have to do before the August recess. We have to pass all 12 appropriation bills, we have to make time on the schedule for health care reform, for the military authorization bill, and for historic climate change legislation. I just think we ought to get on with it.

I think everybody understands what is in this bill, and the sooner we can get on with it, the sooner we can get on with this year's business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we at least for now appear to be returning to regular order on appropriations bills as we deal with this emergency supplemental that is before us. However, I must confess to being disappointed at the turn this final product has taken in recent days as compared to where we began with our original House-passed bill. The majority has chosen to go to the high-dollar level for every account in this conference report, except as it relates to the primary purpose of the legislation, the critical troop funding in the Department of Defense and Military Construction accounts.

My understanding of the final conference agreement is that it cuts the House level for DOD and MilCon by \$4.6 billion. More disconcerting is that the final package includes \$5 billion for IMF funding that was not a part of the original House package. This \$5 billion for foreign aid will secure a whopping \$108 billion in loans.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, this is such an important message and important piece of legislation, I think it is important that our constituents, as well as our colleagues, pay careful attention to this debate.

In essence, in this package the IMF is funded at a level almost \$30 billion more than what is provided for our

troops, which supposedly was what this bill was all about. What began as a troop funding bill has become a means of fulfilling the President's promise to provide more IMF funding, or foreign aid, for international bailouts.

If that isn't bad enough, the conference agreement also includes \$1 billion in emergency spending for the Cash for Clunkers program that was not a part of either the House or the Senate package, nor was it requested by the President.

I understand the conferees have dropped the Graham-Lieberman-McCain language relating to the release of detainee photos. The conferees have also significantly watered down language relating to the release or transfer of detainees at Guantanamo Bay. This is an issue that is and will continue to be of great concern to many of us, as well as the American people.

Just last week, the President approved having a Guantanamo detainee transferred to New York City and ordered the release and transfer of four Uyghers to Bermuda. The President appears to be racing to move these detainees to their new homes before Congress can act substantively on the issue of closing Guantanamo.

During last week's conference meeting, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. GRANGER and I offered several amendments. The first, offered by Ms. GRANGER, sought approval of the Senate provision prohibiting the release of detainee photos. The second motion, offered by Mr. YOUNG, insisted upon the higher House funding level for DOD and MilCon spending in this conference agreement. And the third motion, which I offered, insisted upon agreeing to section 202(a) and section 315 of the Senate bill prohibiting the transfer or release of Guantanamo detainees. All three amendments were defeated in a party-line vote by the House conferees.

As I prepare to close, let me make one additional point. Much has been made about the total cost of this emergency supplemental. I note for the record that the final conference agreement is \$106 billion, which is \$14 billion more than the President's request, \$9 billion more than the House-passed bill, and \$15 billion more than the Senate-passed level.

Again, we have increased funding for everything in this bill except for the troops. Arguments about maintaining some level of fiscal responsibility certainly ring hollow when we lard up a troop funding bill with taxpayer dollars to support foreign aid for hostile governments and cash for cars past their prime. This is a troubling pattern that is being repeated in many of our funding bills this year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that a process that began in a spirit of bipartisanship has concluded in such a partisan manner. We began as a united, bipartisan House seeking to support our troops, but have ended this process by appeasing the very Members who

opposed this emergency funding in the first place.

I strongly support our troops, but cannot and will not support an international bailout for hostile regimes disguised as a troop funding bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2346.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would simply note in light of the gentleman's comments on the IMF that in 1999, the last time we voted on it, the IMF funding was attached to the Transportation bill and 162 Republicans voted for it. They didn't seem to have any problem at that time. I find it interesting that today, with a different President, they do.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the ranking member.

The distinguished chairman of the committee said we know what is in this bill. That may or may not be accurate, but we certainly know what is not in this bill. The conferees ignored the specific instructions of a bipartisan vote to include instructions to protect the detainee photos of alleged abuses that went on in our custody.

Mr. Speaker, the protection of these photos, to prevent their release, requires a legislative fix, in my view. I don't believe the President has full authority to stand against the judicial branch, so we need to protect these photos from release.

Even the court has recognized the validity of the claims of harm that would come from release of these photos, whether it is recruitment of additional jihadists or inflaming the current jihadists into doing things they might not otherwise have done, but also perhaps squelch the growing protests in Iran if we were to release the photos showing this abuse. Think back to the cartoon that was released in the Danish paper that insulted Mohammad and the overreaction to that cartoon. Think what the release of these photos would do to our relationships.

The military leadership, Generals Odierno and Petraeus, both oppose the release of these photos. They have persuaded Secretary Gates and President Obama to change their original position, and they too now oppose the release of these photos.

The release of these photos will serve no good purpose. They will get young

Americans hurt that don't need to get hurt. I am disappointed that the conferees did not include the instructions that we specifically gave them to protect these photos from disclosure.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the finest whip Virginia has ever produced.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. America has the best military in the world. I think all of us who have traveled and who have seen the commitment of our Armed Forces are overwhelmed by their patriotism. The success of our military has much to do with the character and the courage of the men and women in uniform who fight every single day for our freedom.

□ 1715

And what we can do, as Members of this Congress, to speak to that courage and that commitment on the part of those men and women is to stand up and to remove politics from bills affecting their ability to execute on their mission to protect us.

Mr. Speaker, we can pass a bipartisan bill. This House has shown several weeks ago, we passed a bill with a 368-60 vote, clearly, a bipartisan bill sending the message that this Congress stood for our troops and nothing got in the way.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we now find a conference report that will make its way to this House that is vastly different from the bill approved in a bipartisan way.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, the provisions in the conference report that will make its way to this floor seem to put the rights of terrorists before the security of Americans. When we see that this body somehow wants to remove language prohibiting the transfer of detainees at Guantanamo Bay to U.S. soil, when this House allows for that transfer, what that says is we are willing to take on untold risk at the expense of the security of the people that our troops are trying to protect.

Next, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the conferees take out language that would prohibit the release of photographs that we know will endanger the lives of our troops. Our commander on the ground in Iraq, General Odierno, was very clear in his admonition several weeks ago when he said our troops will be put in greater harm's way, and specific units will have enhanced danger immediately, if these photographs are allowed to be released.

And I know that the majority says that we've got protections, that the White House will stand up and not allow for their release. But at the end of the day, we have the ability to stop it and to act now.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. CANTOR. And I ask that this House stand up, act now, and make sure that these photos don't make their ways to brochures for recruitment of al Qaeda or make their way on to Internet sites to help attract more terrorists in the fight against our troops.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, to burden our troops with \$108 billion of a loan guarantee to a global bailout is not putting our troops first. That's putting politics before our troops, and that's unacceptable to the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) a member of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the defense portion of the supplemental were considered as a stand-alone legislation it would receive my support and the majority of those on this side of the aisle. We recognize that we need to provide our deployed men and women, all volunteers, with the funding and resources they need to accomplish their important ongoing missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. But unfortunately, the majority has added items to this measure totally unrelated to these wars.

First, the much-debated IMF provision, which interestingly enough, allows our country drawing rights for the first time in the history of the IMF.

Secondly, the majority stripped language from this bill that would have prevented release of photographs of detainees, thus endangering U.S. citizens and members of our own Armed Forces overseas.

Thirdly, the majority inserted watered-down language on the closing of Guantanamo Bay, allowing for these dangerous prisoners to be brought to the U.S. for trial 45 days after the Obama administration submits certain paperwork to Congress. These all represent reasons to vote "no," to send this legislation back to the drawing board, and to come back with a straightforward bill that supports our troops.

But I want to use this time to talk about the direction of our national security funding, our defense spending. If you believe the administration, this will be the last supplemental appropriations bill to fund our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, even though our forces will remain in Iraq for a significant number of years and our efforts in Afghanistan are just now ramping up.

The administration says it's putting such costs for future soldier needs into the base appropriations bill. However, it doesn't take a green eyeshade to determine that the administration's request, combined with the rate of infla-

tion, essentially adds up to no growth. We're standing still. We're treading water.

And in a world where the North Koreans threaten conventional nuclear war, Russia is becoming more resurgent and aggressive, and China is rapidly increasing its aggressiveness.

For these reasons, I rise to oppose this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I please check and see how much time there is on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining. And the gentleman from Wisconsin has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to TOM COLE, one of the fabulous new members on our side of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this conference report, and I do that with a heavy heart, quite frankly. When this measure was initially before us I supported it enthusiastically. And in my remarks I praised the President. I thought he'd made a tough decision and deserved bipartisan support. I praised the majority because they had brought us, I think, a very good and finely crafted bill. And frankly, I was proud of the minority because we stepped up unconditionally, supported the President, provided the votes that he needed to win and make a difference to have not just a bipartisan majority, but Republican votes that put us in the majority.

I felt like we dealt with the President and the administration in good faith. And frankly, I don't think, since that point, that faith has been reciprocated. Over the course of the process as this legislation's moved through, IMF funding has been added. It scores at \$5 billion but it's a considerably greater amount of money that will be deployed.

We've had this issue with the photos. We've had the issue of detainees. And frankly, throughout that, there's been no effort to negotiate with our side of the aisle, which did provide the funding again, the votes needed to pass the original bill, you know, without condition. And frankly, it's almost as if there was assumption on the other side that we would either roll over or be blackmailed or be bullied into supporting the bill simply because of the military funding in it.

And I wonder whether or not, in retrospect, it was worth losing literally dozens and dozens of Republicans that were prepared to support this bill in a bipartisan fashion in order to add these other measures which could have, frankly, been brought to the floor on their own.

So I'm forced to urge the rejection of this conference report. I would hope that we could restore the military funding that was taken out. I would hope that we could strip the unrelated IMF funding, and I would hope that we

could practice once again the bipartisanship that led us to such an overwhelming success in the original bill. And if we go back to that method, I think that the President and the administration will be able to rely on continued bipartisan support in the tough decisions they have to make going forward.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I rise in strong support of this legislation. Eighty percent or more of this bill is to support the young men and women, and some not so young, whom we have sent in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan to confront terrorism. We passed that bill. We passed it with 368 votes.

It then went to the Senate, and the Senate amended the bill and added additional funding for the IMF, the International Monetary Fund. That did not squeak by on some partisan vote. In fact, more than two-thirds of the Senators voting on that issue, including approximately 25 percent of the Republicans voting on that issue, voted to include the IMF. Why? Because, like Ronald Reagan, President George Bush in the 1990s, President George Bush in 2008, because they believed that the IMF itself was an important asset in the seeking of security by the United States of America.

Now, we didn't put it in that bill. But it's supported by two-thirds of the United States Senate, supported by the President of the United States, who, when he met with the G-20, pledged to play our part in trying to bring the security that this country has paid so dearly to achieve. Our share is approximately 20 percent. The other members of the G-20, 19 nations, will be putting up 80 percent. Why? Because they too believe this is enhancing the security of their countries and also what they think it does to lift up the poorest nations of the world. Not Iran, who hasn't gotten any money since 1984 when Ronald Reagan was President, the last time Iran got money from the IMF. Not Hezbollah, no discussions with them. The United States would clearly weigh in to stop such funding; properly so.

So we have a bill that seeks security and peace, and it's two-pronged now, not one. And I suggest to you that it is my belief that if it were a Republican President asking for this that this bill would pass with some 368 votes again. Why? Because Democrats would join in the Republican President's request, as we have in the past, and say this is for America's security, for international security, and we'll support it.

Now, this bill does some other things. We have a pandemic flu, swine flu, H1N1 flu, that is now at a level that the World Health Organization says is 41 years historically in the context. And the administration has said, because of that, we need additional funds for new vaccines.

We didn't have that in our bill. Clearly, there's not a Member in this House

that doesn't want to take care of the health of our people. I might say, although he doesn't carry a lot of weight on your side of the aisle, that Jim Leach has strongly endorsed this effort; for the same reason, Ronald Reagan, who we honored just the other day. Just the other day we heard so many people say what a great leader Ronald Reagan was.

I'm going to quote Ronald Reagan for you, if I can find it real quickly. Ronald Reagan said this: The IMF is the linchpin of the international financial system. That's Ronald Reagan. He went on to say, I have an unbreakable commitment to increased funding for IMF. That's not a Democrat. That is a conservative leader that you revere, who led this country, and was strongly supported by this country.

And I want you to know that I supported Ronald Reagan on most of his security initiatives, as my good friend JERRY LEWIS knows, because I believed that we needed to make America stronger and to tell our Soviet adversaries that we were prepared to invest in the security of our country.

□ 1730

I think, in doing so, they ultimately decided that they couldn't compete, and glasnost and perestroika came about.

The first President Bush said this: "The IMF and the World Bank are at the crossroads of our cooperative efforts."

Remember the responsibility of Speaker Gingrich when he said in 1998: "We have an obligation to work with the International Monetary Fund."

This is not a partisan issue, but I suggest to you it has been made a partisan reason to oppose this bill and to try to embarrass Democrats, very frankly, that we can't pass funding. We can and we will. I urge you to join us. I urge you to forget the partisan rhetoric. I urge you to think of Ronald Reagan, of George Bush, of the second George Bush, of Newt Gingrich, and of so many other Republican leaders who I won't take the time to quote, who have said that this is a critical component of our security apparatus.

We did not have it in our bill, but we all know how the legislative process works. The other body, particularly when it does so by a two-thirds vote, adds legislation. The President of the United States believes that's good legislation, and very frankly, I believe it's good legislation, and many in this House do as well. Would we have added it? We didn't, but it's here.

Do not use this addition by the United States Senate as a reason to say, "I can't vote," for 80 percent of this bill supports those young men and women and, as I said, some not so young who are deployed abroad in the defense of freedom and in the furtherance of our security.

I will tell you, my friends, on numerous occasions, as most of you know who have served with me, I have put

my card in the slot or have come to this well or have raised my voice on behalf of Republican Presidents who sought to further the security of this country. I am proud of those votes. I am proud of that voice. I ask you to join me today to support our troops, to support our national security, to support propping up countries that will be the repositories of economies that will further the ability of terrorists to recruit in countries that find themselves without jobs, without economic opportunity for their young people and that will have them turn and be recruited by those who would undermine their lives and would recruit them as terrorists.

So I urge each one of my colleagues: This is a vote for America, for its interests and for its troops. Do not delude yourselves that this is not a vote to support the troops. Eighty percent plus of this bill is about American servicemen and women in harm's way. Stand up for them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the majority leader, and he is very eloquent at the microphone, but he forgot to mention a couple of things that, I think, the American people would like to know.

For instance, 80 percent of this bill is helping the troops, but this is a war supplemental; 100 percent should be helping our troops. In addition to that, he did not mention that this is a 22 percent reduction from what was in the supplemental last year, so we're actually cutting funding to the troops by 22 percent over what we did last year, and we're just expanding our operation into Afghanistan. So I think that the people ought to really get the whole picture. The whole picture is that this is a war supplemental, and it's being cut over what we spent last year for the same type of legislation.

Now, he mentioned the International Monetary Fund, the \$5 billion for that. This is a war supplemental. This is not an IMF bill. It's going to create \$108 billion in additional loaning capability by the IMF. A few of the countries that will benefit from this with Special Drawing Rights are people who are not our friends—like Venezuela, Mr. Chavez down there; like Iran, a terrorist state; Yemen; Syria; Zimbabwe; and Burma.

So I would just like to say—and I would never admonish the majority leader, because he is a great man, and I really like him—let's get all of the facts out there and not just part of them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the military supplemental bill that is before Congress today. I was pleased to join many of my Democratic colleagues in supporting the bipartisan military supplemental bill that passed this House earlier in this Congress.

It seems to me, when it comes to providing our soldiers with the resources they need to get the job done and to come home safe, it's the right time to set aside politics as usual—the partisan divide—and go forward to the best of our abilities in a united front. We did that, but I cannot support this military supplemental bill today. I see it as a disservice to the taxpayers of this country and as a disservice to those brave men and women who defend us every day.

You know, in the midst of difficult economic times, it's easy for some people to forget that we are a Nation at war, and it's easy to go back to politics as usual and to spending as usual; but with American soldiers in harm's way, we must never falter in our effort to make sure those soldiers have everything they need to get the job done and to come home to us and to their families safely.

Emergency war funding bills should be about emergency war funding. This legislation, which includes \$108 billion in loan authorizations for a global bailout for the International Monetary Fund at a time when this government has run up a \$2 trillion annual deficit I believe does a disservice to taxpayers and to those who defend us. Passing a \$108 billion global bailout on the backs of our soldiers is just not right.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report. Stand with our troops. Stand with the American taxpayer. Stand against one more bailout. Let's reject this bill tonight, and let's come right back to this floor here tomorrow and bring a clean emergency war funding bill, in a bipartisan fashion, back into the legislative process.

It is time for us to reject this legislation, to reject the changes that were made in the United States Senate, to get our soldiers the resources they need, and to do it in a way that serves the broadest possible interests of the American taxpayer.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), a member of our leadership.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report precisely because it is about our troops. The bill that left this Chamber with broad bipartisan support was 100 percent about our troops, and it is precisely now why it is only 80 percent about our troops. We should not allow for that 20 percent reduction to delude us that somehow this is a better bill.

I had the opportunity today to read in the *detroitfreepress.com* that the Treasury Department had said that \$10 billion in loan guaranties to auto manufacturing suppliers was a nonstarter. They didn't have it. I come here tonight. I hear that we have \$108 billion for the IMF.

This is not only about our troops. It is about the hardworking men and women who put money into the Federal Government not only to defend our troops but to defend their own way of life and their own prosperity and to make sure that it's here when they get back.

Of the \$108 billion going off to the IMF, I did not hear of anyone at the IMF losing their jobs in a painful restructuring. I did not hear of anyone at the IMF being asked to take reductions in their lifetimes of hard-earned health care benefits. I did not see anyone lose anything from the IMF for the \$108 billion underwriting by the U.S. taxpayers; but for \$85 billion, I did see back home in Detroit people losing their jobs under a painful restructuring. I saw retirees losing health care benefits. I saw dealerships closing. I was told this was necessary. I was told by this administration that we've got to be careful not to put money into a sinkhole. Well, this is also about equity.

When those troops come home, when they come home to the Midwest, when they come home to my Michigan, I will look them in the eye and say, "As long as I have been here, I have defended and supported our troops, but I have also made sure that, when you came home, you came back to the American opportunities that you left behind to defend us."

As for the future that the majority leader has talked about, I don't have to speculate. Let me read you a statement:

If people tell you that we cannot afford to invest in education or in health care or in fighting poverty, you just remind them that we are spending \$10 billion a month in Iraq.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MCCOTTER. If we can spend that much money in Iraq, we can spend some of that money right here in Cincinnati, Ohio, and in big cities and in small towns in every corner of this country.

That was candidate Barack Obama.

I would never take money from funds appropriated for our troops and use it for domestic spending. I have said that before; but if you're going to add \$108 billion to fund a conference report for our troops, then spend it here in the United States. Spend it on the men and women who support our troops every day. Spend it on their families so they stay employed. Do not send it to the IMF. I oppose this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it was a proud moment for us to be able to come together in a bipartisan fashion here in the House, as put together in the House, and support the supplemental for the troops; but to add this mess that's coming down here from the conference that the Senate stuck in—over \$100 billion for the IMF? I mean they're loaning money that they get from us and that we're going to have to borrow from China in order to give it to countries that hate us and that would love to see us go away. That makes no sense.

If we are going to add this additional burden onto the American taxpayer, which is going to work counter to the troops who are out there, who are putting their lives at risk, why not just bring them home and not pay our enemies all that extra money and just call it a wash? If we're going to give money that we're going to have to borrow from the Chinese, let's just call it a wash and bring our troops home instead of funding our enemies. That's ridiculous. We should not go there. Let's stop this, and let's get back to the good bill we had in the House before.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I must mention I have only got one speaker remaining, so I would like to inquire of my colleague from Wisconsin just the status of his circumstances: You would be the person to close?

I will have to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have the right to close, and we have only one remaining speaker.

I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I have one additional speaker.

As long as you're giving me all of this flexibility, just let me mention that, as we began this process on this bill, both my chairman and I were very pleased by the fact that there was broadly based bipartisan support for giving the kind of assistance to our troops that is fundamental to our success in the Middle East. To have that package now come back from conference in the shape of being a bill that has reduced the President's request for troop funding by approximately \$4.7 billion and, in turn, has a cost factor of some \$5 billion for the IMF is most disconcerting to this Member.

I may have two additional speakers since my colleague here is standing.

□ 1745

Mr. NUNES. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. NUNES. I have a question for the gentleman because I know he has spent a lot of time on approps. I know you're from California, and we've talked a lot about the water issue in California.

Because this bill is going to go to the President and become law, this is one of our last opportunities to actually make law and get pumping levels back up to historic levels so we can provide water not only to San Joaquin Valley, but also to Los Angeles and San Diego. Do you think there's any possibility we could amend this bill and get something changed here so it will go to Obama's desk?

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman is asking a very, very important question, and I will try to be straightforward in my response. This is a conference report in which both the House and the Senate have come together. The gentleman has raised his concerns about water in central California at a level that has gotten almost the entire country's attention. Indeed, if there were any way I could amend this package to help you solve this problem, the desperate need to get those pumps going to get water to our crops and the farmlands in Central Valley, I would do so. But, unfortunately, in this case, I am unable to help, but stand ready to try.

Mr. NUNES. Well, I would hope the gentleman would yield again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Sure.

Mr. NUNES. As we go through the approps process, I know you will be helpful in trying to get the point across that we have 40,000 people right now without jobs in the San Joaquin Valley, long food lines, 20 percent unemployment. These are very serious issues, and I would hope that your committee will be helpful.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As we go through with our hearings, I might mention in just a few days ahead we will be discussing agriculture problems and challenges to funding for programs for the 2010 year. Indeed, one way or another, we are going to do everything we can to help the gentleman. So I very much appreciate his inquiry.

Mr. NUNES. Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do have one additional speaker, and I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I said earlier this year that when the President does what we think is the right thing for the American people, that he will have no stronger allies than House Republicans. We believe that the President has a responsible strategy in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and we have in fact supported him.

When this troop funding bill left the House, it left with a broad bipartisan majority. And as this bill is now considered, after a conference with the Senate, there are a couple of very troubling parts of this bill.

First and foremost, the addition of a \$108 billion line of credit for the Inter-

national Monetary Fund I think is unnecessary in this bill. And it's unnecessary because to ask our troops to carry money for a global bailout, frankly, I think is unfair. There is only about \$80 billion in this bill for our troops, and here we're asking them to spend nearly \$30 billion more to carry this global bailout.

Now, I've got to tell you, we may have enough money in the United States to solve our economic problems, but I'll guarantee you we don't have enough money to solve the world's economic problems. And when you think about the fact that we don't have \$108 billion to loan to the IMF, so what's going to happen here? The United States is going to go to China, we're going to borrow \$108 billion, we're going to give it to the IMF, and they're going to give it to countries, most of whom don't like us very much.

Now, I would suspect that most of my constituents would say, This is a bad deal, and, BOEHNER, we expect you to vote "no." And trust me, I am going to vote "no." But the fact is, it doesn't belong in this bill. That issue should be debated on its own and should be voted up or down on its own.

The second issue is that the Senate included language in their bill that would have protected these photos of detainees from being released. General Petraeus, General Odierno, and others, have made it clear that the release of these photos will endanger our troops. I believe it will also cripple the ability of our intelligence officials to do their job. And yet while it was supported in this House last week with another broad bipartisan vote, the language isn't in the bill; it's been taken out at the demands of the fringe left. And so I would suggest to my colleagues that this is not a bill that I can support.

I'm going to do everything I can to help our troops. They're doing a marvelous job on our behalf in helping to keep Americans safe. But to load this bill up with this kind of political gamesmanship is not what the American people expect of their Congress.

So I would ask my colleagues to stand up and say "no" to this bill. Let's bring back the broad bipartisan majority that passed the first bill and take care of our troops the right way. This is not the answer, though.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 28 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted at the beginning of the debate, this item represents last year's left-over business. It is the last item of last year's left-over business.

We have been mired in a war for over 7 years. The President previous to this one has continually minimized the cost of that war by financing it on the installment plan. Instead of providing a

full estimate of a yearly cost for the war, he would ask to fund that war in 6-month increments. And when he left office, there was still one 6-month increment left to go that was not yet paid for left over from his watch. And so this bill today, in the process of supporting the President's policies of trying to wind down that war, is providing the remaining funding for this fiscal year to help accomplish that.

In addition, this new President is trying to change the way that that war has been breaking in Afghanistan, and by necessity, Pakistan, which is integrally tied to the Afghanistan situation. And what he is trying to do is, through a combination of military action, political action, and diplomacy, he is trying to change the mix and gradually extricate ourselves from that conflict and stabilize that region politically in the process. I doubt that that will succeed. But this President, having inherited a God awful mess both at home and abroad, has a right to try to fix this situation. That's what the American people, in part, elected him to do. And so this bill provides the financing to do that.

And, yes, it added some other items that were not in the bill when it left the House. It did add funding for the IMF, about which our friends on the other side of the aisle roundly complain. But I would point out, in 1999, the last time I believe that we voted on this, the majority party then, our friends on the other side of the aisle, added IMF funding to the Transportation bill and 162 Republicans voted for it. I find it interesting that today, with a new President, they decline to provide that support.

We also added something else. The GI bill education proposal that the Congress passed last year, had one remaining gap which needed to be filled. That legislation said that if you served your country in the military a sufficient length of time, you could then obtain education benefits; and if you did not use them yourself, you could convert them to the use of your spouse or your children. This bill closes a gap because the one thing that that bill did not do last year was to enable a combat veteran who was killed in combat to make that same transfer of education benefits to a spouse or children. This bill provides that expanded benefit for our fighting men and women. It was not in the bill when it left the House. It is now. If you vote against this bill, that's one of the provisions you will be voting against.

We also have additional money for military hospitals that the administration did not request. We have additional help for the auto industry. I didn't think that was a Federal offense to try to provide some assistance to that industry. And, yes, we have a significant amount of additional funding for pandemic flu. Now, we tried to put that money initially in the original economic recovery package. We did put it in when the bill left the House. It

went to the Senate and we were laughed at. People said, "Oh, what does the flu have to do with the economy and with jobs?" Well, Mexico found out when they had to shut down their entire economy for 2 weeks because of the turmoil in that country with the flu. It is now estimated that as many as one-third of Americans will be hit by that flu. This bill has billions of additional dollars to try and meet that challenge. And I would submit to you that the average American family has a greater chance of being hit by that flu than it does to be hit by any terrorist presently ensconced in Guantanamo.

Now, we are also told that the IMF funding is bad because it borrows money in order to give to other countries. You know, this is a tough reality; we have to participate in the world. And when the world economy becomes shaky, we have a responsibility to ourselves to try to stabilize that world economic situation. That is one of the roles that the IMF tries to play. It certainly does it imperfectly—and I've had many arguments with them in the past—but to say that our contribution to the IMF does not benefit us is to be ignorant of history and to be ignorant of how the world economy works.

The fact is that we created the IMF after World War II. Why? Because we saw what led up to World War II. We saw the world's financial system col-

lapse in the thirties. As a result, in Germany, Hitler came to power and 50 million people died. We would kind of like to avoid that this time. And so what we're trying to do is to provide the President with all the tools he needs internationally to defend our economic stability and to stabilize the economy of our trading partners because our economy does not function and we do not create sufficient jobs in this economy unless we help create economic conditions in other countries so they can buy our goods. That's why we do it. It's called enlightened self-interest.

In addition, it has been suggested that somehow money that we appropriate to the IMF is going to go to Iran. Well, let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. Iran has not had a loan from the IMF since 1962. And under this legislation, the United States representative at the IMF is required to oppose any loan or assistance to countries such as Iran that have been designated by the Secretary of State as a state sponsor of terrorism.

The United States can effectively block loans that it opposes. We've got by far the largest block of votes of any single member. And I doubt very seriously that the IMF is going to approve any loan that we don't approve of.

One other thing. We've been told that somehow the President is endangering

national security because he has not allowed the Congress to pass the Lieberman amendment with respect to the release of those pictures. The fact is the President sent to the conferees a letter and made quite clear that he will do everything in his power to prevent the use of those pictures. I want to quote one paragraph from his letter:

□ 1800

"I deeply appreciate all you have done to help with the efforts to secure funding for the troops and assure you I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure that DOD detainee photographs are not released. Should a legislative solution prove necessary, I am committed to work with the Congress to enact legislation that achieves the objectives we all share."

Now, each of us can nitpick or object to certain specifics in this bill, but the great thing about democracy is that after we've had a chance to state our first preferences and fight for what we believe in, in the end we also have an obligation to reach consensus and move on. That's what this bill tries to do. It must be finished before we can move on to finish the rest of our appropriation bills and to get to the other huge items on the agenda, including health care and climate change.

I urge an "aye" vote for the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009						
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Foreign Agricultural Service						
Public Law 480 Title II Grants.....	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	500,000	700,000	---	-500,000	-700,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	700,000	+700,000	+700,000
TITLE I GENERAL PROVISION						
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Additional Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct.....	---	(360,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)	---	---
Farm operating loans:						
Direct.....	---	(400,000)	(225,000)	(400,000)	---	(+175,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	---	(50,201)	---	(50,201)	---	(+50,201)
Subtotal.....	---	(450,201)	(225,000)	(450,201)	---	(+225,201)
Additional Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	22,860	---	---	-22,860	---
Direct (emergency).....	---	---	22,860	22,860	+22,860	---
Farm operating loans:						
Direct (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	47,160	---	---	-47,160	---
Direct (emergency).....	---	---	26,530	47,160	+47,160	+20,630
Unsubsidized guaranteed:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,250	---	---	-1,250	---
(emergency).....	---	---	---	1,250	+1,250	+1,250
Subtotal.....	---	48,410	26,530	48,410	---	+21,880
Rural Development mission (rescission)(emergency).....	---	-71,270	-49,390	---	+71,270	+49,390
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.....	---	---	---	71,270	+71,270	+71,270
(Loan authorization).....	---	(810,201)	(585,000)	(810,201)	---	(+225,201)
Total, Title I.....	300,000	500,000	700,000	771,270	+271,270	+71,270
Appropriations.....	(300,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(49,390)	(771,270)	(+771,270)	(+721,880)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(571,270)	(700,000)	---	(-571,270)	(-700,000)
Rescissions (emergency).....	---	(-71,270)	(-49,390)	---	(+71,270)	(+49,390)
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs (emergency).....	---	---	40,000	40,000	+40,000	---
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	30,000	---	---	---	---	---
Detention trustee:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	60,000	+60,000	+60,000
Total, General Administration.....	30,000	---	60,000	60,000	+60,000	---
Legal Activities						
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	1,648	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,648	1,648	---	-1,648	-1,648
(emergency).....	---	---	---	1,648	+1,648	+1,648
United States Attorneys, Salaries and expenses.....	5,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	5,000	5,000	---	-5,000	-5,000
(emergency).....	---	---	10,000	15,000	+15,000	+5,000
Total, Legal Activities.....	6,648	6,648	16,648	16,648	+10,000	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
United States Marshals Service						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
National Security Division						
Salaries and expenses	1,389	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,389	1,389	---	-1,389	-1,389
(emergency)	---	---	---	1,389	+1,389	+1,389
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	35,000	35,000	+35,000	---
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives						
Salaries and expenses	4,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	4,000	14,000	---	-4,000	-14,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	5,038	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	5,038	5,038	---	-5,038	-5,038
(emergency)	---	---	---	5,038	+5,038	+5,038
Total, Department of Justice	47,075	17,075	162,075	162,075	+145,000	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Office of Inspector General:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
(emergency)	---	---	---	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
(rescission) (emergency)	---	-3,000	---	-3,000	---	-3,000
Total, Legal Activities	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title II	47,075	17,075	202,075	202,075	+185,000	---
Appropriations	(47,075)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(85,000)	(205,075)	(+205,075)	(+120,075)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(20,075)	(117,075)	---	(-20,075)	(-117,075)
Rescissions (emergency)	---	(-3,000)	---	(-3,000)	---	(-3,000)
TITLE III						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
Military Personnel						
Military Personnel, Army	10,195,106	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	10,924,641	11,455,777	11,750,687	+826,046	+294,910
Military Personnel, Navy	1,354,782	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,716,827	1,565,227	1,627,288	-89,539	+62,061
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	1,419,979	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,577,850	1,464,353	1,524,947	-52,903	+60,594
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,390,554	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,783,208	1,469,173	1,500,740	-282,468	+31,567
Reserve Personnel, Army	284,155	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	381,155	387,155	418,155	+37,000	+31,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	39,478	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	39,478	39,478	39,478	---	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	29,179	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	29,179	29,179	29,179	---	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	16,943	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	16,943	14,943	14,943	-2,000	---
National Guard Personnel, Army	1,439,333	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	1,373,273	1,542,333	1,775,733	+402,460	+233,400
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	17,860	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	101,360	46,860	45,000	-56,360	-1,860
Total, Military Personnel	16,187,369	17,943,914	18,014,478	18,726,150	+782,236	+711,672

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation & Maintenance, Army.....	14,119,401	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	14,024,703	13,933,801	13,769,418	-255,285	-164,383
Operation & Maintenance, Navy.....	2,380,116	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	2,367,959	2,337,380	2,274,903	-93,056	-62,457
(Transfer out).....	(-129,503)	(-129,503)	---	---	(+129,503)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	1,090,842	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,084,081	1,037,842	1,034,366	-49,715	-3,476
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force.....	6,294,031	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	6,216,729	5,992,125	5,980,386	-236,343	-11,739
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	5,667,483	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	5,353,701	5,065,783	5,101,696	-252,005	+35,913
(Transfer out).....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---	---	(+30,000)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	115,017	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	101,317	110,017	110,017	+8,700	---
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	25,569	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	24,318	25,569	25,569	+1,251	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	30,775	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	30,775	30,775	30,775	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	34,599	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	34,599	34,599	34,599	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	203,399	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	178,446	203,399	178,446	---	-24,953
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....	29,971,232	29,416,628	28,771,270	28,540,175	-876,453	-231,095
Iraq Freedom Fund.....	415,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	365,000	---	---	-365,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.....	3,606,939	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	3,606,939	3,606,939	3,606,939	---	---
Iraq Security Forces Fund (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund 1/.....	400,000	---	---	---	---	---
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	34,393,171	33,788,567	33,778,209	32,547,114	-1,241,453	-1,231,095
Procurement						
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	762,604	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,285,304	315,684	1,192,744	-92,560	+877,060
Missile Procurement, Army.....	767,141	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	677,141	737,041	704,041	+26,900	-33,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,683,371	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	2,233,871	1,434,071	1,983,971	-249,900	+549,900
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	230,075	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	230,075	230,075	230,075	---	---
Other Procurement, Army.....	8,121,572	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	8,039,349	7,029,145	7,113,742	-925,607	+84,597
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	600,999	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	691,924	754,299	636,669	-55,255	-117,630
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	99,540	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	31,698	31,403	29,498	-2,200	-1,905
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	348,919	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	348,919	348,919	348,919	---	---
Other Procurement, Navy.....	264,826	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	172,095	207,181	197,193	+25,098	-9,988
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,638,386	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,509,986	1,658,347	1,526,447	+16,461	-131,900
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	2,378,818	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	5,138,268	2,064,118	4,592,088	-546,200	+2,527,950
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	57,416	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	57,416	49,716	49,716	-7,700	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	183,684	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	183,684	138,284	158,684	-25,000	+20,400
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	1,834,953	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,745,761	1,910,343	1,802,083	+56,322	-108,260
Procurement, Defense-Wide.....	197,068	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	200,068	237,868	237,868	+37,800	---
Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund.....	2,693,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	4,843,000	4,243,000	4,543,000	-300,000	+300,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	500,000	500,000	500,000	---	---
Total, Procurement.....	21,862,372	27,888,559	21,889,484	25,846,718	-2,041,841	+3,957,224

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army.....	73,734	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	73,734	71,935	52,935	-20,799	-19,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy.....	144,536	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	96,231	141,681	136,786	+40,555	-4,895
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force...	108,259	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	92,574	174,159	160,474	+67,900	-13,685
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide.....	483,368	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	459,391	498,168	483,304	+23,913	-14,864
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	809,897	721,930	885,943	833,499	+111,569	-52,444
Revolving and Management Funds						
Defense Working Capital Fund, Army.....	443,200	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	443,200	443,200	443,200	---	---
Defense Working Capital Fund, Air Force (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Defense Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide.....	403,526	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	403,526	403,526	403,526	---	---
Total, Revolving and Management Funds.....	846,726	846,726	861,726	861,726	+15,000	---
Other Department of Defense Programs						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance.....	845,508	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	845,508	845,508	845,508	---	---
Procurement.....	30,185	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	50,185	30,185	50,185	---	+20,000
Research and development.....	33,604	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	201,604	33,604	159,604	-42,000	+126,000
Total, Defense Health Program.....	909,297	1,097,297	909,297	1,055,297	-42,000	+146,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (overseas deployments and activities).....	141,198	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	137,198	123,398	120,398	-16,800	-3,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund:						
Attack the Network.....	499,830	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	499,830	349,830	349,830	-150,000	---
Defeat the Device.....	607,389	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	457,389	457,389	457,389	---	---
Train the Force.....	333,527	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	333,527	283,527	283,527	-50,000	---
Staff and infrastructure.....	26,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	26,000	26,000	26,000	---	---
Total, Joint IED Defeat Fund.....	1,466,746	1,316,746	1,116,746	1,116,746	-200,000	---
Office of the Inspector General.....	9,551	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	9,551	9,551	9,551	---	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	2,526,792	2,560,792	2,158,992	2,301,992	-258,800	+143,000
Department of Defense General Provisions						
Special DE transfer authority (this title only).....	(4,000,000)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---
Additional transfer authority.....	(1,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Defense Cooperation Account.....	6,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	6,500	6,500	6,500	---	---
Iraq Security Forces Fund.....	1,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
(emergency).....	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
(rescission) (emergency).....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	---	-1,000,000	---	-1,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.....	125,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	---
(rescission) (emergency).....	-125,000	-125,000	---	---	+125,000	---
Fuel (rescission).....	-2,900,000	-3,010,000	---	-1,003,007	+2,006,993	-1,003,007
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission).....	---	---	---	-1,906,993	-1,906,993	-1,906,993
Classified (rescission).....	-10,000	---	---	---	---	---
Classified and other (overseas deployments and activities) (rescission).....	---	---	---	-1,051,160	-1,051,160	-1,051,160
Fuel, Classified, and Other (Rescissions).....	---	---	-925,203	---	---	+925,203
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission).....	---	---	-3,646,633	---	---	+3,646,633
Personnel: Army, Army Reserve, & Army National Guard..	470,900	---	---	---	---	---
Procurement, Army (rescission).....	-470,900	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities) (rescission).....	---	---	---	-354,000	-354,000	-354,000

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Personnel: Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard (by transfer) (overseas deployments)						
Guard (by transfer) (overseas deployments)	---	(150,600)	---	---	(-150,600)	---
Procurement, Army (transfer out)	---	(-150,600)	---	---	(+150,600)	---
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission)2/ (overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)						
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission)2/ (overseas deployments and activities) (rescission)	-181,500	-181,500	---	---	+181,500	---
Stop Loss Transfer Fund (overseas deployments and activities)	---	734,400	---	534,400	-200,000	+534,400
Total, DOD General Provisions	-3,085,000	-2,450,600	-4,565,336	-3,955,760	-1,505,160	+609,576
Total, Title III						
Total, Title III	73,541,327	81,299,888	73,023,506	77,161,439	-4,138,449	+4,137,933
Appropriations	(78,228,727)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(85,766,988)	(77,595,342)	(81,658,099)	(-4,108,889)	(+4,062,757)
Rescissions	(-3,562,400)	(-3,342,100)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,339,093)	(-77,804)
Rescissions (emergency)	(-1,125,000)	(-1,125,000)	---	(-1,000,000)	(+125,000)	(-1,000,000)
Rescissions (overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	(-3,646,633)	(-3,493,653)	(-3,493,653)	(+152,980)
(Transfer out)	(-159,503)	(-310,103)	---	---	(+310,103)	---
(Transfer authority)	(5,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities:						
(Transfer out)	---	(150,600)	---	---	(-150,600)	---
(Transfer authority)	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---

Title III:

1/ House recommends an additional \$400M under International Security Assistance, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (Title XI)
2/ Budget request includes rescission to fund Military Construction, Defense-Wide

TITLE IV

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

Corps of Engineers - Civil

Operation and maintenance (emergency)	---	---	38,375	42,875	+42,875	+4,500
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (emergency)	---	---	804,290	754,290	+754,290	-50,000
Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil	---	---	842,665	797,165	+797,165	-45,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Programs

Strategic Petroleum Reserve

Strategic Petroleum Reserve (by transfer)	(21,586)	(21,586)	---	---	(-21,586)	---
(By transfer) (emergency)	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---

National Nuclear Security Administration

Weapons activities:						
(overseas deployments and activities)	---	---	34,500	---	---	-34,500
(emergency)	---	---	---	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation						
(overseas deployments and activities)	89,500	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency)	---	55,000	55,000	---	-55,000	-55,000
(emergency)	---	---	---	55,000	+55,000	+55,000
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	89,500	55,000	89,500	85,000	+30,000	-4,500

Total, Title IV	89,500	55,000	932,165	882,165	+827,165	-50,000
Emergency appropriations	---	---	(842,665)	(882,165)	(+882,165)	(+39,500)
Overseas deployments and activities	---	(55,000)	(89,500)	---	(-55,000)	(-89,500)
(By transfer)	(21,586)	(21,586)	---	---	(-21,586)	---
(By transfer) (emergency)	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE V						
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices						
Salaries and expenses (emergency).....	---	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Unanticipated Needs						
Unanticipated needs for influenza 1/.....	(3,500,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Pandemic preparedness and response (emergency).....	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	-1,500,000
National Security Council						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,936	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	2,936	2,936	---	-2,936	-2,936
(emergency).....	---	---	---	2,936	+2,936	+2,936
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	2,936	2,936	1,502,936	2,936	---	-1,500,000
THE JUDICIARY						
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency).....	---	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission						
Salaries and expenses (emergency).....	---	---	---	8,000	+8,000	+8,000
TITLE V GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Federal Deposit Insurance Act amendment.....	---	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Total, Title V.....	2,936	2,936	1,530,936	34,936	+32,000	-1,496,000
Appropriations.....	(2,936)	---	(4,000)	---	---	(-4,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(1,514,000)	(34,936)	(+34,936)	(-1,479,064)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(2,936)	(12,936)	---	(-2,936)	(-12,936)

Title V:
1/ Amount of new budget authority request that the House and Conference considered and funded under Health and Human Services, Title VIII

TITLE VI						
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY						
U.S. Customs and Border Protection						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	46,200	---	---	-46,200
(emergency).....	---	---	---	46,200	+46,200	+46,200
Air and marine interdiction, operations, maintenance and procurement:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, Customs and Border Protection.....	---	---	51,200	51,200	+51,200	---
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement						
Salaries and expenses:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	66,800	---	---	-66,800
(emergency).....	---	---	---	66,800	+66,800	+66,800

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
Coast Guard						
Operating expenses (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	139,503	139,503	+139,503	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
State and local programs:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
TITLE VI GENERAL PROVISIONS						
FEMA Disaster Relief (rescission of emergency).....	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---
FEMA State and local programs (emergency).....	---	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Federal Share of Disaster Assistance (emergency).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title VI.....						
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	287,503	287,503	+287,503	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	(100,000)	(248,000)	(+248,000)	(+148,000)
Rescissions (emergency).....	---	---	(287,503)	(139,503)	(+139,503)	(-148,000)
	---	---	(-100,000)	(-100,000)	(-100,000)	---
TITLE VII						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Department-wide Programs						
Wildland fire management:						
Wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation (emergency).....	50,000	---	---	---	---	---
	---	50,000	50,000	50,000	---	---
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Wildland fire management:						
Wildfire suppression and emergency rehabilitation (emergency).....	200,000	---	---	---	---	---
	---	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---
Total, Title VII.....						
Appropriations.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(250,000)	---	---	---	---	---
	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
TITLE VIII						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Administration for Children and Families						
Refugee and entrant assistance:						
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	82,000	---	---	-82,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	82,000	+82,000	+82,000
Office of the Secretary						
Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund 1/...	1,500,000	---	---	---	---	---
(contingent funds).....	2,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
(emergency).....	---	1,850,000	---	1,850,000	---	+1,850,000
(contingent emergency).....	---	---	---	5,800,000	+5,800,000	+5,800,000
Total, PHSSEF.....						
	3,500,000	1,850,000	---	7,650,000	+5,800,000	+7,650,000
TITLE VIII GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Department of Education: Career, Technical, and Adult Education (by transfer).....	---	---	(17,678)	(10,260)	(+10,260)	(-7,418)
Total, Title VIII.....						
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(1,850,000)	82,000	7,732,000	+5,882,000	+7,650,000
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	(1,932,000)	(+82,000)	(+1,932,000)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	---	(5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)
(By transfer).....	---	---	(82,000)	---	---	(-82,000)
	---	---	(17,678)	(10,260)	(+10,260)	(-7,418)

Title VIII:
1/ Budget request and Senate proposes funds under the Executive Office of the President

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE IX						
JOINT ITEMS						
Capitol Police						
General expenses.....	71,606	---	71,606	---	---	-71,606
(emergency).....	---	71,606	---	71,606	---	+71,606
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses.....	---	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
(emergency).....	---	---	---	2,000	+2,000	+2,000
Total, Title IX.....	71,606	71,606	73,606	73,606	+2,000	---
Appropriations.....	(71,606)	---	(73,606)	---	---	(-73,606)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(71,606)	---	(73,606)	(+2,000)	(+73,606)
TITLE X						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
Military construction, Army.....	1,229,731	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,407,231	1,229,731	1,182,989	-224,242	-46,742
(emergency).....	---	---	49,000	143,242	+143,242	+94,242
(Rescission) (emergency).....	---	-142,500	-49,000	-143,242	-742	-94,242
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps.....	239,031	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	235,881	243,083	235,881	---	-7,202
Military construction, Air Force.....	280,970	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	279,120	265,470	281,620	+2,500	+16,150
(rescission) (emergency).....	---	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Military construction, Defense-Wide 1/.....	181,500	---	181,500	---	---	-181,500
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,086,968	---	661,552	-425,416	+661,552
Subtotal, Military construction.....	1,931,232	2,836,700	1,919,784	2,362,042	-474,658	+442,258
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program.....	100,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005.....	263,300	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	263,300	230,900	263,300	---	+32,400
Total, Title X.....	2,294,532	3,200,000	2,250,684	2,725,342	-474,658	+474,658
Appropriations.....	(2,294,532)	---	(181,500)	---	---	(-181,500)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(49,000)	(143,242)	(+143,242)	(+94,242)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(3,372,500)	(2,069,184)	(2,725,342)	(-647,158)	(+656,158)
Rescissions (emergency).....	---	(-172,500)	(-49,000)	(-143,242)	(+29,258)	(-94,242)
Title X: 1/ Budget request includes rescission of \$181.5M from O&M, Defense-Wide under Title III						
TITLE XI						
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	594,315	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,016,215	645,444	997,890	-18,325	+352,446
Worldwide security protection.....	(117,983)	(403,983)	(117,983)	(146,358)	(-257,625)	(+28,375)
(transfer authority).....	(137,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	(157,600)	(135,629)	(137,600)	(-20,000)	(+1,971)
International Broadcasting Operations, Pakistan-Afghanistan Border Region (by transfer).....	---	(10,900)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(-900)	---
(transfer out).....	---	---	(-40,000)	---	---	(+40,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	7,201	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	17,123	22,200	24,122	+6,999	+1,922
Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (by transfer).....	---	---	(7,000)	(7,000)	(+7,000)	---
Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (by transfer).....	(7,201)	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	(7,201)	(7,200)	(7,200)	(-1)	---
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance.....	898,728	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	989,628	820,500	921,500	-68,128	+101,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	1,500,244	2,022,966	1,488,144	1,943,512	-79,454	+455,368

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
International Organizations						
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year.....	836,900	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	836,900	721,000	721,000	-115,900	---
(by transfer).....	---	---	(155,900)	---	---	(-155,900)
Total, International Organizations.....	836,900	836,900	721,000	721,000	-115,900	---
Total, Department of State.....	2,337,144	2,859,866	2,209,144	2,664,512	-195,354	+455,368
UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
Funds Appropriated to the President						
Operating expenses.....	152,600	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	152,600	112,600	157,600	+5,000	+45,000
(by transfer).....	---	---	(40,000)	---	---	(-40,000)
Capital investment fund.....	48,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	48,500	48,500	48,500	---	---
Office of Inspector General (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	3,500	3,500	3,500	---	---
(by transfer).....	---	(2,000)	---	(2,000)	---	(+2,000)
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
Funds Appropriated to the President						
Global Health and Child Survival (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	300,000	50,000	150,000	-150,000	+100,000
Development assistance.....	38,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	38,000	---	---	-38,000
International disaster assistance.....	230,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	200,000	245,000	270,000	+70,000	+25,000
Economic Support Fund.....	3,004,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	2,907,500	2,828,000	2,973,601	+66,101	+145,601
(transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	(-2,000)	---	(-2,000)
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia.....	242,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	242,500	230,000	272,000	+29,500	+42,000
Assistance for Georgia (overseas deployments and activities).....	---	---	42,500	---	---	-42,500
Subtotal, Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia.....	242,500	242,500	272,500	272,000	+29,500	-500
Department of State						
International narcotics control and law enforcement.....	389,500	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	483,500	393,500	487,500	+4,000	+94,000
Migration and refugee assistance.....	333,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	343,000	345,000	380,000	+47,000	+45,000
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	122,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	98,500	102,000	102,000	+3,500	---
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	4,359,500	4,575,000	4,274,000	4,645,101	+70,101	+371,101
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE						
Peacekeeping operations.....	50,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	80,000	172,900	185,000	+105,000	+12,100
(transfer out).....	---	---	(-155,900)	---	---	(+155,900)
International Military Education and Training.....	2,000	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Foreign Military Financing Program.....	98,400	---	---	---	---	---
(overseas deployments and activities).....	---	1,349,000	98,000	1,294,000	-55,000	+1,196,000
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund 1/.....	---	400,000	---	700,000	+300,000	+700,000
Total, International Security Assistance.....	150,400	1,831,000	272,900	2,181,000	+350,000	+1,908,100
Total, Title XI.....	7,048,144	9,470,466	6,920,644	9,700,213	+229,747	+2,779,569
Appropriations.....	(7,048,144)	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(9,470,466)	(6,920,644)	(9,700,213)	(+229,747)	(+2,779,569)
(By transfer).....	(137,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer)(overseas deployments & activities).....	---	(175,701)	(159,829)	(161,800)	(-13,901)	(+1,971)

Title XI:

1/ Budget request includes \$400M under Title III

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
TITLE XII						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Office of the Secretary						
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund) (emergency).....	---	---	13,200	---	---	-13,200
	---	---	---	13,200	+13,200	+13,200
Federal Aviation Administration						
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund (rescission of contract authority).....	---	---	-13,200	-13,200	-13,200	---
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Public and Indian Housing						
Tenant-based rental assistance (emergency).....	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
TITLE XII GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Federal Highway Administration						
Emergency Relief (North Dakota) (outlays only) (emergency) (outlays only).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	---	---	---	---
Federal Transit Administration, Transit Capital Assistance (emergency) (outlays only).....						
	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Title XII.....	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
Appropriations.....	---	---	(13,200)	---	---	(-13,200)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(30,000)	(43,200)	(+43,200)	(+13,200)
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	---
TITLE XIII						
CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE ACT						
Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save (emergency)...	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, Title XIII.....	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
TITLE XIV						
OTHER MATTERS						
INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS						
International Monetary Programs						
United States Quota, International Monetary fund and Loans to International Monetary fund (overseas deployments and activities) (emergency).....	5,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
	---	---	5,000,000	---	---	-5,000,000
	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Total, Title XIV.....	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	---
Appropriations.....	(5,000,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Grand total.....	92,145,120	96,716,971	91,283,119	105,850,549	+9,133,578	+14,567,430
Appropriations.....	(96,832,520)	---	(272,306)	---	---	(-272,306)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(2,171,806)	(2,920,055)	(11,583,494)	(+9,411,888)	(+8,663,439)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	(5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)	(+5,800,000)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(99,436,936)	(93,229,913)	(94,385,957)	(-5,049,979)	(+1,157,044)
Rescissions.....	(-3,562,400)	(-3,191,500)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,188,493)	(-77,804)
Rescissions (emergency).....	(-1,125,000)	(-1,371,770)	(-198,390)	(-1,246,242)	(+125,528)	(-1,047,852)
Rescissions (overseas deployments and other activities).....	---	---	(-3,646,633)	(-3,493,653)	(-3,493,653)	(+152,980)
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	---
(By transfer).....	(28,787)	(349,887)	(373,407)	(174,060)	(-175,827)	(-199,347)
(Transfer out).....	(-159,503)	(-310,103)	---	---	(+310,103)	---
(Transfer authority).....	(5,637,600)	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer) (emergency).....	---	---	(21,586)	(21,586)	(+21,586)	---
Overseas deployments and activities:						
(By transfer).....	---	(328,301)	(355,729)	(163,800)	(-164,501)	(-191,929)
(Transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	(-195,900)	(-2,000)	---	(+193,900)
(Transfer authority).....	---	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2009 (H.R. 2346) CONFERENCE AGREEMENT (H.REPT. 111-151)
(Amounts in thousands)

	Request	House	Senate	Conference Agreement	Conference vs. House	Conference vs. Senate
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP BY TITLE						
TITLE I DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.....	300,000	500,000	700,000	771,270	+271,270	+71,270
Appropriations.....	(300,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(-71,270)	---	(771,270)	(+842,540)	(+771,270)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(571,270)	(700,000)	---	(-571,270)	(-700,000)
TITLE II DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE.....	47,075	17,075	202,075	202,075	+185,000	---
Appropriations.....	(47,075)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(-3,000)	(85,000)	(202,075)	(+205,075)	(+117,075)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(20,075)	(117,075)	---	(-20,075)	(-117,075)
TITLE III DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.....	73,541,327	81,299,888	73,023,506	77,161,439	-4,138,449	+4,137,933
Appropriations.....	(74,666,327)	(-3,342,100)	(-925,203)	(-1,003,007)	(+2,339,093)	(-77,804)
Emergency appropriations.....	(-1,125,000)	(-1,125,000)	---	---	(+1,125,000)	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(85,766,988)	(73,948,709)	(78,164,446)	(-7,602,542)	(+4,215,737)
TITLE IV DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE (CIVIL), AND ENERGY ..	89,500	55,000	932,165	882,165	+827,165	-50,000
Appropriations.....	(89,500)	(-21,586)	(-21,586)	(-21,586)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(864,251)	(903,751)	(+903,751)	(+39,500)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(76,586)	(89,500)	---	(-76,586)	(-89,500)
TITLE V EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, JUDICIARY, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.....	2,936	2,936	1,530,936	34,936	+32,000	-1,496,000
Appropriations.....	(2,936)	---	(4,000)	---	---	(-4,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	(1,514,000)	(34,936)	(+34,936)	(-1,479,064)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	2,936	12,936	---	-2,936	-12,936
TITLE VI DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.....	---	---	287,503	287,503	+287,503	---
Appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	(148,000)	(+148,000)	(+148,000)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	(287,503)	(139,503)	(+139,503)	(-148,000)
TITLE VII DEPARTMENTS OF THE INTERIOR, AND AGRICULTURE	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	---	---
Appropriations.....	(250,000)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE VIII DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION.....	3,500,000	1,850,000	82,000	7,732,000	+5,882,000	+7,650,000
Appropriations.....	(3,500,000)	---	---	(-10,260)	(-10,260)	(-10,260)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(1,850,000)	---	(7,742,260)	(+5,892,260)	(+7,742,260)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	(82,000)	---	---	(-82,000)
TITLE IX LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.....	71,606	71,606	73,606	73,606	+2,000	---
Appropriations.....	71,606	---	73,606	---	---	-73,606
Emergency appropriations.....	---	71,606	---	73,606	+2,000	+73,606
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE X DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE, AND VETERANS AFFAIRS	2,294,532	3,200,000	2,250,684	2,725,342	-474,658	+474,658
Appropriations.....	(2,294,532)	---	(181,500)	---	---	(-181,500)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	(-172,500)	---	---	(+172,500)	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(3,372,500)	(2,069,184)	(2,725,342)	(-647,158)	(+656,158)
TITLE XI DEPARTMENT OF STATE.....	7,048,144	9,470,466	6,920,644	9,700,213	+229,747	+2,779,569
Appropriations.....	(7,048,144)	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(9,470,466)	(6,920,644)	(9,700,213)	(+229,747)	(+2,779,569)
TITLE XII DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.....	---	---	30,000	30,000	+30,000	---
Appropriations.....	---	---	---	(-13,200)	(-13,200)	(-13,200)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	30,000	43,200	+43,200	+13,200
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE XIII CONSUMER ASSISTANCE TO RECYCLE AND SAVE....	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE XIV INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	---
Appropriations.....	5,000,000	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	---	(5,000,000)	---	---	(-5,000,000)
GRAND TOTAL, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 2009.....	92,145,120	96,716,971	91,283,119	105,850,549	+9,133,578	+14,567,430
Appropriations.....	(93,270,120)	(-3,363,686)	(-687,683)	(-1,048,053)	(+2,315,633)	(-360,370)
Emergency appropriations.....	(-1,125,000)	(799,836)	(2,743,251)	(16,189,098)	(+15,369,262)	(+13,425,847)
Overseas deployments and activities.....	---	(99,280,821)	(89,227,551)	(90,729,504)	(-8,551,317)	(+1,501,953)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons to vote for this bill. The bill funds our withdrawal from Iraq, stop-loss compensation for our troops, a more robust pandemic flu response, extends the 21st Century GI Bill of Rights education benefits to children of members of the armed forces who die while on active duty, additional international food and refugee assistance during the current global economic crisis, and other worthy programs as well. But candidly, those issues are ancillary to the real issue before us: this vote is essentially about whether or not we support current Administration policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. I hope the President does not let the country down on this.

Does the Congress want to support and fund the President's new military plan? Looking back at this vote from the future, it will be seen as a vote on the war in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Will a vote for this bill move us closer to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in southwest Asia?

In this dangerous, complicated world it is never clear how to advance peace, prosperity, and justice for ourselves and the rest of the world. We Members of Congress are called on to exercise our best judgment, and in my best judgment what the President has done so far in Afghanistan is not the way forward, and the President will have to change the policy. The President is doing much good at home and abroad, and I want to support him wherever I can. However, he so far has not changed the policy in Afghanistan in a way that shows he has learned the lessons of Iraq. Nevertheless, I am willing to give him the opportunity to operate from a position of strength in forming that new policy.

The chairman of the full committee has suggested that he is willing to give the President a year to turn things around in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but no more than that—an argument that has considerable merit. The problem, though, is that the President's new policy may not be new enough—not enough of a clean break with the past policy that placed excessive reliance on the use of force to solve what are by definition political problems. We should take a lesson from Iraq where it was not an American troop surge that reduced violence, but rather empowering local provincial forces. And as in Iraq, it will be a reduced American combat presence that will ultimately allow the country to find some peace. So-called surgical strikes—with inevitable civilian casualties—and remote assassinations will not remove the threat of militant extremists.

Our understanding of Afghanistan is inadequate and our poor intelligence in Afghanistan and Pakistan limits our ability to carry out any strategy. We are moving forward in Afghanistan with too much military bravado and too little genuine understanding. Other countries are opting out of combat, not because they are cowards, but because they do not see the situation the same way. Some of us have asked for a plan of success or a plan of withdrawal before sending another wave of soldiers. We have received no such plan.

As with other tragic wars without a clear plan of how to get out, I fear we may be taking a first step that will be followed by sending soldier after soldier to redeem our sunk costs. Alexander the Great, the Mongols, the Mughals, the British, the Soviets—all their military interventions in this region ended badly because they misread the people and the his-

tory of this region. I am giving the President the benefit of the doubt on this request by supporting it, with this caveat: my patience has limits.

I will not support an endless military commitment in this region. Reading between the lines, I suspect I see the letter Q in Afghanistan—as in quagmire. If a year from now I do not see unambiguous indicators of success—fewer civilian casualties, Afghan and Pakistani security forces in the lead on the security mission, genuine progress in rebuilding Afghanistan's shattered infrastructure and civil institutions—I will not support further funding for operations and will support only measures that will bring our forces home, and quickly.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2009 Iraq/Afghanistan Defense Supplemental Appropriations bill provides \$105.9 billion, 77 percent of which would be to cover costs relating to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq for the rest of this fiscal year. I voted for these funds because I chose to give President Obama time to implement his Afghanistan strategy and withdraw troops from Iraq. But it was not an easy decision.

The war in Afghanistan has entered its eighth year without clearly defined objectives and an exit strategy. With a deteriorating security situation and no comprehensive political outcome yet in sight, some experts view the war in Afghanistan as open-ended. Had the Bush Administration not shifted its focus to the unnecessary war in Iraq, we may have already brought Al Qaeda and the Taliban to justice. I believe President Obama made an error by ordering an additional 17,000 troops to Afghanistan before first completing a detailed review of U.S. Afghanistan policies. Continuing the vaguely defined strategies of the Bush Administration is not acceptable.

The President did finally lay out a strategy for Afghanistan in late March of this year. It made some significant improvements to the Afghanistan strategy, but fell short in other areas. For example, I was pleased to see a regional approach, "treating Afghanistan and Pakistan as two countries but one challenge," and a commitment to "devote significantly more resources to the civilian efforts in both Afghanistan and Pakistan." These are significant improvements over the Bush Administration's approach.

Unfortunately, the President's new Afghan strategy fails to set clear benchmarks for the Afghanistan and Pakistan governments and fails to lay out the consequences of not meeting the benchmarks. It is not surprising that the President has also failed to set benchmarks for the Pentagon and State Department too.

Thankfully, the supplemental bill lays out detailed benchmarks for Afghanistan and Pakistan and the President must report back to Congress on the:

(1) Level of political consensus and unity of purpose across ethnic, tribal, religious and party affiliations to confront the political and security challenges facing the region.

(2) Level of government corruption and actions taken to eliminate it.

(3) Performance of the respective security forces in developing a counterinsurgency capability, conducting counterinsurgency operations and establishing population security.

(4) Performance of the respective intelligence agencies in cooperating with the United States on counterinsurgency and

counterterrorism operations and in purging themselves of policies, programs and personnel that provide material support to extremist networks that target U.S. troops or undermine U.S. objectives in the region.

(5) Ability of the Afghan and Pakistani governments to effectively control the territory within their respective borders.

In addition, I am an original cosponsor of the McGovern bill that simply states, "Not later than December 31, 2009, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report outlining the United States exit strategy for United States military forces in Afghanistan participating in Operation Enduring Freedom." I firmly believe that the United States is best served by outlining a clear exit strategy that the American public can support and that the Afghan public can be reassured that we have no long-term desire to occupy their nation.

Unfortunately, President Bush's disregard for the complexities of Afghanistan and the damage that came from his disregard may make this war unwinnable. We also must not forget that the Soviet military, with over a hundred thousand troops on the ground, lost decisively in Afghanistan. Today, our troops are fighting some of the very same warlords who defeated the Soviets with our covert support.

As you may know, Secretary of Defense Bill Gates, removed the commanding general of Afghanistan in a bid to change the on-the-ground strategy in Afghanistan. With a new White House strategy, a new commanding general, and 21,000 additional troops, I believe this is now President Obama's war.

The bill also funds the continued presence of our troops in Iraq. Despite the continued bursts of violence in Iraq, I am thankful the President has committed to a responsible redeployment of troops out of Iraq. This bill recognizes and supports President Obama's plan to withdraw all U.S. combat brigades from Iraq by August 31, 2010 and all U.S. military forces by December 31, 2011. The bill continues to prohibit the construction of any base for the permanent stationing of U.S. forces in Iraq and U.S. control over any oil resource of Iraq. To ensure accountability, the bill directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress every 90 days that includes:

1. How the Government of Iraq is assuming responsibility for reconciliation initiatives;

2. How the drawdown of military forces complies with the President's timeline; and

3. The roles and responsibilities of remaining contractors in Iraq as the U.S. mission evolves.

The bill does some very good things besides funding wars for Afghanistan and Iraq. I am very supportive of the \$534 million for additional pay for more than 170,000 troops who have had their enlistments involuntarily extended since Sept. 11, 2001. These funds allow for payments of \$500 per month for every month a soldier was held on active duty under "stop-loss" orders. The average payment should be above \$4,000. Stop loss orders were used by the Bush Administration to avoid tough decisions on deployment and troop increases, creating a de facto draft for current soldiers. These payments are a good step to honor the sacrifice unfairly asked of these brave men and women.

I also support some of the foreign aid in the bill. The \$660 million for bilateral economic, humanitarian, and security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza represents an important

commitment to the Middle East peace process. In addition, the bill includes \$889 million for United Nations peacekeeping operations, including an expanded mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and a new mission in Chad and the Central African Republic. Finally, the bill includes \$700 million for international food assistance to alleviate suffering during the global economic crisis.

Finally, I was pleased that the conference agreement provides \$7.7 billion for efforts to address a potential pandemic flu. The total includes \$1.5 billion for the Health and Human Services Department and the Center for Disease Control to supplement federal stockpiles, develop and purchase vaccines, and to expand detection efforts, and \$5.8 billion in contingent emergency funds. Of the \$1.5 billion, \$350 million was set aside to assist state and local governments in preparing for and responding to a pandemic.

Unfortunately, the conference agreement included a \$108 billion loan to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). I objected to this loan because Congress should not be in the business of bailing out Central and Eastern European nations that lost money speculating in highly deregulated financial markets and now are indebted to European banks.

The \$108 billion loan to the IMF is an unreasonable and irresponsible burden to place on the backs of American taxpayers. They're already paying through the nose for the \$700 billion blank check passed by Congress for "too big to fail" banks. For the record, I voted against the bank bailout. And, now, Congress is returning to the American taxpayers hat in hand for a rescue package to bailout European banks.

The fact that we continue to run annual deficits means the Federal Reserve will print the \$108 billion or borrow it from China. In other words, the U.S. will borrow funds from China to, lend to the International Monetary Fund, which will lend to a Central or Eastern European country to help rescue a foreign bank caught in the credit bubble.

We should be focusing on economic recovery at home rather than loaning billions of dollars to the IMF to rescue troubled European banks. I vehemently oppose the inclusion of the \$108 billion for the IMF in the War Supplemental bill. Had this provision been voted on separately—as it should have—I would have voted against this provision.

Reluctantly, I voted in favor of this bill because it reversed the Bush Administration's irresponsible approach to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I will continue to watchdog the IMF and look for opportunities to rein in their misguided attempt at restructuring poorer nation's economies.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in stroll support of H.R. 2346, the FY09 Emergency Supplemental Conference Report. This legislation provides the resources our military, diplomatic, and development personnel need to make our nation more secure.

The Obama administration's policy to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is critical to prevent the region from being a base for terrorist plots against the United States and our allies. H.R. 2346 provides \$3.8 billion for economic security initiatives in the region and funds our diplomatic and development personnel and their security.

I welcome the administration's efforts to forge a lasting peace between Israel and the

Palestinian Authority. This legislation provides economic, humanitarian, and security assistance to the West Bank and Gaza to encourage stability and political moderation. It ensures that Hamas and other terrorist organizations do not receive taxpayer funds and conditions funds for a potential Palestinian unity government on all its ministers publicly recognizing Israel's right to exist, renouncing violence, and adhering to past agreements.

The conference agreement provides \$420 million to help Mexico fight violent narco-traffickers with surveillance aircraft, helicopters, and law enforcement equipment, and to support rule of law programs, bringing to \$1.12 billion the total appropriated in 2008 and 2009 for these purposes.

The bill exceeds the President's request for assistance programs and diplomatic operations in Iraq to ensure a smooth transition from the military mission to a civilian-led effort.

The bill includes \$5 billion to provide the IMF with the resources necessary to respond to the global economic crisis. This funding is a central component of a comprehensive economic strategy to protect American families and jobs.

In addition, the bill addresses significant humanitarian and development priorities by providing \$225 million to address the growing displacement of civilians in Pakistan and to help refugees in other countries; \$836.9 million for peacekeeping; \$256 million for countries impacted by the global financial crisis, including Haiti and Liberia; and the House-passed level of \$100 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009.

The agreement reached by the House and Senate negotiators provides our troops needed equipment on the battlefield and adequate pay for their service through the remainder of the 2009 fiscal year, compensation of \$500 for every month they were forced to remain on active-duty for longer than planned since 2001, funding to fulfill President Obama's promise to end the Iraq War, support for refocusing our military and civilian operations in Afghanistan, and assistance for new counterterrorism, economic, and diplomatic initiatives in Pakistan.

In addition, this legislation contains much-needed funding to respond to urgent humanitarian crises involving refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). While I thank the Committee for including this assistance, I am hopeful such funding is just a sign on more to come. I am especially hopeful the U.S. will continue to respond to the dire needs to Iraqi refugees and IDPs, the largest refugee crisis since Palestinian Diaspora of 1948.

I would also like to thank Chairman OBEY for providing \$1 billion for the program authorized by the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act (also known as "cash-for-clunkers.") I was pleased to cosponsor and help craft the cash-for-clunkers legislation which will result in meaningful reductions in vehicle fleet carbon emissions and fuel consumption, while providing much-needed stimulus for our ailing automakers and economy.

Finally, as a long-time supporter of the Department of Health and Human Services and front-line public health agencies such as the

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, I am pleased that the Supplemental Appropriations Act includes \$1.5 billion for these Federal programs, along with an additional \$5.8 billion in contingent emergency appropriations for priority efforts to respond to the pandemic flu. Further, it provides \$350 million to assist State and local governments, who play an important role in protecting the public, in preparing for and responding to a pandemic.

After the recent outbreak of H1N1, which has been confirmed in 75 countries, it became apparent that the United States must work swiftly to ensure our readiness. The funding provided in the bill will allow the United States to take important steps forward in protecting Americans from a dangerous outbreak, including the expansion of detection efforts, shoring up Federal stockpiles, and securing sufficient vaccinations.

I thank Chairman OBEY, the Appropriations Committee, and the conference negotiators for including these provisions, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report to H.R. 2346.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we live in difficult times. Families continue to struggle to make ends meet. Two major American auto companies have crumbled before our eyes. And the US faces threats from groups and individuals across the globe who endeavor to do us harm.

Today, the bill before us—hopefully the last war supplemental funding measure of its kind—attempts to tackle at least one of these looming problems.

It finances the targeted strategy President Obama has crafted to minimize security threats to the United States and stabilize one of the most volatile regions of the world. The Supplemental's provisions on Afghanistan and Pakistan focus on preventing them from becoming failed states and safe havens for terrorists.

It is also a needed course-correction from the Bush Administration's policies in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan—one that makes ending corruption and improving governance, not projection of military force, the top priority.

The President has asked me—personally—to support this measure.

And I will support it for three reasons. First, this bill funds a very clear strategy in Afghanistan and limits the military mission there. Second, it provides the means to end the combat mission in Iraq and requires the Secretary of Defense to report on troop drawdown status there.

Third, there is no funding for US troops to Pakistan—only non-military aid and counter-insurgency training to enable Pakistani forces to defeat the ominous Taliban threat inside their borders. It rightly focuses on programs that can and should succeed, rather than open-ended engagements that lack achievable goals.

Governance is the key—providing the Afghan and Pakistani people an alternative to the false promise of safety and security offered by insurgent groups who are in fact terrorizing local populations. Earning the trust of the people of those countries is crucial—reforming the police, cleaning up the court systems and targeting corruption are necessary to restore confidence.

One of the most important provisions contained in this bill is the requirement that the President submit a report to Congress within

the next year assessing the success of the Af/Pak policy—the extent to which the Afghan and Pakistan governments have supported counterinsurgency operations and governance reforms, and the ways in which they effectively governing the shared border region.

The oversight measures contained in this bill will ensure that the mission is focused and that our goals are met. Investments are specific and intended to fund a finite objective.

But this measure funds more than our engagements abroad. It provides \$7.7 billion for H1N1 pandemic flu preparedness and response efforts—most of which will be used to expand our ability to detect the virus and supplement vaccine stockpiles. While this pandemic has not been as extreme as initially expected, many scientists fear that H1N1 could recur—in a stronger form—next year. This is a strategic investment in the federal government's contingency planning efforts.

Finally, the legislation honors America's wounded warriors, providing funds for health and rehabilitation programs.

I have long opposed conducting US military operations “off the books.” President Obama is committed to ending this practice, which I believe is necessary to making sure our missions are effective and Americans can understand the real trade-offs involved.

Statement on Conference Report of HR 2346, FY 2009 War Supplemental Appropriations 15 June 2009

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report on the War Supplemental Appropriations. I wonder what happened to all of my colleagues who said they were opposed to the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I wonder what happened to my colleagues who voted with me as I opposed every war supplemental request under the previous administration. It seems, with very few exceptions, they have changed their position on the war now that the White House has changed hands. I find this troubling. As I have said while opposing previous war funding requests, a vote to fund the war is a vote in favor of the war. Congress exercises its constitutional prerogatives through the power of the purse.

This conference report, being a Washington-style compromise, reflects one thing Congress agrees on: spending money we do not have. So this “compromise” bill spends 15 percent more than the president requested, which is \$9 billion more than in the original House bill and \$14.6 billion more than the original Senate version. Included in this final version—in addition to the \$106 billion to continue the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq—is a \$108 billion loan guarantee to the International Monetary Fund, allowing that destructive organization to continue spending taxpayer money to prop up corrupt elites and promote harmful economic policies overseas.

As Americans struggle through the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, this emergency supplemental appropriations bill sends billions of dollars overseas as foreign aid. Included in this appropriation is \$660 million for Gaza, \$555 million for Israel, \$310 million for Egypt, \$300 million for Jordan, and \$420 million for Mexico. Some \$889 million will be sent to the United Nations for “peacekeeping” missions. Almost one billion dollars will be sent overseas to address the global financial crisis outside our borders and nearly \$8 billion will be spent to address a “potential pandemic flu.”

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that the best way to support our troops is to bring them home from Iraq and Afghanistan. If one looks at the original authorization for the use of force in Afghanistan, it is clear that the ongoing and expanding nation-building mission there has nothing to do with our goal of capturing and bringing to justice those who attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. Our continued presence in Iraq and Afghanistan does not make us more safe at home, but in fact it undermines our national security. I urge my colleagues to defeat this reckless conference report.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the 2001 resolution authorizing the use of force because I believed it gave President Bush and any future President a blank check to wage war anywhere on the globe, starting in Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, we will be unable to avoid such ill-fated actions in the future until we repeal the 2001 authorization.

Today, nearly eight years later, I oppose the supplemental appropriations bill for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq because it continues us down the path of open-ended military escalation that can lead to war without end.

I oppose this \$94 billion supplemental because:

It favors military activities over diplomatic, development, and reconstruction efforts by a ratio of 8 to 1;

It does not include an exit plan for Afghanistan;

It does not require the fully funded redeployment of troops and military contractors out of Iraq within 12 months; and

It does not include the strong regional approach the situation demands including a strong nuclear non-proliferation effort in Pakistan.

Madam Speaker, it is time we maximize our nation's “smart power” by increasing our use of diplomatic, development, and reconstruction activities.

Unfortunately, the supplemental appropriations bill does not reflect a fundamental shift in direction.

Therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of myself and my four colleagues from the U.S. territories to express our concern with Section 14103 of the Conference Report on H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009, relative to a funding prohibition on the release or transfer of individuals currently detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Today, my colleagues and I have written a letter to President Barack H. Obama to convey this concern. I submit the text of our letter for print and inclusion in the official RECORD.

Washington, DC., June 16, 2009.

President BARACK H. OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to respectfully request that your Administration not release or transfer any individual who is currently detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to any territory of the United States.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 2346), which is expected to be approved by Congress later this week, prohibits the use of funds made available in the Act to release or transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay to the 50 states or the District of Columbia. However, the Act tech-

nically does not prohibit the use of funds to release or transfer such individuals to any of the U.S. territories.

Although we have no reason to believe that your Administration intends to release or transfer any detainees to the U.S. territories, we write to express our concern about any decision in this context that may treat the territories differently than the 50 states or the District of Columbia. The safety of the U.S. citizens and nationals residing in the territories is no less important than the safety of their fellow Americans residing in the 50 states. We are certain that your Administration fully subscribes to this view and, therefore, that you will treat the territories the same as the 50 states and the District of Columbia with respect to the release or transfer of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

We thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Pedro R. Pierluisi.

Madeleine Z. Bordallo.

Donna M. Christensen.

Eni F.H. Faleomavaega.

Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I wanted to come down to the House floor to let the troops know I support them and how much I appreciate the work they're doing around the world. I have been to Afghanistan and to Guantanamo Bay this year to see the work they're doing, and it is tremendous. We should all be proud of their effort.

Unfortunately, today's vote misuses critical funding for our troops to push through billions in foreign spending. People in east Tennessee question why we're giving \$5 billion and over \$100 billion in loan guarantees to the International Monetary Fund to bail out other countries when we have so many needs right here at home.

Additionally, because this legislation designates everything as “emergency” spending, this spending is not offset and breaks the already-inflated spending caps. The way I see it, the only emergency I see is that a month has passed and the Democrats haven't added a few billion to our already record deficit in new spending.

I urge members to defeat this bill and force the Democratic Leadership to bring us back a clean supplemental that supports the troops.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 366.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 202, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie	Arcuri	Becerra
Ackerman	Baca	Berman
Adler (NJ)	Baird	Berry
Altmire	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Bean	Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer	Himes	Obey	Graves	Massa	Royce	Andrews	Dicks	Kratovil
Bocieri	Hinchey	Oliver	Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)	Arcuri	Dingell	Kucinich
Boren	Hinojosa	Ortiz	Grijalva	McCaul	Scalise	Austria	Doggett	Lamborn
Boswell	Hirono	Pallone	Guthrie	McClintock	Schmidt	Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Lance
Boucher	Hodes	Pascarell	Hall (TX)	McCotter	Schock	Bachmann	Doyle	Langevin
Boyd	Holden	Pastor (AZ)	Harper	McGovern	Sensenbrenner	Bachus	Dreier	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Pelosi	Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Serrano	Baird	Driehaus	Latham
Bralley (IA)	Hoyer	Perlmutter	Heller	McKeon	Sessions	Baldwin	Duncan	LaTourette
Bright	Inslee	Perriello	Hensarling	McMorris	Shadegg	Barrett (SC)	Edwards (MD)	Latta
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Peters	Herger	Rodgers	Shea-Porter	Barrow	Ehlers	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Peterson	Hoekstra	Mica	Sherman	Bartlett	Ellison	Lee (NY)
Cao	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Honda	Michaud	Shuster	Bean	Ellsworth	Levin
Capps	(TX)	Price (NC)	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Simpson	Becerra	Emerson	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Inglis	Miller, Gary	Smith (NE)	Berry	Engel	Linder
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall	Issa	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)	Biggert	Eshoo	Lipinski
Carney	Kagen	Rangel	Jenkins	Murphy, Tim	Smith (TX)	Bilbray	Etheridge	LoBiondo
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Reyes	Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Nunes	Bilirakis	Fallin	Loebsock
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Richardson	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Olson	Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rodriguez	Jones	Nunes	Paul	Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lowey
Childers	Kilroy	Ross	Jordan (OH)	Speier	Paulsen	Bishop (UT)	Filner	Lucas
Clarke	Kind	Rothman (NJ)	Kaptur	Stark	Payne	Blackburn	Flake	Luetkemeyer
Clay	King (NY)	King (IA)	King (IA)	Stearns	Pence	Blumenauer	Fleming	Lujan
Cleaver	Kirk	Roybal-Allard	Kingston	Terry	Petri	Blunt	Forbes	Lummis
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Ruppersberger	Kline (MN)	Thompson (PA)	Pingree (ME)	Bocieri	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel
Cohen	Kissell	Rush	Kucinich	Thornberry	Lance	Boehner	Foster	E.
Connolly (VA)	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Lamborn	Tiahrt	Lance	Bonner	Fox	Lynch
Cooper	Kosmas	Salazar	Lance	Tiberi	Platts	Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Costa	Kratovil	Sánchez, Linda	Latham	Tierney	Poe (TX)	Boozman	Frelinghuysen	Maffei
Costello	Langevin	T.	LaTourette	Tsongas	Polis (CO)	Boren	Fudge	Manzullo
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Latta	Turner	Posey	Boswell	Gallegly	Marchant
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Lee (CA)	Upton	Price (GA)	Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Markey (CO)
Cuellar	Levin	Schakowsky	Lee (NY)	Walden	Putnam	Boustany	Gerlach	Markey (MA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Schauer	Lewis (GA)	Wamp	Radanovich	Boyd	Giffords	Marshall
Dahlkemper	Loebsock	Schiff	Linder	Waters	Rehberg	Brady (PA)	Gingrey (GA)	Massa
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Schrader	LoBiondo	Watson	Reichert	Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Matheson
Davis (CA)	Lujan	Schwartz	Lofgren, Zoe	Welch	Roe (TN)	Bralley (IA)	Gonzalez	Matsui
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Scott (GA)	Lucas	Westmoreland	Rogers (AL)	Bright	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Davis (TN)	Maffei	Scott (VA)	Luetkemeyer	Whitfield	Rogers (KY)	Broun (GA)	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (NY)
DeFazio	Maloney	Sestak	Lummis	Wilson (SC)	Rogers (MI)	Brown (SC)	Granger	McCaul
DeGette	Markey (CO)	Shuler	Lungren, Daniel	Wittman	Rohrabacher	Brown, Corrine	Graves	McClintock
Delahunt	Markey (MA)	Sires	E.	Wolf	Ros-Lehtinen	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Grayson	McCollum
DeLauro	Marshall	Skelton	Mack	Woolsey	Roskam	Buchanan	Green, Al	McCotter
Dicks	Matheson	Slaughter	Manzullo	Young (AK)		Burgess	Green, Gene	McDermott
Dingell	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Marchant			Burton (IN)	Griffith	McGovern
Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder				Butterfield	Guthrie	McHugh
Doyle	McCollum	Space				Hall (IN)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Driehaus	McDermott	Spratt	Alexander	Kennedy	Sullivan	Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Edwards (TX)	McHugh	Stupak	Berkley	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)	Calvert	Hall (TX)	McMahon
Ellsworth	McIntyre	Sutton				Camp	Halvorson	McMorris
Engel	McMahon	Tanner				Campbell	Hare	Rodgers
Eshoo	McNerney	Tauscher				Cantor	Harper	McNerney
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Taylor				Cao	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Teague				Capito	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Foster	Melancon	Thompson (CA)				Capps	Heinrich	Melancon
Frank (MA)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (MS)				Capuano	Heller	Mica
Fudge	Miller (NC)	Titus				Cardoza	Hensarling	Michaud
Giffords	Miller, George	Tonko				Carnahan	Herger	Miller (FL)
Gonzalez	Minnick	Towns				Carney	Herseeth Sandlin	Miller (MI)
Gordon (TN)	Mitchell	Van Hollen				Carson (IN)	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Green, Al	Mollohan	Velázquez				Cassidy	Hill	Miller, Gary
Green, Gene	Moore (KS)	Visclosky				Castle	Himes	Miller, George
Griffith	Moore (WI)	Walz				Castor (FL)	Hinchey	Minnick
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Wasserman				Chaffetz	Hinojosa	Mitchell
Hall (NY)	Murphy (CT)	Schultz				Chandler	Hirono	Mollohan
Halvorson	Murphy (NY)	Watt				Childers	Hodes	Moore (KS)
Hare	Murphy, Patrick	Waxman				Clarke	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)
Harman	Murtha	Weiner				Clay	Holden	Moran (KS)
Hastings (FL)	Nadler (NY)	Wexler				Cleaver	Holt	Moran (VA)
Heinrich	Napolitano	Wilson (OH)				Clyburn	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)
Herseeth Sandlin	Neal (MA)	Wu				Coble	Hunter	Murphy (NY)
Higgins	Nye	Yarmuth				Coffman (CO)	Inglis	Murphy, Patrick
Hill	Oberstar					Cohen	Inslee	Murphy, Tim

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1827

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”
 So the conference report was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366, 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 366.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]
 YEAS—411

Aderholt	Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, M.	Abercrombie	Aderholt	Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.
Akin	Burgess	Doggett	Ackerman	Adler (NJ)	Altmire	Diaz-Balart, M.
Austria	Burton (IN)	Dreier				
Bachmann	Buyer	Duncan				
Bachus	Calvert	Edwards (MD)				
Baldwin	Camp	Ehlers				
Barrett (SC)	Campbell	Ellison				
Bartlett	Cantor	Emerson				
Barton (TX)	Capito	Fallin				
Biggert	Capuano	Farr				
Bilbray	Carter	Filner				
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Flake				
Bishop (UT)	Castle	Fleming				
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Forbes				
Blunt	Coble	Fortenberry				
Boehner	Coffman (CO)	Fox				
Bonner	Cole	Franks (AZ)				
Bono Mack	Conaway	Frelinghuysen				
Boozman	Conyers	Gallegly				
Boustany	Crenshaw	Garrett (NJ)				
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gerlach				
Broun (GA)	Cummings	Gingrey (GA)				
Brown (SC)	Dahlkemper	Gohmert				
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte				
	Davis (CA)	Granger				
	Davis (IL)					
	Davis (KY)					
	Davis (TN)					
	Deal (GA)					
	DeFazio					
	DeGette					
	Delahunt					
	DeLauro					
	Dent					
	Diaz-Balart, L.					
	Diaz-Balart, M.					
	Kosmas					

NAYS—202

Diaz-Balart, L.

Polis (CO)	Schauer	Thompson (CA)
Pomeroy	Schiff	Thompson (MS)
Posey	Schmidt	Thompson (PA)
Price (GA)	Schock	Thornberry
Price (NC)	Schrader	Tiahrt
Putnam	Schwartz	Tiberi
Quigley	Scott (GA)	Tierney
Radanovich	Scott (VA)	Titus
Rahall	Sensenbrenner	Tonko
Rangel	Serrano	Towns
Rehberg	Sessions	Tsongas
Reichert	Sestak	Turner
Reyes	Shadegg	Upton
Richardson	Shea-Porter	Van Hollen
Rodriguez	Sherman	Velázquez
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Rogers (AL)	Shuler	Walden
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Walz
Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Sires	Wasserman
Rooney	Skelton	Schultz
Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Waters
Roskam	Smith (NE)	Watson
Ross	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Rothman (NJ)	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Weiner
Royce	Souder	Welch
Ruppersberger	Space	Westmoreland
Rush	Speier	Wexler
Ryan (OH)	Spratt	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Stearns	Wilson (OH)
Salazar	Stupak	Wilson (SC)
Sánchez, Linda	Sutton	Wittman
T.	Tanner	Wolf
Sanchez, Loretta	Tauscher	Woolsey
Sarbanes	Taylor	Wu
Scalise	Teague	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Terry	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Alexander	Harman	Neal (MA)
Barton (TX)	Honda	Poe (TX)
Berkley	Kagen	Smith (TX)
Berman	Kennedy	Stark
Carter	Larson (CT)	Sullivan
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)
Frank (MA)	Maloney	
Grijalva	McHenry	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1835

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 2009, I missed rollcall votes 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347 and 349, due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2847.

□ 1835

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Depart-

ments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALTMIRE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in regard to H.R. 2847, the legislation appropriating funds for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for 2010.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in general debate.

Mr. Chairman, if this is June, it must be appropriations season, and today I'm pleased to present to the House the first of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2010, H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriation bill.

While the summer may be hot and humid, as is typical in the Nation's Capital, with the assistance of this body, our days and nights need not be long for the House to fully consider this and the other 11 appropriations bills in regular order, or so we hope.

I want to thank the ranking member of this subcommittee with most sincerity for his assistance, help, counsel, and guidance in the development of this bill. Mr. FRANK Wolf of Virginia was chairman of this committee for a number of years, served on it for a great number of years. We served on it together. He brings to this bill a lot of experience and knowledge and that is really helpful as you work up an appropriation bill, and I appreciate, Frank, very much your assistance on the bill and the credibility and knowledge you bring to it.

I also want to thank publicly and personally the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, for his assistance in developing this bill. Mr. OBEY's courtesy and the assistance of the front office has been very much appreciated, and we also appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the allocation that you've given us for this bill that's allowed us to do what we are allowed to do, however short the allocation may be.

I would also like to sincerely recognize the staff: the excellent work of the clerk, John Blazey, and the leadership he's provided to the rest of the staff, and all of them have done excellent work, which I appreciate: Adrienne Simonson, Dixon Butler, Diana Simpson, Darek Newby, Tracey LaTurner, Scott Sammis, all with the subcommittee; Mike Ringler and John Martens on the minority staff. And then on my personal staff, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson.

It's a lot of work putting together one of these appropriation bills, as anybody who's been involved with it or

close to it understands, and they have worked long hours diligently with great competence to move this bill forward, and I most sincerely thank them for the efforts. We couldn't do this without them.

Mr. Chairman, in brief summary, this bill totals \$64.4 billion, an increase of \$6.7 billion over last year, but it is \$200 million below the President's budget request. The bill provides \$30.6 billion for investments in science, technology, and innovation, an increase of \$1 billion over comparable levels from last year.

Within this level, the bill provides \$6.9 billion for the National Science Foundation and \$18.2 billion for NASA. For NIST, the bill provides \$781.1 million. For NOAA, it's recommended at \$4.6 billion. The committee's recommendation continues to provide resources consistent with the doubling path identified for NSF and NIST in the COMPETES Act. It also considers the science and research conducted at NOAA and at NASA as critical to the Nation's science enterprise just as that performed by NSF and NIST.

For law enforcement and other agencies of the Department of Justice, the bill provides a total of \$27.7 billion. Full funding of \$7.9 billion for the FBI, \$2 billion for the DEA, and \$1.1 billion for ATF.

For the Bureau of Prisons, the bill provides \$6.2 billion to address longstanding critical shortages in corrections' staffing and education, in addition to drug treatment. For State and local law enforcement activities, the bill provides a total of more than \$3.4 billion, restoring, in large part, reductions proposed by the administration.

For programs funded through the Office of Violence Against Women, the bill provides an increase of \$11 million, including a \$10 million increase for STOP Formula Grants, and a \$1 million increase for Sexual Assault Victims Services.

I want to be clear that while the funding table in the report for the Office of Violence Against Women may appear in the report to show a funding decrease, that is only because the bill moves a number of programs to the Office of Justice programs which actually administers those programs.

So, let me repeat, the bill increases funding for the Office of Violence Against Women by \$11 million.

The bill provides a full funding of \$298 million for the COPS hiring program. In other areas within the Justice Department, the bill provides \$325 million—an increase of \$41 million over the fiscal year 2009 level—for the Adam Walsh Act.

With respect to border security, the bill provides \$1.5 billion, a 30 percent increase over fiscal year 2009. These funds will be used to address firearms and narcotics trafficking between the United States and Mexico, an issue on which every Member of this body has concerns, and we're pleased to provide these increases.

□ 1845

For the Second Chance Act, the bill includes a total of \$114 million to develop and implement evidence-based strategies and programs at the Federal and State levels to reduce recidivism and the future costs of incarceration. I want to particularly compliment the authorizing committee for the good job that they have done with the Second Chance Act and other legislation they are considering. We are looking forward and appreciate the opportunity to cooperate with them on the funding side.

A significant initiative across the Department of Justice is increased investments in law enforcement and prosecution efforts in Indian Country, for which the bill provides approximately \$155 million, and that is an increase of \$65 million over fiscal 2009.

For SCAAP, which the President proposed to eliminate, Mr. Chairman, the bill includes \$300 million.

With respect to the Department of Commerce, \$4.6 billion is slated for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an increase of \$129 million above the request.

The bill provides \$7.4 million for Census, the same level as the budget request.

For NASA, the bill provides a total of \$18.2 billion, an increase of \$420 million over last year's level. Investments have been made in Earth science to further the decadal surveys. The recommendation, however, acknowledges, and this is important for Members to consider and take note of, that the administration has established a blue ribbon panel, Mr. Chairman, led by Dr. Norm Augustine, to review the current vision for human spaceflight.

Funds are provided in this bill to continue investments in human spaceflight at the level of last year. Reductions from the budget request should not be viewed by this body as any diminution of certainly my support or the committee's support in NASA's human spaceflight activities. Rather, it is a deferral. It is a deferral taken without prejudice. It is a pause. It is a timeout.

Call it what you will, it is an opportunity for the President to establish his vision for human space exploration, looking at the Augustine report when it becomes available in August, and then for his administration to consider what their vision will be, and then, most importantly, certainly for our committee, Mr. Chairman, to come forward with a realistic future funding scheme for the human space exploration program.

We hope it is a vision worthy of the program, and we look forward to realistic funding levels, which we have never had, or haven't had for many, many years, for human spaceflight.

It is also important to note that the total funding contained in this bill for NASA is an increase of \$421 million over the fiscal year 2009 level, and, moreover, some \$1 billion was provided

in the Recovery Act for NASA activities.

Lastly, the bill provides \$440 million for the Legal Services Administration. Appropriations for Legal Services increased by almost \$90 million over the last couple of years, with which we are very pleased. It is still underfunded compared to base years in the nineties. This is indicative of the rising need for legal support for the poor, particularly because of mortgage fraud and the home crisis.

The bill continues the existing limitations, Mr. Chairman, on the use of these funds, except that it lifts the current restrictions on attorney's fees.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief summary of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, in beginning consideration of H.R. 2847, making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies. The bill provides funding for programs whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the study and exploration of space.

The bill before the House today addresses a number of national needs and requirements, and I think it is important for the RECORD to show that I believe, and I think any fair-minded person would, to say that the chairman has done a commendable job in balancing the many competing interests and has put together a solid bill in a fair and evenhanded way.

At times I have felt the minority has not been treated very, very fair, and I will say with the gentleman, we have been treated very, very fair, and I think it is important to make sure everyone knows that. We have not been foreclosed from anything.

I also want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their help and assistance, including the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, and the Republican members of the subcommittee, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. BONNER.

I also want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle who spent long hours in putting this bill and report together. The majority staff: John Blazey, Tracey LaTurner, Dixon Butler, Adrienne Simonson, Diana Simpson, Darek Newby and Scott Sammis. And the minority staff: Mike Ringler and John Martens. And on my staff, Tom Culligan, and on the chairman's staff, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson.

Overall, the bill, as I said, includes important increases to priority programs, including the need to address violent crime, particularly crime related to drug trafficking and gangs; and the need to boost our Nation's competitiveness through more invest-

ments in scientific research and improving science, math in education.

However, I believe we could have met the most pressing needs by prioritizing within the lower allocation. This allocation given to the subcommittee is \$64.8 billion, which is \$6.8 billion or 11.7 percent above 2009. This allocation allows virtually every agency, account and program to grow, and I believe it is more than a sufficient amount to address the highest priority needs.

The rate of increased spending in the bill corresponds with the majority's overall budget blueprint, which increases discretionary spending by \$77 billion over the current fiscal year. Since the other party took control of Congress, nondefense, nonveterans affairs discretionary spending has increased by 85 percent.

This rate of spending does not represent a step toward restoring fiscal balance. There was an article today I think in Reuters mentioning that our Nation, if we continue the current course, will lose our triple A bond rating, it is the earliest date I have ever seen, by 2010. It is 2009 now. That means next year. So how we deal with that is really a tough, but an important, issue.

Some highlights: for the Department of Commerce, the bill includes \$13.85 billion, including an increase of \$4 billion to conduct the 2010 Census.

The chairman has included strong funding for trade enforcement, which I appreciate, particularly with regard to China and the full request for Commerce Department programs to enforce dual-use export controls and respond to cyber-espionage threats.

For the Justice Department, the bill includes \$27.5 billion, \$672 million above the request. The FBI's operating level is funded at the President's request, which is necessary in order to continue current staffing operation levels, which also fund the urgent increases in counterterrorism programs.

Too often we fail to recognize the critical and often dangerous work that the FBI is doing at home and abroad in order to detect and prevent terrorist attacks. This is incredibly important work, and the bill strongly supports those efforts while also providing necessary funding for the FBI to fulfill its traditional roles and address emerging problems such as mortgage and financial fraud, child exploitation, and the spread of violent gangs.

On the gang issue, this bill includes a new \$35 million initiative to fund the FBI's Safe Streets Task Force and ATF Violent Crime Impact Teams. This will fund new task forces and new positions on existing task forces in the areas, which is pretty much the entire country, plagued by gang violence.

The bill increases State and local law enforcement accounts by \$197 million. Despite this increased funding for SCAAP, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the program is reduced to \$300 million from the current level of \$400 million, and the chairman,

appropriately so I think, has drafted an amendment to increase SCAAP that I hope will pass with bipartisan support.

In the area of science, the bill includes important initiatives in science competitiveness. Our country is falling behind. We have about 95,000 engineers working for the space program, and China has about 200,000.

The previous administration launched the American Competitiveness Initiative, which included a commitment to double the funding for basic scientific research over 10 years and also to strengthen education and encourage entrepreneurship. I am pleased that the chairman has done this and also that the new administration embraced this goal.

For the National Science Foundation, the bill provides \$6.9 billion, a 6.9 percent increase above the current year for research that will set the groundwork for the development of new technologies and science education that will ensure we have a well-educated and skilled workforce to improve competitiveness.

For NASA, the bill includes \$18.2 billion. This includes the full request for aeronautics, the shuttle program and the International Space Station, as well as funding above the request for NASA science and education. However, the bill freezes funding at the current level for exploration activities pending the outcome of a blue ribbon panel review of future options.

The result of this cut is a funding level that will not be sufficient to sustain the current development scheduled for the next generation of space exploration vehicles and would result in severe disruption to the Nation's human spaceflight program.

I look forward to the recommendations, as the chairman does, of the review panel being led by Norm Augustine, and to working with the chairman and other Members to ensure that the final bill will include sufficient funds to continue the U.S. leadership role in human spaceflight.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the important language that is included in the bill regarding the release and transfer of Guantanamo detainees. This bill does not prevent the closure of Guantanamo. It seeks only to ensure in the process of carrying out the executive order that national security, the security of our communities and the security of our men and women in uniform overseas are the highest priority.

The bill prohibits the release of any detainees into the United States. It also prohibits transfer to the U.S. for prosecution as well as transfers or release to other countries unless and until the administration presents a comprehensive report to the Congress on the proposed disposition of each individual. This report will detail security risks and measures to mitigate those risks and will include a certification that affected State governments have been notified in advance.

Regarding transfers to other countries, the report must address the risk

of recidivism. Some are going to Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Saudi Arabia has funded many of these radical madrasas up on the Pakistan-Afghan border, and Yemen has been the center of a lot of terrorist activities. The report must address the risks of recidivism and detail the terms of any financial agreements related to the acceptance of the individuals transferred.

The language will ensure that detainees are not released into our communities, and it places important restrictions and conditions on future transfers and releases.

It has become clear in the last few days that the administration is rushing to release and transfer as many of these detainees as possible before the will of Congress to place restrictions can be enacted.

In closing, despite concerns about the overall levels of spending, the bill represents the chairman's best efforts to distribute the allocation he was given to the various competing requirements under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. I commend the chairman and I thank the chairman for his openness and his thoroughness to the minority.

I would say that the chairman held a week of hearings on prison reform. We, unfortunately, have the largest per capita prison population in the world. They were the best hearings that I have seen held in this Congress.

Based on that, and I want to commend Mr. MOLLOHAN, based on that, the Council of Governments and the Pew Foundation will be putting on a major conference this fall that I am sure the chairman will be very much involved in to establish the best practices, because you cannot just put a man or woman in prison and lock them up and throw away the key without any job training and things like that.

There was not a lot of coverage. I don't think The New York Times ever covered the story. I don't think many of the major papers did. But it was the best hearings in the time that I have been here, and I want to thank the chairman for his efforts and concerns. I think a lot of positive things will come out of that.

Lastly, I am pleased to operate under an open rule today, and look forward to the consideration of the many amendments that have been filed and will be urging my Members on this side at final passage to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for those kind comments about our Bureau of Prisons hearings. I would like to comment he was the leader with regard to prison reform and has been for a great number of years. Based upon those hearings, he is the one that contacted the State Council of Governments to encourage them to follow up with their proceedings in the fall. Thank you, Mr. WOLF.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio for the purpose of colloquy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, thank you for discussing with me a matter of great importance to the citizens of the United States.

At the heart of our financial crisis is the housing crisis and at the heart of the housing crisis is mortgage fraud. The FBI redeployed financial special agents in the last decade and have yet to allow the White Collar Crime Division to replace those agents even when it warned the public and the administration in 2004 of the potential for mortgage fraud to become an epidemic. The vast majority of mortgage fraud in fact goes unreported, and thus the depth of mortgage fraud is vastly underestimated.

In the savings and loan investigations of the late eighties and early nineties, approximately 500 FBI agents worked on cases. In February 2009, however, Deputy Director of the FBI John Pistole testified before the Senate stating: "However, today's financial crisis dwarfs the S&L crisis as financial institutions have reduced their assets by more than \$1 trillion related to the current global financial crisis, compared to the estimated \$160 million lost during the S&L crisis."

□ 1900

According to the Department of Justice budget documents, there are currently 175 FBI agents working mortgage fraud and corporate mortgage fraud. That is laughable, given the vast amount of taxpayer dollars still at risk. We know that the FBI Mortgage Fraud Division needs to have an increase in special agents and an increase in the necessary support personnel such as forensic accountants.

I look forward to working with the chairman as the bill moves forward to address this national need.

Mr. OBEY. Let me thank the gentlewoman for her comments on this issue and her steadfast advocacy on behalf of those who are suffering during this economic downturn.

The bill we're considering today continues the process of rebuilding the FBI's mortgage fraud capability by adding 50 new agents and \$25 million to the white-collar crime program. We look forward to working with the gentlewoman to monitor the FBI's progress on mortgage fraud investigations and to ensure as we move through the conference that the Bureau is appropriately resourced and staffed to address a problem of this magnitude.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on this issue and for your leadership on our full committee. I look forward to working with you to bolster the FBI's critical investigative capabilities and deliver justice to the American people through prosecution of those who have perpetrated systemic financial fraud and control fraud, which have brought our Republic to this dangerous juncture.

Mr. WOLF. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely thank Chairman MOLLOHAN, Ranking Member WOLF for the bipartisan manner in which this bill was put together. Mr. MOLLOHAN truly has, and Mr. WOLF, opened up this process to all members of the committee to participate. Majority and minority views are included, and it is, truly, the bill was put together in an open, bipartisan way, which I'm very grateful for.

And I especially also want to thank Chairman OBEY, Mr. LEWIS, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Mr. WOLF for the strong commitment that they have made to invest in the sciences, the National Science Foundation, the scientific work that's being done at NASA and NOAA. The scientific advancement that this Nation makes, and throughout our history, has been one of the most important factors in the advance of America throughout our history. And I'm very, very pleased at the investment the committee is making in scientific research.

However, I do have some serious concerns about the bill's reduction in funding from the budget request for NASA's human spaceflight frame.

Mr. Chairman, if I could engage in a colloquy with you, sir, to ask about the manned spaceflight funding and what the committee, what the country and NASA can expect as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if you'd agree that the United States must maintain its world leadership in space exploration, and that, in order to lead the world, America must have a robust human spaceflight program; and also, that NASA's human spaceflight program must have a clearly defined mission, and that Congress and the Obama administration should fully fund that mission. And also, Mr. Chairman, that Congress and NASA should do everything possible to mitigate the 5-year gap between the retirement of the shuttle and the initial operating capability of the next generation of human spaceflight.

And then finally, Mr. Chairman, that the Appropriations Committee, we will all work together in an absolutely bipartisan and open way to fully fund the mission of NASA's manned space program as defined by the Augustine Commission, the Obama administration and this Congress.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague, Congressman CULBERSON, who is a fine member of our subcommittee, and who brings particular expertise. As I often say, I aspire to know as much about the sciences as he does and he makes significant contributions to our committee. I thank him for his passion to our committee, and also to our Nation's space programs.

I share the sentiments the gentleman just expressed. I should note that the

bill before the House today does not cut human spaceflight programs in fiscal year 2010; rather, the bill level funds ongoing activities until such time as the Augustine Commission completes its review, and the Obama administration commits to the next generation of human spaceflight.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm very confident that under the leadership of Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF that these proposed reductions from the President's budget request will be reviewed once again after the Augustine report is completed in an announcement from the Obama administration on how to proceed in human spaceflight. We genuinely appreciate the chairman's commitment to fund that recommendation with, of course, the input of the authorizing committee and the Appropriations Committee, because for America to surrender the high ground of space exploration, Mr. Chairman, would be as dangerous today as it would have been for General Meade to surrender the high ground of Little Round Top and Cemetery Hill at the Battle of Gettysburg. If General Meade had surrendered the high ground, I don't think there's any doubt that the United States would have lost the Battle of Gettysburg. And just as certainly as America would be at the mercy of our enemies, in position to lose any future war, if America surrenders the high ground of outer space to other nations.

Mr. OLSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purposes of continuing this colloquy?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to participate in this colloquy with you here today.

This Nation has been the leader in human spaceflight for 50 years, and the decisions we make today will determine whether we will continue to lead in the next 50. And I'm worried that as other nations look at the stars, we're staring at our feet.

The proposed cut in the exploration budget threatens our economic, military and technological standing, and would lead to a loss of up to 4,000 jobs, extend up to 2 years the time needed to fully design and develop the Constellation system, and result in additional cost of up to \$8 billion. Therefore, I have prepared an amendment to restore that funding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your pledge to revisit the funding issues based on the outcome of the Augustine panel, and that if the panel agrees, we will work as a Congress to reassess appropriate funding levels. In light of that commitment, I will not offer my amendment, and look forward to working with you to meet the pressing needs of human spaceflight.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I appreciate the work of both my colleagues from Texas. I appreciate and agree with the sentiments that they've expressed here

today. I just wish I could have expressed them as eloquently as my colleague and committee member, Mr. CULBERSON, particularly as he alludes to the Civil War. I can think of no comparison to match it. But the sentiment I agree with.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, Mr. CULBERSON is definitely the science man. I mean, he is the science guy. It's not debatable, and if we have an amendment, and he also is a Civil War guy too, but he is the science guy.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, those were Texans that were coming up on Little Round Top against Colonel Chamberlain that day, but I did want to point that out.

But I want to appreciate the subcommittee chairman, my good friend, Alan Mollohan, for the hard work him and his staff have done while drafting this bill. It's not an easy job being the committee chairman, but I know you've done a great job to balance these many priorities.

That being said, I just want to echo my comments, my colleague from Texas, JOHN CULBERSON, in regards to the current level of funding for NASA. And hopefully we can, as you said, we'll work with you to make sure that the \$700 million, which obviously would be devastating to NASA if that cut stayed in, to make sure that we get that money back in the 2010 Commerce, Justice spending as enacted.

As you know, as has been pointed out, the challenges that we have with other countries that are making major investments in space—China, India, Japan, Pakistan, Russia. And certainly we don't live in a world today where we're the only ones involved in outer space.

So I support the chairman and what he's trying to do with the Augustine panel to wait to find out what the report is. But I'm optimistic we'll work this out with our fellow NASA supporters in Congress to provide necessary funding and the rules and tools it needs to realize the agency's human space exploration under President Obama.

And so I would again thank the chairman for your hard work on that.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and look forward to working with him on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Justice-Science, Mr. MOLLOHAN. And I want to thank the chairman for the increased funding in the bill to hire more corrections officers in our Federal prison system, which will allow the Bureau of Prisons to hire an additional 1,000 corrections officers nationwide.

And while I fully support such an increase, I believe we must do more,

given that the director of the Federal prison system has asked for an additional 3,000 correctional officers to effectively run our Nation's prison system.

And by bringing this issue to the floor, I hope to raise the awareness of our colleagues in the House regarding staffing levels at the Federal correction facilities located not just in our districts but in our communities all across the country.

The district that I represent, Pennsylvania's 10th, contains three of the 15 high-security penitentiaries operated by the BOP, in addition to one minimum- and one medium-security facility. Also I represent correction officers from communities working at two minimum- and two medium-security Federal penitentiaries in neighboring districts.

Additionally, we have one of the federal penitentiaries in my district, USP Lewisburg, that is in the process of being converted to a "special management unit," the only one of its kind in the entire system. Lewisburg will house inmates from other penitentiaries who prove too troublesome to manage, but who do not qualify for the ADMAX facility at USP Florence in Colorado.

For various reasons, funding for our Nation's corrections officers has failed to keep pace with increased prison populations and increasingly dangerous prisoners over the last several years.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are making every effort to reverse the trend of underfunding the BOP and to assure that communities hosting Federal corrections sites, that they are safe, and the corrections staff working within the walls will be able to work together as this bill moves forward to ensure that the Bureau has the funding it needs to catch up with the staffing needs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his rising on this important issue, and I appreciate his leadership in supporting increased funding for the Bureau of Prisons.

BOP funding has simply not kept pace, Mr. Chairman, with the rising prison population and the aging BOP infrastructure. The Bureau of Prisons prisoner population is currently 37 percent above the rated capacity for BOP facilities, and the prisoner-to-staff ratio is an appalling 4.9-1. We must begin to turn that around, and this bill takes a big step in that direction. This committee has had this concern for a number of years and has been working diligently to increase this funding.

The bill provides an increase of \$481.5 million above the fiscal year 2009 level for the Bureau of Prisons salaries and expenses, which is \$97.4 million above the administration's request. We added that \$97.4 million to help restore the BOP's base budget, which has been progressively hollowed out in recent years by inadequate budget requests. These additional funds will enable the Bureau of Prisons to hire additional correc-

tional officers and activate two newly constructed prisons.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are making every effort to reverse the trend of BOP funding to ensure that communities hosting correction sites are safe, as are the corrections staff working within the facility walls. I hope that we will be able to work together as the bill moves forward, to ensure that the Bureau has the funding it needs to catch up with staffing needs.

□ 1915

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the biggest problem I have with this bill is that we've been talking about cutting spending and about controlling the budget. So far this year, in the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act, the TARP bill, we've spent \$700 billion. In the Children's Health Reauthorization Act, the State Children's Health Insurance, we've spent \$73.3 billion. In the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus, we've spent \$1.16 trillion. In the February '09 consolidated appropriation, the omnibus bill, we've spent \$625 billion. Now, I understand the necessity of this bill, but it's 11.6 percent higher than, I think, the same bill last year.

The thing that really bothers me is that, I think, you have 80-some pages of earmarks, of pork bill projects, whatever you want to call them, at a time when we're suffering severely economically and at a time when we're spending way, way more money than the American people can afford. We're spending so much money that they're actually, I think, running the printing presses over at Treasury day and night. I can't understand why we're allowing all of these earmarks, many of which have nothing to do with Commerce, Justice and Science.

So I would just like to say that I think this is something that we ought to take a hard look at when we get into the amendments. I wish that we didn't have this kind of a tremendous amount of additional expenses, and I sure wish we didn't have all of these earmarks.

If there is one thing the American people are very concerned about right now it is all of these additional projects, especially at a time when they're suffering at home. People can't afford their houses. They can't afford to take care of their kids' educational needs. There are so many problems the American people have. The unemployment rate is at—what?—9 percent nationally. Here we are with all of these earmarks, and we're spending all of this money that they don't have and that, certainly, the government doesn't have.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the RECORD a June 16, 2009, document on general funding levels.

To: Congressman Dan Burton

From: Legislative Staff

Date: June 16, 2009

Subject: Talking points

GENERAL FUNDING LEVELS:

The bill provides \$6.7 billion (11.6 percent more than FY 2009 for programs funded under the CJS Appropriations bill.

Agencies funded through the bill received approximately \$16 billion in supplemental appropriations outside the normal FY 2009 appropriations process, the vast majority of which came from the "stimulus" bill.

H.R. 2847 would provide \$13.85 billion for the Department of Commerce, which is an increase of \$4.57 billion, or 49 percent, over FY 2009. The majority of the increase for Commerce is due to a \$4.2 billion increase in spending for the Census Bureau.

The bill provides \$27.74 billion for the Department of Justice, DOJ, which is an increase of \$1.65 billion, or 6.3 percent, above FY 2009.

Funding for science agencies is \$25.1 billion, an increase of \$868 million, or 3.5 percent, above FY 2009.

Spending for other related agencies is \$956 million, which is \$83 million, or 9.5 percent, above FY 2009.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE BILL:

Earmarks: The Report accompanying H.R. 2847 contains \$386 million in funding for approximately 1,100 earmarks, listed on 80, non-searchable pages.

Earmarks in the bill range from: \$180,000 for "Training the Next Generation Weather Forecasters" at San Jose State University; \$1 million for a forensics laboratory in South Carolina; \$100,000 for Tennis, Sports, Literacy and Education Program in New York City

Competitive Bidding Ban: The bill prohibits the Bureau of Prisons from using any funds to enter into a public/private contract under the OMB Circular A-76, which requires private contractors to compete for Federal money to ensure that the U.S. receives maximum value for tax dollars.

Matching Funds Waived: The appropriation grants the Attorney General, AG, authority to waive a legislatively mandated requirement that Federal grants for prisoner re-entry programs under the Second Chance Act be matched by State or local funds.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS).

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a point in the committee report related to the space shuttle program.

It is my understanding that the committee's position relative to the retirement of the space shuttle is consistent with NASA's testimony and the administration's position that there is no hard date on shuttle retirement. This position that the space shuttle will fly until it completes its current manifest, even if it runs beyond 2010, has also been supported by this Congress, as demonstrated by the inclusion in this year's congressional budget resolution of shuttle funding in fiscal year 2011.

We also expect the administration to fund the fly-out of the shuttle when it submits its fiscal year 2011 budget request.

I hope you can clarify whether this is the committee's position as well.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentlewoman is correct. That is the committee's position.

Ms. KOSMAS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to express my concern with the level of funding for NASA contained in the bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield another 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. KOSMAS. According to preliminary estimates, the funding included in the bill for exploration could cause additional delays of up to 2 years and could increase the cost up to \$8 billion. These levels will also mean a greater reliance on Russia, a loss of our highly skilled workforce, and it could create a situation that could be detrimental to over 1,500 businesses that supply NASA and commercialized spinoff technologies. This level would result in thousands of layoffs in 2010. This will only exacerbate the challenges related to retaining our uniquely skilled workforce, many of whom are already working on both shuttle and exploration.

So we must recognize that the investments in NASA have large multiplier effects, contributing \$100 billion to our economy last year and employing nearly 300,000 people in 41 States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your consideration.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member on the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at this time of economic turmoil and of growing international technological competitiveness, it seems to me that America should be funding those things that advance our capabilities and that increase our standing in the world.

As ranking member of the House Science and Technology Committee, I've always felt that NASA has done more to advance America's technological leadership than any other Federal agency, and this bill presently reduces NASA's funding in human spaceflight at a very critical time.

The House Appropriations' reduction of \$670 million in exploration systems represents a reduction of 17 percent from the President's FY 2010 budget request. With NASA on a path to retire the space shuttle after only eight more flights, America needs to rapidly develop the next generation of spacecraft. The \$670 million reduction would have prevented NASA from completing the Constellation system before March 2015. In fact, because this reduction would occur in the peak design year when staffing is at its highest, NASA

estimates that the work stoppages, inefficiencies and loss of key skills and capabilities would delay the Constellation program by as much as 2 years from that time.

Moreover, the cut in exploration funding would increase costs by as much as \$8 billion to the program, and it would reduce the Constellation workforce by more than 20 percent in 2010, or by approximately 4,000 contractors, mostly from the existing workforce.

During this gap in human spaceflight capability, America must buy seats from the Russians to get to the International Space Station and fulfill our obligations to our international partners.

I am really encouraged that Chairman MOLLOHAN, though, and Ranking Member FRANK WOLF are working to mitigate this loss. I am grateful to them, and I thank them both for the colloquy.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a 2-minute colloquy with the chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me.

I rise from Alabama's 5th District, the birthplace of NASA and of the space program. I, too, am concerned, but I appreciate very much the hard work the chairman and Ranking Member WOLF have entered into in trying to preserve the NASA budget. However, the decrease in funding is of some concern to us.

The Aries 1 and the Aries 5 will represent what the Saturn was to us 50 years ago with spaceflight and in putting a man on the Moon. This is not just a matter of jobs; it's a matter of international security and of national pride. I believe, after the Augustine Commission is done, we'll find that the NASA program is underfunded and that the funding will return to a level that will put us on the Moon in 2020 and that will return us to manned spaceflight in 2015.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Let me just say that I appreciate my colleague's comments this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, let me first note that the bill before the House today does not actually cut human spaceflight programs in fiscal year 2010. Rather, the bill level funds ongoing activities until such time as the Augustine Commission completes its review and the Obama administration commits to the next generation of human spaceflight. In fact, the total in the bill before the House today provides an increase of over \$420 million over the fiscal year 2009-enacted level across all NASA activities and programs.

We're talking only about the human spaceflight program here. I believe that the Augustine panel is well-positioned to make an informed review of planned U.S. human spaceflight activities and alternatives to ensure that the

Nation is undertaking efforts that are safe, innovative, affordable, and sustainable in the years following the completion of space shuttle manifests and its retirement.

When that panel provides its information, its informed judgment, to us and to our new President and when we have had an opportunity to embrace the Nation's next human spaceflight program and to budget accordingly, we look forward to moving forward.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I appreciate those comments.

Mr. Chairman, we will certainly work hand in hand with the committee.

I will say one final thing, which is that the human spaceflight community—the scientists who are involved in that—is a culture, and that culture cannot be interrupted and put back together again as though it were a puzzle.

So I appreciate so much your efforts, and I appreciate the wording in this bill. Thank you for allowing me to enter into a colloquy with you.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman with those assurances, too.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY), who represents Cape Canaveral, who worked on the Apollo, who helped put the first man on the Moon, and who is a strong advocate for NASA and for the space program. He has advocated and has talked to me over and over about this.

Mr. POSEY. Thank you, Congressman WOLF, for that kind introduction.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a brief moment and thank Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF for their bipartisan commitment to fully fund America's manned space program.

Of course, I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS for bringing this bill to the floor and for allowing this process to work like it is supposed to.

The security of our great Nation and of the world will be enhanced because of their efforts to provide our country and the world with vehicles for our future Christopher Columbus, Magellans and Marco Polos.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona, Chairwoman GIFFORDS.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the reductions from the request recommended for the NASA Constellation program in this appropriations bill. As you know, this bill provides the same level of funding as in the year 2009, and it's almost \$600 million less than what the President requested for 2010.

As the Chair of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, I strongly believe that NASA should be given the funding needed to carry out one of the

most important missions, which is exploration. I am very concerned that the levels obtained in this bill will be viewed by the Augustine Human Spaceflight Review Panel as a lack of support for Constellation and for NASA's other human spaceflight programs, programs that have been strongly endorsed, as we've heard by the colloquies here on the floor, on a bipartisan basis in last year's NASA Authorization Act of 2008.

So Chairman MOLLOHAN, is it your view that the Augustine panel should not interpret the House's action today as any weakening of congressional support for the Nation's human spaceflight and exploration programs?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That is absolutely correct.

The funding deferral does not signify any weakening of the committee's support for human spaceflight and exploration. I would also direct the attention of my colleague to the bill's accompanying report that states this very fact.

□ 1930

And if I could find it here quickly, I would read it for her.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, let me continue, and when you find that—

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And I did find it. At page 146 of that report, I would refer the gentlelady to read a pertinent part. "Accordingly, after the work of the panel is complete"—that's the Augustine Panel—"the committee expects the administration will amend its fiscal year 2010 budget request to fund fully the plan advocated by the panel, and that the administration's subsequent budget request shall similarly include resources that fund fully the Nation's Human Space Flight Program." That's in our report. And I am pleased to reaffirm that here tonight with the gentlelady with this colloquy and with the others that we've had colloquy.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In addition, do you agree that it's imperative that the President—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. GIFFORDS.—and Congress provide the appropriate resources that we can avoid cost increases and further delays in the initial operating capabilities of our Nation's next generation of human space flight architecture?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, I do. And I stated as much at the subcommittee markup of this legislation. Again, I would turn my colleague's attention to the accompanying report where these sentiments are also expressed.

Ms. GIFFORDS. And finally, do you agree with me that the Augustine Panel should not be bound by arbitrary OMB budgetary projections as it develops its best advice to the President and Congress on the future conduct of the Nation's Human Space Flight Program?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I believe that the Augustine Panel is well positioned to make an informed review of planned U.S. human space flight activities and alternatives to ensure that the Nation is undertaking efforts that are safe, innovative, affordable and sustainable in the years following the completion of the space station manifest and retirement. And when that panel provides its informed judgment to us and the President and we are able to evaluate it, our new President and our authorizers will have a chance to look at it and act on it, our new President—and we—will have an opportunity to move forward together on our Nation's future human space flight program and budget accordingly.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we've heard tonight, not only is manned spaceflight strongly bipartisan, but it truly represents the best that our civilization has ever achieved.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentlelady, among these other colleagues, is a champion of the program. Thank you.

The CHAIR. Both sides have 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I rise to engage in a colloquy with you, Mr. Chairman, regarding the Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies programs.

Mr. Chairman, as a long-time advocate for prevention of violence against women, I know that Federal funding is really essential to ensuring that victims of violence, especially in rural or underserved areas, have access to life-saving programs and resources. There are several programs that assist victims of domestic violence in need of funding, including programs aimed at curtailing abuse in public and assisted housing, establishing privacy for victims, and providing outreach to underserved populations.

According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, poverty and lack of education contribute to the economic dependency that keeps many women dependent on their abusers for financial support. Especially in these challenging economic times, though, as you recognize, domestic violence doesn't discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, economic status, or party identification.

In 2005, Mr. Chairman, there were 34 domestic violence-related homicides in your home State of West Virginia. And in my State of Maryland, in my congressional district, in fact, in just 1 year, from July 1, 2007 until June 30, 2008, there were 11 domestic violence-related homicides just outside of the District of Columbia in Prince George's and Montgomery County, totaling 16 domestic violence homicides in my congressional district in that short time.

Our communities need this increased funding in order to save lives, and fi-

nancial support for the programs really is a matter of life and death. And so, Chairman MOLLOHAN, I appreciate the funding increase already provided in the bill, and I urge you to maintain this funding and to possibly increase it because of the need.

Ending domestic violence really requires, as you know, a collective commitment for law enforcement, prosecution, training, outreach, education, and of course shelters and programs as you have provided for in this legislation. And so I would appreciate increased funding for these programs as we work together in the future.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Let me first commend the gentlelady for her good work in this area in the short time she has been in the United States Congress and for her input into our subcommittee, which has certainly influenced our markup of the bill in this important area.

I thank the gentlelady for her comments. And I appreciate her support and commitment to programs funded through the Office of Violence Against Women.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to thank my friend from Virginia for his leadership on this issue and his attempts to promote fiscal responsibility and raise some significant concerns just in general about this piece of legislation.

The fact of the matter is that the rule that was adopted by this House to consider this bill in fact waives rules that are supposed to keep us fiscally responsible. So it waives rules that say that you have to have appropriate information about earmarks, and it waives rules to say that the PAYGO rule, that things have to be paid for, that we're not going to drive the Nation further into debt and deficit with the adoption of this.

Now, waiving a rule means that you don't follow it. And we don't follow it to such a huge degree in the area of earmarks that I have here the list of earmarks. And they go on, Mr. Chairman, for page after page after page after page in what I think is probably about six font. So it's pretty small. And there are thousands of them, literally thousands.

The question becomes whether or not anybody in Washington is listening to the concerns of the American people. And their concern that I hear every weekend when I go home and every day when I talk to my constituents and folks from around this land is that they don't believe that Washington is being fiscally responsible. They see bailout after bailout, they see expenditure after expenditure, they see bill after bill of more money going out the door and not money coming in, more things being done to depress the economy than to improve the economy.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with great concern that I believe we are launching into this appropriation season, having started the process by setting the precedent that thousands and thousands of earmarks are appropriate and that we are not going to worry about whether or not we pay for the bill itself.

So I think that we all ought to listen to our constituents and take pause and think about the issues with which we're dealing here and attempt to be more responsible with the hard-earned taxpayer money.

I thank my good friend from Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, before coming to Congress, I was a prosecutor in Coconino County, home to five Native American tribes. Many people do not realize that for many classes of serious crimes committed on tribal land, prosecution can only be initiated by the Federal Government.

Today, I represent 11 federally recognized tribes in my congressional district. I hear frequently from these communities who have seen major crimes going unprosecuted because the Federal Government is not providing enough help. This is why I have advocated for more Federal support for tribal law enforcement. These areas have always been vastly underserved by the government, and it is time we begin closing the gap.

Therefore, I am very happy to see that this bill directs \$6 million to hire new assistant U.S. Attorneys who will be devoted to handling cases coming from tribal areas. This should provide dozens more prosecutors and will result in a huge increase in prosecuting major crimes in Native American communities all across the country.

Increasing the number of prosecutions will also reduce the level of narcotics flowing through many Southwestern tribal lands, providing an important step in closing a jurisdictional loophole that cartels have been using to their advantage.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of the bill, but to encourage the committee and this Congress moving forward to better address the issue of gaps in our missing persons database system. On August 24, a 31-year-old resident of my district, Billy Smolinsky, went missing. Sadly, foul play is suspected. And to this day, his parents, Janice and Bill, still don't know what happened to their son. What they found out, when they tried to go online to find databases that helped identify remains that had been found and missing adults, was that

there is no central repository of information, and the databases that do exist don't communicate with each other. In fact, up until 2 years ago, there wasn't even a database that was open to the public, there were only databases that were available to private law enforcement.

Today, we have the Name Us database, which is available to individuals and families who are looking to try and find this kind of information, and yet it doesn't have enough information. The private databases that are run by the FBI don't communicate with these public databases.

And so I come to the floor this evening simply to encourage my colleagues in appropriations bills going forward to make sure that we look to appropriating funds to allow for this kind of transfer of information to make sure that families like the Smolinskys all across this country have access to the best and most accurate information possible to try to press their cases going forward.

I understand that there are legitimate privacy concerns regarding what kind of information the FBI might share with this public database, but I think that we can solve those problems and create a much more comprehensive public database for families going forward. I look forward to that conversation in coming appropriations bills.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair be kind enough to let both sides know how much time they have remaining, respectively?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate Chairman MOLLOHAN and his staff for their hard work on H.R. 2847.

I feel it is necessary, however, to highlight what I feel is an egregious error on the part of the U.S. Census Bureau, the misrepresentation of data collected in the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community.

Last month, I, along with 51 of my colleagues, sent a letter to the Director of Office of Management and Budget, Peter Orszag, expressing concern over the U.S. Census Bureau's intention to continue altering data of same-sex married couples in the reporting of the 2010 census.

With same-sex marriage now legal in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, it is crucial to accurately represent the collection of data for same-sex married couples. Currently, if same-sex married couples in these States list themselves as married, the U.S. Census Bureau will go back and manually alter the data.

The U.S. Census Bureau was created to collect data and provide the American public with accurate reporting on

the population, not to collect data and then alter it based on political decisions. I hope the Obama administration will reconsider this policy and direct the Department of Commerce to provide the American public with an accurate representation of LGBT families in the U.S. census.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman and I thank the ranking member for their collaboration on this appropriation. This is a very difficult challenge dealing with issues of commerce, science and justice.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate going forward dealing with the President's mark in the NASA space exploration, which was \$400 million more than the House mark, and would only offer my support for the continuing statements that have been made on the floor of the House, hoping that we will have an opportunity to reimburse those dollars to be able to provide for space exploration, particularly as relates to the Constellation, the CEV vehicle, and to be able to achieve the goals that we need to achieve with respect to the international space station.

1945

I would hope that the Augustine report would not be impacted by this particular mark. And I know that there has been a lot of hard work. I obviously intended to offer an amendment. I will look forward to discussing this further with the chairman as we move forward into this section so that we'll have an opportunity to discuss possibly my amendment and the idea of working to lay a mark, if you will, for the idea that space exploration, the international space station, all are linked together, and it is valuable for this Nation that we continue to be on the cutting edge of science and provide the support we need for human space flight.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in closing, as we look at this bill, I know there is going to be a series of amendments at different times, and I think a lot of the amendments that will be offered will be from Members who are very sincerely concerned about the economic crisis that our country faces. There was an article today in Reuters. Let me read it to the Members here. It says:

"New York Reuters: Technical analyst Robert Prechter on Monday said he sees the United States losing its top AAA credit rating by the end of 2010, as he stuck by a deeply bearish outlook on the U.S. economy and stock market.

"Prechter, known for predicting the 1987 stock market crash, joins a growing group of market heavyweights in forecasting the United States will lose its top credit rating as the government

issues trillions of dollars in debt to fund efforts to bail out the economy.

“Fears about the long-term vulnerability of the prized U.S. credit rating came to the fore after Standard & Poor’s in May lowered its outlook on Britain, threatening the U.K.’s top AAA rating. That move raised fears that the United States could face a similar risk, with the hefty amounts of government debt issued in both countries to pay for financial rescues causing budget deficits to swell.”

So as Members offer these, I would just say there are some things there that are important in the country. We have got to get control of spending. But in other areas, our country is facing a crisis—in the area of science. Last year China and India graduated 700,000 engineers, and we only graduated 70,000, and 40 percent of our engineers are foreign students who are returning to their country.

And, lastly, in the space program, we have 95,000 engineers working on the space program. But China has 200,000. And unless we do some fairly dramatic things, our factories will close and we will lose the edge in science and engineering. So we need to gain control of the entitlement spending, and I hope to be able to offer an amendment to the Financial Services bill. I’m going to offer an amendment that sets up a bipartisan commission to put every spending program on the table, every spending program in the government on the table, and give that bipartisan commission an opportunity to then go around the country holding public hearings, but to send a proposal up to Congress and require the Congress to vote on it.

So I understand the frustration of many of the Members when they see this Congress failing to address the fundamental issues of spending in the Congress. And we also have the trustee’s report showing that the Social Security system is beginning to go bankrupt faster, the Medicare system is going to go bankrupt faster, and young people have no confidence and believe that the Social Security system is not sound.

We have a moral obligation to deal with that, and I hope that Congress will.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time in general debate. Let me again reiterate my appreciation to the committee, subcommittee, and ranking member in marking up this bill. And we look to proceeding through amendments at this time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chair, thank you, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF, for the opportunity to offer remarks on the fiscal year 2010 Commerce, Justice and Science Appropriations bill. I appreciate your hard work and dedication bringing this important funding legislation to the floor.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education and as a

member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I work with my colleagues to support and strengthen several agencies of great importance to our nation’s technological innovation capacity. The core of that capacity depends on basic scientific research, and a vigorous research base is crucial to our national economic security. Coupled with that research base is research in education supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF).

I am pleased that this legislation has essentially supported the President’s overall requested budget for the National Science Foundation, an agency which has great significance to our federal research endeavors. However, I do have some concerns about the science, technology, engineering and math (collectively, STEM) education funding provided for the NSF within this year’s spending bill.

In late April, the President announced “. . . a renewed commitment to education in mathematics and science, since we know that the progress and prosperity of future generations will depend on what we do now to educate the next generation.” I support this commitment, but am troubled that somehow the education directorate budget at the NSF is not keeping pace with the budgets of the research directorates. While the overall research budget of the NSF will receive a 9 percent increase in this year’s funding bill, the education budget will only increase by 2 percent.

Congress, economists, and scientists have consistently maintained that the NSF’s research and educational missions must be treated as co-equal and core missions of the Foundation. Enhancing our research competitiveness in scientific fields while neglecting the educational component of such research will cripple our ability to succeed as an innovative nation.

I want to recognize that both the budgets for research and education at the National Science Foundation are increasing in this budget, and I greatly appreciate the work of the Committee in supporting both activities. I simply want to emphasize that both of these endeavors are equally critical to the competitiveness of our nation, and research and education should be treated as parallel—and equally worthy entities—at the National Science Foundation.

I look forward to working with you on the NSF research and education funding, and, again, thank you for your dedication to improving our nation’s research enterprise.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I would like to associate myself with the comments by Mr. CULBERSON and many others about NASA’s Exploration budget and the Constellation programs. I believe it is very important to National Security and to many science related efforts for us to aggressively move forward with our own launch capability and exploration efforts.

While I value international cooperation, it is very important that we not have to depend on other nations for access to space. The Ares and Orion programs have made progress, and we should accelerate them.

I look forward to hearing the results of the Augustine Panel. It is important that Congress take decisive action with regard to funding Exploration in this Fiscal Year 2010 budget. I look forward to working with my friends and colleagues, Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF, in the coming weeks.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I thank the chair, and I’d like to thank the gentleman/gentlelady for yielding.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has been conducting extensive oversight of the Census Bureau and its preparations for the 2010 census. We have identified many things that are working, along with many areas that need remedial action. However, it is critical that if these problems are to be fixed in time for the start of the census less than one year away, the census needs sufficient funding.

This bill includes a cut of \$206 million dollars to the Census Bureau at the worst possible time. I strongly oppose these cuts, and any amendments that would divert money from the census. The Census Bureau needs these funds in order to improve response rates in areas that have been undercounted for many years. To cut money now on preparation and outreach would do nothing but increase the costs to count nonrespondents next year.

And let me just say, I’ve heard a lot from my colleagues and my constituents on this issue. My district in Brooklyn and other urban areas in general have suffered from undercounts over the last few decades, and we do not want to see this happen again next year. The Bureau has promised to address the problems with undercounting in urban communities and other areas, but we cannot expect them to fix their problems in 2010 if we cut their funding here today.

This cut would be devastating to outreach and education efforts and very costly in the long run. The Bureau estimates that a one-percent decrease in the mail response rate will add between \$80 and \$90 million to the cost of the follow up operations.

I urge my colleagues to support full funding for the Census Bureau and oppose all amendments that would take funds from this effort to accurately count all Americans.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment to the bill may be offered except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in a daily issue dated June 15, 2009, or earlier, and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment may be offered only by the Member who submitted it to be printed, or his or her designee, and shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2847

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the International Trade Administration between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 40118; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed \$45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, \$444,504,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which \$9,439,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International Trade Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided*, That not less than \$7,000,000 shall be for the Office of China Compliance, and not less than \$4,400,000 shall be for the China Countervailing Duty Group: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to section 5412 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4912); and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities: *Provided further*, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization to recognize the right of members to distribute monies collected from antidumping and countervailing duties: *Provided further*, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization consistent with the negotiating objectives contained in the Trade Act of 2002, Public Law 107-210: *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated, \$3,715,000 shall be used for the projects, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled "Congressionally-designate items" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000)".

Page 23, lines 18 and 19, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,132,000)".

Page 45, lines 1, 4, and 13, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$78,768,000)".

Page 47, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 48, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment. I'm offering this amendment on behalf of Mr. HONDA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. MARSHALL.

This amendment would provide an additional \$100 million, Mr. Chairman, for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, restoring it to the fiscal year 2009 funding level of \$400 million.

Mr. Chairman, the current administration and the predecessor administrations have in turn each year proposed elimination of the SCAAP program. And since our allocation is \$200 million below the administration's request, it is difficult to restore moneys such as to the SCAAP program to \$300 million in the subcommittee mark. When the administration requests zero and then you have to fill that hole, that makes a tremendous strain on the other accounts in the bill.

I opposed the SCAAP amendment during committee consideration of this bill largely because it would have unadvisedly used the Bureau of Census as an offset. We are in the final year, final months of preparing for a census that's just a year away, and this is not any time to take money away from the Census. We have overcome hurdles in the Census and challenges as a result of some mismanagement with regard to census preparation. We are on track now. And this is not the time, given this short period before we have to conduct the census, to take money away from the Census, so we opposed it.

However, I am aware that there is considerable support, as reflected by the number of our colleagues who want to be cosponsors on this amendment here today. There is tremendous broad-based support in the body for the SCAAP program. It is supported by many Members; so I offer this amendment in recognition of that support.

Mr. HONDA is a member of the subcommittee and a cosponsor of this amendment, and he has been particularly persuasive about the need to restore SCAAP funding to the level that this amendment would bring it to.

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support strongly the issue of SCAAP.

I come from the State of California, where the financial situation is very grave, and help in this manner would be tremendous for the State of Cali-

fornia and I suspect for the other States that have these kinds of problems too.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Mr. MOLLOHAN's amendment, of which I am a co-sponsor, to increase funds for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). I'm pleased that we were able to work in a bipartisan manner to increase SCAAP by \$100 million, from \$300 million to \$400 million. Representatives LEWIS, HONDA, CALVERT, SCHIFF, EDWARDS, CULBERSON, LINDA SANCHEZ, MITCHELL, GARY MILLER, GIFFORDS, MCCAUL and KIRKPATRICK all provided valuable input and support to make this happen.

Securing our nation's borders is the responsibility of the federal government. Congress has consistently legislated that the federal government must either take criminal aliens into federal custody or reach an agreement to compensate state and local jurisdictions for their incarceration.

The cost of jailing criminal illegal immigrants has placed an enormous cost on all of our states and local governments. My state of California, in particular, shoulders the greatest burden of illegal immigration, and has received over \$2.5 billion in SCAAP funds since the inception of the program, representing 42 percent of nationwide SCAAP awards.

Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County, which I represent, receive only a fraction of what they spend to jail criminal illegal immigrants. According to Los Angeles County Sheriff Lee Baca, incarcerating illegal aliens costs the County \$100 million per year. And according to San Bernardino County Sheriff Rod Hoops, jailing illegal immigrants costs the County \$24 million per year. Yet last year, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties only received \$14 million and \$2.3 million, respectively. In fact, since 2000, Los Angeles County has received \$159 million in SCAAP funds and San Bernardino County has been awarded \$6.7 million. In nine years, Los Angeles County was reimbursed an amount equal to what it spends on jailing criminal illegal immigrants in just a year and a half, while San Bernardino County received SCAAP funds equal to what it spends in less than half a year.

While the underlying bill provides \$300 million for SCAAP, this is still \$100 million less than we provided last year. At a time when our state and local governments are feeling the financial crunch, they should not be forced to continue to shoulder what is a federal responsibility. This amendment will add \$100 million to SCAAP, restoring the program to its 2009 level of \$400 million.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of our amendment to block the proposed 25 percent cut to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, otherwise known as "SCAAP".

SCAAP was created in 1994 to reimburse states and localities for the arrest, incarceration and transportation of undocumented immigrants who commit crimes in our communities.

Immigration enforcement is supposed to be a federal responsibility, but as any Arizonan can tell you, the federal government has yet to meet them.

When State and local governments are forced to step-in and do the federal government's job, it is only fair that they be reimbursed.

Last year, the Arizona Department of Corrections received \$12.8 million from the federal government to house 5,600 criminal illegal immigrants in our state prisons. That was only 10 percent of the \$124 million Arizona spent to house illegal inmates that year.

Currently, Arizona's state prisons hold 6,100 illegal immigrants, nearly 15 percent of the total inmate population.

The Arizona Department of Corrections estimates that it will spend \$128 million in 2009 to clothe, feed and provide medical care to illegal immigrant inmates.

Instead of boosting funding to help pay the actual expense imposed on states like Arizona, however, the Fiscal Year 2010 Commerce Justice Science Appropriations bill cut SCAAP funding by 25 percent.

This is just plain wrong.

That is why I am proud today to join with my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, to offer this amendment to restore full funding for SCAAP.

If we are serious about immigration enforcement, we need to reimburse Arizona—and other states that bear brunt of our nation's broken immigration policy—for keeping criminal illegal immigrants behind bars.

I want to thank Chairman MOLLOHAN for his leadership on this issue, and his willingness to listen to so many of us from the southwest who know how critical this program is to our nation's immigration enforcement efforts. Mr. Chair.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. SCHOCK:
Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 7, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of amendment No. 8, which seeks to transfer \$500,000 from the Census salary and expenses to the International Trade Administration.

The intent of this amendment is to dedicate funding for the International Trade Administration to conduct a study on the economic impact, including the loss of U.S. jobs, due to the failure of this body to pass the Colombian Free Trade Agreement. My intent is to have the ITA submit this study to Congress no later than 60 days after the date of this enactment.

For more than a year now, Congress has left an agreement sitting in our collective "in box" which will result in

more good-paying manufacturing jobs for all Americans. And I, for one, want to know the price of this neglect.

Now, I understand that not everybody in this body or this Chamber shares my view. I know there are those who believe that the Colombian Free Trade Agreement will, in essence, result in the loss of American jobs. And to these Members, I would say vote for my amendment. If you are right, my amendment will prove that and the study subsequently will prove that. Please have the confidence in your convictions that I have in mine and vote for this amendment, and we'll see which of the two sides is correct.

I recently had the opportunity to travel to Colombia and Panama with a number of both Republican and Democrat colleagues. During this trip, we met with President Uribe of Colombia. And the President detailed with great specificity the human rights and labor strides that his country has made over the last decade. Every question that my colleagues raised to President Uribe, he had an excellent answer. Every charge these Members made, Mr. Uribe described how his reforms had addressed the issues. Colombia has done her part, and now we in our country need to do our part to ensure our top democratic ally in the region remains a good one.

And while I found the President's answers remarkable, I was most impressed with the view of the Colombian people. The vast majority of the people in Colombia we met with support the free trade agreement, even though they already enjoy virtually duty-free access to the U.S. markets as a result of the Andean Trade Preferences Act. They support the trade agreement because it will mean not only a new relationship status with the United States, but they will also be able to buy even more American products, putting more dollars back in American pockets.

After our experience in Colombia, it was the overwhelming belief of the Members on that trip, both Republicans and Democrats, that they could see firsthand the benefits of a free trade agreement, truly highlighting the bipartisan support in this body for the pending free trade agreement.

□ 2000

The facts for a trade agreement speak for themselves. This free trade agreement will help make American companies more competitive globally, increase their profitability, allow them to hire new American workers and help stimulate the economy. Currently we enjoy a \$2.7 billion trade surplus, including a manufacturing surplus with nations with which we have a signed free trade agreement. But for more than a year, the majority has disallowed this body to add Colombia to this list. America's two-way trade with Colombia reached \$18 billion in 2007, making Colombia our fourth largest trading partner in Latin America. Since America's market is already

open duty free for imports from Colombia, the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement will give American businesses, farmers, ranchers and workers similar access to this important market. The independent nonpartisan International Trade Commission has estimated that the Colombia Free Trade Agreement would increase U.S. exports by at least \$1 billion. Since Colombia signed the trade agreement in 2006, U.S. products have been charged more than \$2 billion in needless duties, money that could have been spent by companies near our country making the products and expanding infrastructure here in our country to hire more domestic workers.

In 2008 the United States had a trade surplus of \$35 billion with countries with FTAs that were signed under the Trade Promotion Authority, the same authority that the Colombia Free Trade Agreement was signed under. This surplus was up over 61 percent just in 2007. Finally, Colombia is a model country for what we need to do by providing an open hand from America to emerging democracies around the world. This country's bipartisan approach with Colombia, taken 10 years ago when they were on the verge of becoming a terrorist state, was a comprehensive diplomatic approach, one of open trade market policy and has brought them back toward a democracy. And the strongest way to promote democracy is with that same kind hand and the benefits it brings, not through an isolationist policy.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not mention that on January 1, 2010, Colombia will formally enter into free trade agreements with Europe and Canada. For these reasons and more, I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment and would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman says, Colombia is a strong ally and a partner in this hemisphere; and I support the Congress acting to implement U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. The trade agreement that has been negotiated would bring important economic benefits to the U.S. and level the playing field between our countries. It would create jobs. The unemployment rate that just came out is 9.2 percent. Not to do this would border on being crazy. The gentleman's amendment would serve the ongoing debate by generating information about the economic impacts here in the U.S. of our failure to adopt the agreement. So I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend my friend from Illinois for offering this amendment and just to point out a couple items as it relates to these issues. The Census is slated in this bill to receive \$7.1 billion. So I think that the gentleman from Illinois has picked an appropriate, responsible amount out of that \$7.1 billion to be used for a study that ought to be performed to demonstrate the importance of what ought not really be called the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. It ought to be called the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

As the gentleman stated with great eloquence, the lack of enacting the Colombia FTA by this majority is actually harming American companies. That's right, Mr. Chairman. We're harming American jobs and American companies by not acting on something that both executive branches have already agreed to.

So this is a wise amendment, an appropriate amendment, an appropriate area of study that ought to be done. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing to respond to a question.

To my friend from West Virginia, I wonder, if this amendment passes, is my friend from West Virginia able to commit to doing all that he can to make certain that this amendment remains in the final work product as it comes through the conference process?

I will yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. We're willing to accept the amendment. What happens in conference is in the future, and I wouldn't be able to make any commitments with regard to that in any way.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that really is where the rub is, is that there appears to be no significant resolve on the part of the majority party to actually determine what the level of harm is to the American economy and American businesses without adoption of the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

I appreciate my friend from West Virginia for agreeing to accept the amendment. But it is with little comfort because, as you heard, Mr. Chairman, there is little or no commitment to making certain that this stays in this bill as it moves through the process. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is the first step in this appropriations process, and we're early in the amendment process. But it seems to me that this amendment is of significant import, and also significant knowledge would be gained from this study to give Members of this body appropriate information with which to be able to make decisions as they move forward and decide for themselves whether or not to push their leadership, the Speaker and the leadership on the Democrat side, to, in fact, adopt the Colombia Fair Trade Agreement.

So I want to commend my friend from Illinois for the work that he's

done and for the important amendment that he brings to the floor. I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I have great respect for my colleague, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and undoubtedly he is going to be one of the conferees. I would like to ask him a question.

What I would like to know is, when you go to conference, you and I both know that there's a lot of give-and-take. And if you really feel strongly about an amendment, you fight for it. So I'd just like to ask you this question: Because the Colombia Free Trade Agreement is so important, will you use every bit of your fiber and being to fight for this in conference?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. As the gentleman understands—the gentleman has been to conference before on bills.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Sure.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And the gentleman understands that conferees come to the conference from many different directions and have many different attitudes. There are many different issues in the bill during conference. I will tell the gentleman that we take seriously our bill as it is fashioned, as we bring it to the floor, and as it is amended on the floor as we proceed to conference.

Beyond that, the gentleman clearly understands that conferences are about process and that there's give-and-take in the Congress. All of the attitudes expressed in conference must be taken into consideration, and there is nothing about this amendment that precludes our not seriously supporting it in conference. But the gentleman is asking for something that the gentleman knows in the process cannot be guaranteed, and that is, I guarantee that we're going to do something in conference. I hope that's satisfactory. If it's not, it's the best I can do for the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that we've been fighting this issue for a long, long time. One of the biggest problems that we've had is drugs coming into the United States from Central and South America. And President Uribe of Colombia has been one of our best friends and allies down there. He has stabilized that country, and one of the things that he really needs is a Free Trade Agreement to help further stabilize his country. I think it's extremely important that Mr. MOLLOHAN, or whoever else is on the conference committee, realize the gravity of this situation. And Mr. MOLLOHAN well knows that when you go to conference, and you're sitting across the table from your Democrat counterparts, if you are willing to really hang tough on an amendment, many times you can

get that accepted, especially when you start compromising on other issues that may be in the bill. So I asked the question of Mr. MOLLOHAN, will you fight for this in conference, and he reluctantly skirted the issue just a little bit.

So since this amendment has been accepted by Mr. MOLLOHAN, it seems to me that it should be pretty well guaranteed that he is going to do everything he can to keep it in the bill when it goes to conference committee. And if that is not the case, then, you know, this might appear to be—I would never accuse my colleague of being insincere—but it might appear to be a facade. So if you accept this, Mr. MOLLOHAN, I would just like to ask you one more time: Will you do everything you can to keep this in the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will you answer the question? Will you do everything you can to keep it in the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. We will approach the conference, my colleague from Indiana, exactly the way I described to you. We will consider every issue that is in the bill as it comes out of the House of Representatives seriously as we approach conference. If it's accepted, it will be in the conference report. You have the ranking minority member. He is going to be a part of the conference. The other members of the committee are going to be a part of the conference, and we will treat this issue just as seriously as we treat all issues. We will support it in conference, and it will be a part of the process of the conference as it moves forward. I hope that is satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I will just end by saying, I really hope this stays in the bill. I can't think of anything that's more important as far as stabilizing Central and South America than free trade agreements. We've been fighting for a free trade agreement with Panama and Colombia for a long, long time; and if we're going to make sure that we slow down the illegal immigration that's coming from Central and South America, we've got to do things to stabilize that entire region, not only from a drug standpoint, but also from the illegal immigration standpoint. So I really hope that my colleague—and I'm sure Mr. WOLF will—I really hope my colleagues will do everything they can to make sure that this stays in the piece of legislation.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

MOTION TO RISE

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIR. The question is on the motion to rise.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Illinois was on his feet

prior to the gentleman asking that the Committee do rise.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia was the Member who sought recognition, and he had a motion preferential to an amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIR. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 124, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—179

Abercrombie	Grayson	Murphy (NY)
Ackerman	Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick
Adler (NJ)	Griffith	Nye
Altmire	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Ortiz
Arcuri	Halvorson	Pascarell
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Heinrich	Payne
Barrow	Herseth Sandlin	Perlmutter
Berry	Himes	Perrillo
Bishop (GA)	Hinchev	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Hodes	Polis (CO)
Boccieri	Holt	Pomeroy
Bordallo	Honda	Price (NC)
Boren	Hoyer	Quigley
Boswell	Inlee	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Israel	Reyes
Bright	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Butterfield	(TX)	Ross
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kagen	Rush
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Kildee	Sablan
Carson (IN)	Kilroy	Salazar
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kissell	Schakowsky
Childers	Klein (FL)	Schauer
Clarke	Kosmas	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kratovil	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sestak
Cohen	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Skelton
Costa	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Dahlkemper	Loftgren, Zoe	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Lujan	Tauscher
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Taylor
DeFazio	Maloney	Teague
Delahunt	Markey (CO)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Marshall	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Massa	Titus
Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Driehaus	McGovern	Towns
Ellison	McIntyre	Tsongas
Ellsworth	McMahon	Van Hollen
Engel	McNerney	Visclosky
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Walz
Faleomavaega	Melancon	Wasserman
Farr	Michaud	Schultz
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Waters
Filner	Minnick	Watson
Foster	Mitchell	Watt
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Welch
Fudge	Moore (KS)	Wilson (OH)
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Murphy (CT)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	

NOES—124

Akin	Biggart	Broun (GA)
Austria	Bilbray	Brown (SC)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Bachus	Blackburn	Ginny
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Buchanan
Bartlett	Boozman	Burgess
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Burton (IN)

Buyer	Harper	Paulsen
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Camp	Heller	Platts
Campbell	Herger	Posey
Cantor	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Capito	Hunter	Putnam
Carter	Inglis	Reberg
Cassidy	Issa	Roe (TN)
Castle	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Jones	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	Jordan (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kirk	Scalise
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Deal (GA)	Lamborn	Schock
Dent	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham	Sessions
Dreier	Latta	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lee (NY)	Shuster
Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Flake	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Fleming	Lummis	Stearns
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Fortenberry	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Fox	McHenry	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Tiahrt
Garrett (NJ)	McMorris	Tiberi
Gerlach	Rodgers	Turner
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Upton
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Walden
Goodlatte	Miller (MD)	Wilson (SC)
Graves	Murphy, Tim	Wittman
Guthrie	Neugebauer	Wolf
Hall (TX)	Nunes	Wu

NOT VOTING—136

Aderholt	Hill	Paul
Alexander	Hinojosa	Peterson
Baird	Holden	Petri
Bean	Johnson, E. B.	Pierluisi
Becerra	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Berkley	Kaptur	Poe (TX)
Berman	Kennedy	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel
Blunt	Kind	Reichert
Bonner	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Bono Mack	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Boucher	Larson (CT)	Roskam
Boyd	LaTourette	Rothman (NJ)
Brady (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Braley (IA)	Linder	Ruppelberger
Cao	Lucas	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	Luetkemeyer	T.
Christensen	Lungren, Daniel	Sarbanes
Clay	E.	Schiff
Conyers	Mack	Schrader
Costello	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Crenshaw	Manzullo	Serrano
Crowley	Marchant	Shadegg
Culberson	Markey (MA)	Sherman
Cummings	Matheson	Simpson
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Sires
DeGette	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McClintock	Souder
Dicks	McCollum	Space
Dingell	McDermott	Speier
Doyle	McHugh	Stark
Duncan	Meeke (NY)	Stupak
Edwards (MD)	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Edwards (TX)	Miller, George	Sutton
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Eshoo	Moran (VA)	Tierney
Frelinghuysen	Murtha	Velázquez
Gallely	Myrick	Wamp
Gordon (TN)	Nadler (NY)	Waxman
Granger	Napolitano	Weiner
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Westmoreland
Grijalva	Norton	Wexler
Hare	Oberstar	Whitfield
Harman	Olson	Woolsey
Hensarling	Oliver	Young (AK)
Higgins	Pallone	Young (FL)

□ 2101

Messrs. AKIN and PLATTS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Messrs. MCKEON and TERRY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Messrs. LIPINSKI, DOGGETT and MINNICK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALTMIRE, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the rest of the evening.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want the Members to understand the context in which we find ourselves. I have indicated—and I have had discussions with Mr. BOEHNER, with Mr. CANTOR and with Mr. LEWIS with reference to the appropriations bills—that none of us likes the omnibus appropriations bills.

In order to pass appropriations bills individually, you have to take appropriately significant time, but if you take so much time that you can't possibly get them done, then you are left at the end of the day with an omnibus appropriations bill which nobody likes.

In discussions with Mr. BOEHNER, with Mr. CANTOR and with Mr. LEWIS, Mr. OBEY and I have tried to come to an agreement on time constraints. There was a discussion on the floor during the course of the rule between Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS with respect to time constraints, and at that point in time, that was not possible.

Subsequent to that, there were further discussions between Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS in which there seemed to be some progress, perhaps, that was possible. As a result, we proceeded with the preprinting requirement that, I know, some people felt was an unnecessary constraint, but it is, after all, the opportunity to give notice to Members of what amendments can be anticipated; but I know that I've discussed it on your side of the aisle, and you felt that was an imposition. We felt it was an open rule because the amendments were not specified.

Notwithstanding that disagreement, there were 127 total amendments. One amendment just now was offered by Mr. SCHOCK, my good friend. He and I have a good relationship. We've traveled together, and I think he is a good Member. We accepted. Notwithstanding that, it took 20 minutes of debate and was going to be subject to a vote.

Now, if you multiply, say, 25 minutes—and we had a 15-minute vote. If

you multiply that by 127, you come to a pretty high number, making it impossible for us to complete, in my view, the appropriations process by the end of July. If we don't complete it by the end of July, frankly, we won't have the opportunity to conference with the Senate and, therefore, will not be able to complete the process in a timely fashion. I don't know whether that's the objective of some, but it is certainly not my objective.

As a result—I was not here—Mr. OBEY felt it necessary for us to go to the Rules Committee for the purposes of constraining time. In a body of 435 people in which everybody has an opportunity to do 5 minutes and to then, perhaps, even get yielded some additional time from somebody else who takes 5 minutes, it would be impossible to complete 10 amendments, much less 127 amendments, in a time frame that we agreed to in a unanimous consent request in 2006 and in 2005.

In fact, on this bill, the average number of amendments that were offered when you were in the majority was 30, the average number. There was a high of 46. In 2004, 16 amendments were offered—10 Republicans and 6 Democrats. In other words, for your bill, you offered more amendments to your bill than we offered to your bill. We would like to proceed in a fashion that is reasonable and that provides for opportunities for amendments to be offered, but we also believe that it is our responsibility to ensure that the appropriations process is completed.

So, when Mr. OBEY asked that the Committee rise, it was, at that point in time, the intention to go to the Rules Committee to provide for amendments in order, not all 127 amendments—I can't predict how many amendments. There are a lot of duplications in that—and to provide for, however, time constraints within which we can do our business. We do not think that's unreasonable, and we certainly don't think it's unfair.

I will tell you that, in 2007, we proceeded for 10 bills without time constraints. From our perspective, we thought we had an agreement that we would use the same time that we gave to you in 2006 when you were in the majority and were controlling. We gave this to Mr. LEWIS. Notwithstanding that, we believe we went at least 53 hours overtime. That is 53 hours longer than the unanimous consent constraints that we gave to you when you were in the majority and we were in the minority. As you know, the last two bills were very contentious because we did, in fact, pursue them under a rule.

I want to say to the Members, particularly who are new, that, while appropriations bills have historically been open, they have historically not taken—as a matter of fact, some of the biggest bills have taken some of the shortest times—the Labor-Health bill and the Defense bill. I've served on the Appropriations Committee from 1983

until I became majority leader 2½ years ago, so I'm fairly familiar with the procedures under which we operate.

So I tell my friend, the Republican whip, that the reason for rising was to give us the opportunity to go to the Rules Committee and to provide for, as I said, time constraints in which we can effectively complete this bill.

I want to say to the Members that we did not expect to have votes. We had votes. Your side believed that we ought to have votes, so we had a vote to rise, but we have made efforts to try to reach agreement to provide a process in which we can complete the appropriations bills.

Very frankly, we think that, in years past, there have been a lot of amendments that have been offered, not for the purpose of the substance of the amendment but for the purpose of simply delaying the ability to get our work done. We've been in the minority ourselves. We understand the frustration that exists; but my responsibility as the majority leader and as the manager of this floor is to provide for the completion of our appropriations process one at a time so that we can consider them on their merits and then, hopefully, pass them individually and have them signed. It would be my hope to have them signed before the beginning of the fiscal year. That's our thought and plan.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would, first of all, respond to speak to the issue of the 127 amendments having been filed. I think that it's certainly a result of and, perhaps, due to the unintended consequences of imposing a preprinting requirement.

As the gentleman and I have discussed, many of our Members felt it necessary to prefile their amendments to preserve their right to proffer an amendment without necessarily having the intention of following through with offering that amendment. There are several amendments that are duplicative. There are many amendments that our Members have already said that they would not offer.

So I would say to the gentleman that it is hard for us on this side of the aisle to stand here and to accept the notion that somehow, 30 minutes into the debate and on page 2 of line 7 of the bill and while in discussion of the first Republican amendment, that was where you drew the line and decided that the tactics by us were going to be dilatory. It certainly seems to me, I would say to the gentleman, with all due respect, that there was some preconceived notion that this was the direction in which the majority was going to head regardless.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, I will say to the gentleman—and the gentleman and I have spoken about this—it is our intention to practice some good faith and to ask the majority to engage with us, to allow our Members to come to the floor, to deliberate in the context of the only constitutional

duty of this body, which is the expenditure of taxpayer dollars, and to allow our voice to be heard.

I hardly think, Madam Speaker, that the decision to close this process after 30 minutes, to close this process after just the first Republican amendment, is at all being made in good faith.

So I ask the gentleman again: What is the thinking of the majority here? The first appropriations bill. The first Republican amendment. How is it that we can expect a good-faith debate?

Our Members complied with your rule—unprecedented. The gentleman speaks to prior years and to the number of amendments that came up on this bill and on others. He knows as well as I that the preprinting requirement was not in place. This is the unintended consequence of a preprinting requirement, the 127 amendments. We have had that discussion. There will not be discussion and debate and votes asked for 127 amendments. So we stand here in good faith and want to engage with the Members on your side of the aisle.

So I ask the gentleman: What is it? What is the intention tonight—to go back to Rules? Our Members have already been told their amendments will be accepted. Now how should they proceed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me reiterate what the gentleman knows to be the case. He and I have discussed this matter on at least three different occasions. They were, I think, friendly discussions. The gentleman indicated that he did not believe an agreement was possible on the time constraints. Mr. BOEHNER indicated that to me as well, so it's not as if we haven't had significant discussions about this. You also, in fairness, did indicate to me that the preprinting requirement would be something that your side would take umbrage at.

Mr. OBEY, I think correctly, said both sides like notice of actions that are to be taken on the floor. In fact, when we take notice, when we do less than 24 hours, you rightfully believe that's inappropriate. I agree with you on that, and we try to do that. Sometimes we don't make it.

□ 2115

But the fact is that this is not as if we haven't had some discussions over at least the last 2 months about this issue. And from my perspective—I don't want to speak for Mr. OBEY, who has spoken with Mr. LEWIS as well—but over the last 2 months I have seen nothing that indicated to me that time constraints would be agreeable to your side of the aisle, not from you, not from Mr. BOEHNER, not from anybody else, not from Mr. LEWIS, who on this floor just hours ago indicated that there would not be any time agreements possible.

So in that context, I am in a position where, if that's the case—and you may

well be correct that 127 wouldn't be offered, but very frankly, our experience in 2007—now, in 2008, the appropriation process was attenuated, as you know. It upset you and disappointed me that we didn't have bills. The reasons for that, obviously, dealt with mainly the Appropriations Committee fighting about energy, as you know. One can blame one another for that, but in any event, it didn't go forward. Nobody was pleased that we didn't consider the bills individually, and we ended up, as you well know, earlier this year doing an omnibus appropriation bill. We did omnibus appropriation bills frequently when you were in charge of the House, as well. Neither side liked that then or when we did it.

So I tell my friend, the intention is going to be to try to construct time frames—and we would be glad to have further discussions with you on those—which will allow for these 12 bills to be done in the time available to us between now and July 30. Because if we don't get them done, I guarantee you that when we get back in September, with 21 days left to go, we will not be able to conference these bills and get them done. That is a practical matter. For those of you who are new, I will tell you that. For those of who have been here, you understand that that's the case.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would respond, first of all, to the suggestion that the discussions that we've had, and others, over the last 2 months as to whether an agreement was possible, frankly, is unprecedented. Because in years past in the appropriations process, time agreements were arrived at once the number of amendments were known, and we worked out the agreements and debate ensued thereunder.

We did not know prior to the deadline and the cutoff of preprinting requirements as to how many amendments there would be. So we do know now how many amendments there would be. But again, Madam Speaker, I say what sticks with us, and not very well, is your decision to cut debate off on page 2, line 7 of the bill after the first Republican amendment. Madam Speaker, again, with all due respect, that does not speak in good faith about the majority's intention to allow us the opportunity to speak to the issues surrounding the expenditure of taxpayer dollars. That is not good faith.

We stand here in good faith, as the gentleman and I have discussed prior, and we want the opportunity to show you that we can conduct debate in good faith, deliberate on the people's business, and not be shut out summarily. And it is very hard, again, Madam Speaker, for us to accept that the majority had any intention of allowing debate if we shut it off after 30 minutes and the first Republican amendment.

So I say to the gentleman, we stand here and we ask you to allow us to proceed this evening, allow us to demonstrate good faith so that then the

majority can then match that good faith and we can proceed in this House in normal course in the appropriations process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0250

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2847, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-158) on the resolution (H. Res. 552) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2847.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today (up until 4:00 p.m.) on account of his daughters' graduation.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 17, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2195. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red Bull Air Race, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0089] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2196. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; F/V PATRIOT, Massachusetts Bay, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0424] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2197. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.4 to Mile Marker 0.6, Pittsburgh, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2198. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World June Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0267] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2199. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World Fireworks Season Kickoff; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0279] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2200. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean Beach Fourth of July Fireworks; Pacific Ocean, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0122] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2201. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Big Bay Fourth of July Fireworks; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0123] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2202. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay Yacht Club Fourth of July Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0124] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2203. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World Memorial Day Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0265] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2204. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World 4th of July Fireworks Display; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0103] (RIN: 1625-

AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2205. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Temporary Change of Dates for Recurring Marine Events in the Fifth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0106] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2206. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special local Regulations for Marine Events; Patuxent River, Patuxent River, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0107] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2207. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coronado Fourth of July Fireworks; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0120] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2208. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean City Air Show, Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0064] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2209. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Events Regattas; Annual Marine Events in the Eighth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0386] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2210. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sturgeon Bay Ship Canal, Sturgeon Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0385] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2211. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Air Pollution Prevention (IAPP) Certificates [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1014] (RIN: 1625-AB31) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2212. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Underwater Object, Massachusetts Bay, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1272] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2213. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; ESL Air and Water Show, Lake Ontario, Ontario Beach Park, Rochester, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0343] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2214. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; June and July Northwest Harbor Safety Zone; Northwest Harbor, San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0330] (RIN:

1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2215. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Paradise Point Fourth of July Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0125] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2216. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World May Fireworks; Mission Bay, San Diego, California [Docket No. USCG-2009-0266] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2217. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Copper Canyon Clean up; Lake Havasu, Arizona [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0242] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2218. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Use of Force Training Flights, San Pablo Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2219. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A380-841, -842, and -861 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0433; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-15902; AD 2009-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2220. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Related Consideration in the Design and Operation of Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2006-26722; Amendment Nos. 25-127] (RIN: 2120-A166) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2221. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and 747-400D Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0135; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-15901; AD 2009-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2222. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drug Enforcement Assistance; OMB Approval of Information Collection [Docket No.: FAA-2006-26714; Amdt. Nos. 47-28, 61-118, 63-36, and 65-51] (RIN: 2120-A143) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2223. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drug and Alcohol Testing Program [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0937; Amendment Nos. 61-122, 63-37, 65-53, 91-307, 120-0, 121-343, 135-117] (RIN: 2120-AJ37) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2224. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments

Updating the Address for the Federal Railroad Administration and Reflecting the Migration to the Federal Docket Management System [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0128] (RIN: 2130-AB99) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2225. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hours of Service of Railroad Employees; Amended Record-keeping and Reporting Regulations [Docket No.: 2006-26176, Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-AB85) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2226. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Rushville, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0120; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-2] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2227. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fulton, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1230; Airspace Docket No. 08-ACE-1] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2228. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 40 and DA 40 F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0240; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-15899; AD 2009-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2229. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30665 Amdt. No 3320] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2230. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30666; Amdt. No. 3321] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2231. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0428; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-053-AD; Amendment 39-15900; AD 2009-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2232. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Refugio, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0241; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-6] received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2233. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Miscellaneous Revisions to the Procedures for Handling Petitions for Emergency Waiver of Safety Regulations and the Procedures for Disqualifying Individuals from Performing Safety-

Sensitive Functions [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0006; Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-AC02) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2234. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH Dornier Model 328-100 and -300 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0419; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-15898; AD 2009-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1214; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-259-AD; Amendment 39-15897; AD 2009-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney (PW) JT9D-7R4 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23742; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-53-AD; Amendment 39-15896; AD 2009-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30662; Amdt. No. 480] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2238. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Robinson R-22/R-44 Special Training and Experience Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2002-13744; Amendment No. SFAR 73-2] (RIN: 2120-AJ27) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2239. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Communication and Area Navigation Equipment (RNAV) Operations in Remote Locations and Mountainous Terrain [Docket No.: FAA-2002-14002; Amendment Nos. 91-306 and 135-110 (RIN: 2120-AJ46) received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2240. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30668; Amdt. No. 3323] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2241. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30667 Amdt. No. 3222] received June 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2242. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment informa-

tion on FEMA-1832-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

2243. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1829-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2244. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1830-DR, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

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. PRICE of North Carolina: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2892. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on June 17 (legislative day of June 16), 2009]

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 552. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-158). 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 Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 2882. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for security at wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that electricity produced in certain possessions of the United States and other areas is eligible for the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources and the investment energy credit to include ocean thermal energy conversion projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the nonbusiness energy property and residential energy efficient property tax incentives to residents of certain possessions of the United States and other areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 2887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to preserve affordable housing in multifamily housing units which are sold or exchanged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2888. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild or recreation rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2889. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments in Oregon as wild or scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Frontline Providers Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend section 5318 of title 31, United States Code, to eliminate regulatory burdens imposed on insured depository institutions and money services businesses and enhance the availability of transaction accounts at depository institutions for such business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WEXLER, Mr.

CAPUANO, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FARR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. INSLIE, Mr. MASSA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2894. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent paper ballot under title III of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. CARDOZA (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 2895. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to promote energy independence and self-sufficiency by providing for the use of net metering by certain small electric energy generation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide the same treatment for covered bonds as for other qualified financial contracts to which a depository institution is a party when such institution is in receivership or conservatorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to return a sense of fairness and accountability to the deposit insurance premium assessment process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide support services for

family caregivers of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 2899. A bill to address the public health and safety threat presented by the risk of catastrophic wildfire on Federal forestlands of the State of California by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest restoration, and forest health; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 2900. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve benefits for members of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Energy and Commerce, 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. MASSA (for himself, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2902. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, to review volume usage service plans of major broadband Internet service providers to ensure that such plans are fairly based on cost; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2903. A bill to establish an assistance program for the construction of digital TV translators to fill coverage gaps that are created from the transition from analog to digital signals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 2904. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from holding ownership interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the first-time homebuyer tax credit and to modify the credit by repealing the first-time homebuyer requirement and waiving recapture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to specifically include problem and pathological gambling in programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and to establish a national program to address the harmful consequences of problem gambling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to ensure that recipients of assistance under the Troubled Asset Relief Program repay such assistance only if they would remain well capitalized after such repayment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PENCE:

H. Res. 548. A resolution providing for the election of certain minority members to a standing committee; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PENCE:

H. Res. 549. A resolution expressing support for all Iranian citizens who struggle for freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the protection of the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H. Res. 550. A resolution recognizing the "Day of the African Child" on June 16, 2009, devoted to the theme of child survival and to emphasize the importance of reducing maternal, newborn, and child deaths in Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H. Res. 551. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the interstate compact regarding water resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin approved by the Congress in Public Law 110-342 expressly prohibited the sale, diversion, or export of water from States in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

95. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the State Senate of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 51 memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to appropriate funds to be used for storm-proofing interior pump stations in St. Bernard and Plaquemines parishes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

96. Also, a memorial of the State Senate of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to maintain the current incentives for the exploration and production of domestic oil and natural gas; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 22: Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 147: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 187: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 213: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 240: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 270: Mr. BERRY and Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 293: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 294: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 297: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 329: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 333: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 362: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 406: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 430: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 450: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 483: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 503: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 513: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 537: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 574: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. REICHERT.

- H.R. 690: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 816: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 886: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 904: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 958: Mr. NADLER of New York and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 982: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 997: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1016: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1021: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1054: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1063: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1064: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HODES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1066: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1084: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1093: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1147: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1169: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1172: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1177: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1179: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1188: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
H.R. 1190: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1191: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1207: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1210: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1211: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1242: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1255: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FARR, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1283: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1313: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1330: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1347: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1392: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1396: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1407: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1410: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1415: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1428: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1454: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1507: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1526: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1528: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1530: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1531: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1548: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1551: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1585: Mr. CARNAHAN and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1614: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1616: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1643: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1670: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1678: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1685: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1708: Ms. WATERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1826: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1835: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1846: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1849: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1868: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1873: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1884: Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 1894: Mr. PITTS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1898: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1956: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1977: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1992: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2014: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2017: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2024: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 2047: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 2061: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2068: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2083: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2085: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2097: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2102: Ms. WATERS and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2125: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2129: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2140: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 2196: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2213: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2243: Mr. BOCCIERI and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2245: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2254: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2270: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2275: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2296: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2303: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2329: Mr. HARE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CAO, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2360: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2373: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2377: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2413: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2443: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 2452: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2462: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2480: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2492: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2493: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2520: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2537: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 2547: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2554: Mr. TERRY and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 2558: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2561: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2562: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2596: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2607: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2616: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2632: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2648: Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2695: Mr. NADLER of New York and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2700: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2709: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2729: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. BIGBERT.
H.R. 2743: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WU, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MEK of Florida, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2746: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2766: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MASSA, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2777: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2829: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2831: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2835: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2842: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2846: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2861: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2866: Mr. BURGESS.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. KOSMAS.
H. Res. 57: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 69: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WU, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 111: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H. Res. 349: Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 366: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 376: Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 397: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Res. 416: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 441: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. DELAULO.
H. Res. 443: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 445: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LEE of New York, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H. Res. 476: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H. Res. 480: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 482: Mr. WATT and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Res. 496: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 507: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H. Res. 519: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Res. 535: Mr. BACA and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 536: Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 538: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 543: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr.

WALZ, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California,

Mr. HOLT, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Commission of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution: R-09-0091 URGING PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA TO RE-SCIND THE EXECUTIVE ORDER OF FORMER PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH THAT TOOK AWAY THE OVERSIGHT OF THE ISSUANCE OF H-2B SEASONAL VISAS

FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA'S AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION; REQUESTING THAT AN INVESTIGATION BE INITIATED REGARDING THE MISUSE OF THE SEASONAL VISA PROGRAM; REQUESTING A REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF SEASONAL VISAS ISSUED; FURTHER DIRECTING THE CITY OF MIAMI'S LOBBYING TEAM TO WORK WITH BOTH THE FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTED OFFICIALS REGARDING THE REDUCTION OF THE H-2B SEASONAL VISA PROGRAM; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2009

No. 90

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God Almighty, may our hearts be right with You so that our lives will honor You. Bless the Members of this body. Provide them with all the direction, defense, support, and consolation they need for life's journey. As they keep their minds on You, infuse them with Your wonderful peace. Lord, give them an abundant supply of Your spirit that they will submit to You in every trial, trusting You even when walking through the valley of shadows. Uphold them by Your might that they may move forward with faith and perseverance.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2009.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS, a

Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURRIS thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period for the transaction of morning business for an hour. Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The majority will control the first 30 minutes and the Republicans will control the next 30 minutes. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act. There will be 1 hour for debate prior to a cloture vote on that motion to proceed. Senators should expect the vote to begin as early as quarter to 12 today. The Senate will recess, as we do on every Tuesday, from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for our weekly caucus luncheons.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every day, like every Senator, I get mail from

men and women across my State. People still write letters. It is not all over the Internet. People still send handwritten letters, lots of them. People offer advice, criticism, suggestions, and stories. They are making sure their representative democracy works the way they believe it should. Anyone who is watching at home and wondering whether the representatives you send to Washington actually read these letters, I can tell you that we do.

I can tell you that on no other issue have the letters my constituents have sent me underscored the urgent need to act more than the health care nightmares they have shared with me.

For example, Lisa lives in Gardnerville, NV, a beautiful place, right under the Sierra Nevada mountains. It is very scenic and beautiful. She lives in Gardnerville with her two daughters. One is 10 and one is 7. The youngest little girl suffers seizures, and her teachers think she has a learning disability. Because of her family history, Lisa, the mom, is at high risk for cervical cancer. Although she has been told by her doctors that she should get an exam every 3 months, she now goes once a year because she doesn't have the money to go every 3 months. When Lisa lost her job recently, she lost her health coverage. Now both Lisa and her daughters miss out on the tests and preventive medicine to keep them healthy. Her long letter ended with a simple plea: "We want to go to the doctor."

Braden lives in Sparks, NV. The 55-hour weeks he works to support his family just barely cover his bills. He doesn't have enough money to buy health insurance for his family, so he doesn't buy it. Braden owes a hospital \$12,000 for a trip to the emergency room—the only place he could go because he has no health care. Braden is brave, though. In his letter, he doesn't dread the debt he carries or grumble about how hard he works, but he does fear, "If I was seriously sick or injured, I would lose it all."

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6611

Alysia is a 21-year-old woman from Las Vegas. She needs surgery for the kidney disease with which she has suffered since she was born, but because she recently lost her job, health care is not part of her life anymore. Alysia has done everything she can to try to get help. Medicaid tells her she doesn't qualify because she isn't pregnant, doesn't have children, doesn't have disability insurance. Insurance companies refuse to cover her, calling her kidney disorder a preexisting condition. Everyone else calls this a tragedy.

These stories are as real as they come. The letters are written by people who play by the rules and don't understand why the health care system doesn't play by the rules. They are written from the heart, and many are written through pain, tears, and uncertainty. Sadly, though, they are not unique. Many Americans like Lisa skip routine medical checkups or, like Braden, live one accident away from bankruptcy or one sickness away from bankruptcy or, like Alysia, fear for the worst as they fight through the red tape.

Our Republican colleagues like things, obviously, just the way they are, the status quo. They have committed themselves to a strategy of misinformation and misrepresentation. I heard it again on the radio this morning—government health care. In fact, one Senator said that if he heard a Republican Senator say anything other than “government health care”—and he instructed them not to use “public choice” or “public option”—he jokingly said they will have to put some money in the kitty.

Misinformation and misrepresentation is not where we should be. This, together with their attempt to delay, is only going to hurt people like Alysia, Braden, and Lisa.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the health care system in this country is in urgent need of reform. People are frustrated with the soaring cost of care, and they are frustrated that so many of their fellow Americans lack the coverage they need that they should be able to expect in a nation as prosperous as ours. People are also worried about the enormous burden rising health care costs is placing on American businesses, which are being forced to put off pay increases and lay off workers to cope with rising insurance premiums. And now people are concerned that a new government health plan that is being talked about will make all of these problems even worse.

For weeks, many of us have been warning about plans for a government

takeover of health care along the lines of takeovers we have seen in other areas of the private sector. Now the details of those plans are coming to light, and they raise two questions: How much is all this going to cost, and how are we going to pay for it?

Let's take just three proposals in the plan that is currently taking shape in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the details of which are just beginning to emerge.

First, there is a massive expansion of Medicaid. Here is a program that was originally established as a partnership between the Federal Government and the States to assist the poor and disabled and which has become fiscally unsustainable. Yet, rather than reform this broken program, the HELP Committee is proposing a massive new expansion.

Second, the HELP Committee bill includes massive new subsidies for Americans with incomes higher than \$100,000 a year. The purpose of these subsidies is to help defray the cost of rising insurance premiums. We all know health insurance is too expensive, but we ought to be working to lower those premiums, not opening the Federal checkbook to drive them up even higher.

Third, the HELP Committee bill establishes a new so-called prevention and public health investment fund. The details of this fund are a little murky, but early indications are that it will direct billions of dollars to things such as having the government build sidewalks and government-subsidized farmers markets. The idea here is to use tax dollars to encourage healthier lifestyles. But at a time when Americans are buried under medical bills and frightened about losing the coverage they have, farmers markets and sidewalks are not the reforms they have in mind.

Americans want serious health care reform, not expansion of programs that are already fiscally unsustainable, subsidies that disguise rising costs instead of addressing their causes, and billions for sidewalks and asparagus. These are precisely the kinds of proposals that mask the underlying problems and cause people to lose faith in government solutions, and they are simply not acceptable.

The details we are seeing from the HELP Committee should make us more skeptical of a government health plan, not less, and they should underscore for every American the need for the kinds of real, comprehensive reforms some of us have been calling for over the last few weeks.

The irony in this whole debate is that we are being told that America's fiscal future will be jeopardized if we do not allow these people who are proposing these outrageous so-called reforms to take over the entire health care system.

Preliminary estimates for this flawed legislative proposal are simply staggering. Just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office released an esti-

mate of just part—just part—of the HELP Committee bill. Focusing on just this one section, the CBO determined the bill will spend \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, even though 37 million people would still be left without health insurance. Let me say that again, Mr. President. Just part of the HELP Committee bill would spend \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, after which 37 million Americans would still be uninsured. Let me say that again, as I just have. One section of the bill—one section—\$1.3 trillion, and 37 million still uninsured. And this isn't even a complete evaluation of the bill. Large proposals that will have a significant impact on the cost, such as the Medicaid expansion and a government-run plan, have not even been factored in yet.

Moreover, according to details of the HELP Committee plan, a new health care exchange would result in 15 million Americans losing the employer coverage they already have—further evidence if you like what you have, you may well lose it under a government-run plan.

How does the HELP Committee propose we pay for all this? Well, its proposal is full of creative new ways to spend taxpayer dollars, but it offers little in offsetting the cost of the overall bill. They will either charge the money to the national credit card or, more likely, raise taxes on working families. In other words, more spending, higher taxes, and even more debt. So far, some of the taxes under discussion include a new tax on soda, juice boxes, the creation of a new tax on jobs, and new limits on charitable deductions.

Based on the CBO estimate, these taxes would only be the beginning. The health care proposal being put together is not only extremely defective, it will cost a fortune. And that cost will come straight out of the taxpayers' pocketbook.

The bottom line is this: Under the illusion of reform, Americans will be asked to give up the care they like for something worse, and then they will be taxed to the hilt to pay for it. Americans don't want changes that make the entire health care system as unsustainable as Medicaid, and they don't want to go broke covering the cost.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the second half.

The Senator from New Jersey.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 15 minutes, after which the Senator from Illinois be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACKNOWLEDGING ISRAEL'S HISTORY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, last Wednesday, a few blocks down the street, a neo-Nazi opened fire at the Holocaust Museum. He murdered a security guard and terrorized the museum's visitors, including schoolchildren, who had come to learn, to express sympathy, and to pray. That evil act was the work of a killer who had made his hatred of other religions and ethnic groups well known. And it was a reminder that intolerance, ignorance, and anti-Semitism have not yet been defeated in our world.

This tragedy reminds us of the need of sound understanding of one of the darkest episodes in the history of the world. Far too many misrepresent the significance of the Holocaust, especially in regard to the State of Israel and her people. And far too many people deny it happened altogether, out of bigotry, hatred, and spite.

In the face of so much misunderstanding, I am compelled today to speak up about the role of the Holocaust in Israel's history and Israel's challenges in preventing anti-Semitic murder from continuing to happen.

The Holocaust was the most sinister possible reminder that the Jewish population in exile was in constant jeopardy. It was a definitive argument that anti-Semitism could appear anywhere, and its horrors galvanized international support for the State of Israel. But let us be very clear: While the Shoah has a central role in Israel's identity, it is not the reason behind its founding and it is not the main justification for its existence.

The extreme characterization of this mistaken view is the following: The Western powers established Israel in 1948 based on their own guilt, at the expense of the Arab peoples who lived there. Therefore, the current state is illegitimate and should be wiped off the face of the map. This flawed argument is not only in defiance of basic human dignity but in plain defiance of history. It is in defiance of ancient history as told in biblical texts and through archeological evidence. It ignores the history of the last several centuries. Because of what is at stake, it is well worth reviewing this history in detail, and let me make a modest attempt at a very broad overview.

There has been a continuity of Jewish presence in the Holy Land for thousands of years. Jewish kings and governments were established in that area

that is now Israel several millennia ago. After untold years of Jewish sovereignty, based in Jerusalem, the land of the Jewish people fell repeatedly to invaders—Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and many others. Jews were repeatedly massacred and expelled, and the departure of so many from the land they had always called home developed into an unparalleled diaspora.

From the 16th century until the earliest 20th century, the land that is now Israel was under the control of a distant Ottoman caliphate based in Istanbul, and during this time, as earlier, many Jews returned to their ancestral homeland. The Ottoman Empire collapsed after World War I, and the treaty granted Great Britain a mandate over the area then known as Palestine.

The League of Nations endorsed and clarified this mandate in 1922, requiring Britain to reconstitute a Jewish national home within the territory they controlled, in accordance with the declaration made by British Foreign Secretary Balfour in 1917, making the restoration of Jewish communities in that area a matter of international law.

By the time World War II had ended, there were more than 600,000 Jews living in the British Mandate of Palestine. In 1947, the United Nations approved a plan to partition the territory into Arab and Jewish states. The Jewish Agency accepted the plan. The Arabs did not. On May 14, 1948, the State of Israel declared its independence. On May 15, five Arab nations declared war. Despite being surrounded on all sides, Israel prevailed and expanded its borders, providing a small additional measure of security against attacks which were certain to come—and did.

So to be clear, the more than 700,000 Palestinians who left Israel were refugees of a war instigated by Arab governments, bent on seizing more land for themselves. But the Arabs who left Israel after its modern founding weren't the only displaced population in the Middle East. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of Jews who left Europe during and after the Holocaust in the 20th century, more than three-quarters of a million Jews fled or were expelled from their homes in Arab and Middle Eastern nations—in cities that many of their families had lived in for nearly a millennium. Their possessions were taken, their livelihoods were destroyed, victims of nationalism and hatred of Israel.

Several thousand years of history lead to an undeniable conclusion: The reestablishment of the State of Israel in modern times is a political reality with roots going back to the time of Abraham. And so the way to consider the immeasurable impact of the Holocaust in Israel is not to ask whether the State would exist otherwise. It is, at least in one sense, to imagine how even more vibrant Israel would be if millions upon millions had not been denied a chance to know it.

The attacks on Israel have barely stopped since 1948—not just attacks by armies but attacks by individuals, attacks by tanks and terrorists, attacks that have come in the form of stones and they have come in the form of speeches. Its enemies have attempted to assassinate its people with rockets and assassinate its national character with hateful rhetoric. Today it is still surrounded by hostility; its back is still to the sea. It is surrounded by hostility from Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in the Gaza strip.

In looking at the threat Israel faces on its southwestern border, one fact must be absolutely, indisputably, unequivocally clear: There is no moral equivalency between Israel and Hamas. Israel is a sovereign democratic state of 7.5 million people—Jews, Muslims, and Christians. Hamas is a terrorist organization. It won control of Gaza after men in ski masks waged gun battles with another branch of Palestinian leadership. It used that control to launch rockets at sleeping children in the nearby Israeli cities of Ashkelon and Sterot. This is the thanks Israel got for withdrawing from Gaza.

Hamas does not recognize agreements that Palestinian leaders have reached with Israel in the past, it does not recognize Israel's right to exist at all, and in fact it is ideologically committed to Israel's annihilation. Gaza's people thirst for freedom and opportunity but are held hostage to Hamas's thirst for destruction. And even today, after the consequences of menacing Israel became clear in a disastrous war, weapons are flowing freely through tunnels into Gaza, Hamas has rearmed and is readying itself for the day when it is going to take on Israel again.

Hamas and Hezbollah may be the head of the snake when it comes to terrorism, but the tail extends much further. The weapons terrorists use were sent from Iran. Money they received was sent from Iran. Propaganda supporting Hamas's campaign of terror and calling for Israel's destruction was conceived in, produced by, and broadcast from Iran.

The fundamentalist regime in Teheran isn't just an emerging threat. It doesn't just have the potential to be a threat to Israel's existence. It is a threat to Israel's existence. Under no circumstances whatsoever can we allow that conventional threat to become a nuclear one. Especially in light of the threat of Iran, and in light of the threat extremists pose to so many innocent civilians around the globe, the importance of Israel as a strategic ally and friend to the United States could not be clearer. It is hard to overstate the value of having such a stalwart democratic ally in such a critical part of the world—an ally in terms of intelligence gathering, economics, politics, and culture. Israel arose in a desert rampant with repression, a force of moderation against fundamentalism and extremism. It is an ally we can constantly depend on and count on to

be with us in international fora and on the key decisions that affect the safety and security of Americans around the world.

For more than six decades, it has been a key U.S. trading partner and a scientific innovator. We have Israeli engineers to thank for everything from advances in solar power to cell phone technology to AOL Instant Messenger. Equipment we are using in Iraq to fight terrorism and keep American troops safe was developed in Israel. Medical treatments we are using in U.S. hospitals to fight cancer, heart disease, and chronic pain were developed in Israel. Israeli-born actors are stars of Hollywood, and an Israeli astronaut has accompanied Americans into space.

So it is not only in the interest of Israel to have its full history recognized, it is in the national interest and the national security interests of the United States. It is in our interests to fully remember the unbreakable bond that has made us both stronger over the last 61 years and to make it unmistakable that our commitment is as strong as ever.

The argument for Israel's legitimacy does not depend on what we say in speeches. It has been made by history. It has been made by the men and women who have made the desert green, by Nobel prizes earned, by groundbreaking innovations and enviable institutions, by lives saved, democracy defended, peace made, and battles won. There can be no denying the Jewish people's legitimate right to live in peace and security on a homeland to which they have had a connection for thousands of years.

We can and must move forward in the peace process, and look for ways to reach agreement between all sides. But we cannot erase the moral distinctions between tyranny and freedom, and we must not edit history. If we stay true to history and follow our moral compass, I am optimistic that talks can lead to understanding and resolution of the very sensitive, detailed, and tough issues we face.

The next pages of Middle Eastern history are not doomed to be stained by an endless, senseless fight to the death. It doesn't have to be that way. Different peoples of vastly different backgrounds have peacefully thrived in the Middle East for generations upon generations, and this coexistence can happen once more.

Let us remember the words of Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat in 1978, when he accepted the Nobel Prize for peace—words that not long before would have seemed incredibly unlikely. He said:

Let us put an end to wars, let us reshape life on the solid basis of equity and truth. And it is this call . . . of the great majority of the Arab and Israeli peoples, and indeed of millions of men, women, and children around the world that you are today honoring. And these hundreds of millions will judge to what extent every responsible leader in the Middle East has responded to the hopes of mankind.

I have been to Israel. I have shaken the hands of its citizens and visited its

holy places. I know that in the heart of Israelis there is a strong desire for peace. We can never lose sight of why peace is so important. After the unspeakable horrors of the Holocaust, the Jewish people would forever be mindful that no one knows what turns history will take and every day we are mindful that anti-Semitism has not gone away, whether in the form of a firebombing of a French synagogue, defamatory comments of a government official in South Africa, or a senseless murder in Washington DC.

Israel is the one place in the world, the one place where anti-Semitism can be structurally impossible. It is a field of hope on which fear can be vanquished, an island of refuge that can stand firm no matter how stormy the sea of history turns. That is why we must always keep it safe and always keep it free.

The United States is not simply allied with a government, it is an ally of Israel's people. It is an ally of Israel's democratic ideals. It is an ally of its history, of its aspirations for peace and prosperity, its can-do spirit, and amazing resilience in the face of threats from all sides. In that sense, we are not just Israel's allies, we are admirers, we are partners, and we are friends.

I plan to do everything I can to see that we support this friendship this year, next year, and every year thereafter.

Let me close by saying Martin Luther King said:

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

We know that in Israel's quest for security, there will be trials along the way, there will be setbacks, and there will be dangers too tremendous for words. But if we continue the work we do and continue to stay true to the values that drive our journey, then the long arc will eventually rest in place in the land of Israel and it is a just and lasting peace that will be at hand.

I yield whatever time I have, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. How much time is remaining in morning business on the Democratic side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I am going to ask consent for an additional 5 minutes on both sides in morning business, and I will try to not use it if I can. I ask consent for an additional 5 minutes on both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent after my remarks the Senator from Oregon be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Could I amend the unanimous consent request that I follow Senator WYDEN?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that on the Republican side, for their morning business, Senator McCAIN be recognized first.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning the Republican Senate leader, MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, came to the floor to talk about health care. It is a timely conversation among Members of the Senate about the future of this important issue. I know Senator WYDEN of Oregon is going to address it as well.

Yesterday, in Chicago, IL, which I am honored to represent, the President came to speak to the American Medical Association, a gathering of doctors from all over the United States, to address this same issue. It is an issue of paramount importance to these medical professionals. They understand, as we do, that we want to maintain the best quality health care in the world. In order to do that, we have to face the realities of the shortcomings of our current health care system.

Although we have many of the best hospitals and doctors and some of the best technology, we lead the world in the development of pharmaceuticals, we also know the cost of this system is spinning out of control. People feel it; whether it is individuals buying health insurance, businesses, governments—State and local and Federal governments—all understand that if the cost of health care continues to rise as it is currently going up, it will literally break the bank, not just for the Federal Government and all the health care programs we have but for individuals and families and businesses. That is the reality.

If we do nothing, if we ignore this reality, we are doomed to face a situation where more and more of the dollars we earn as employees will go toward health care protection and health care insurance and the protection itself will diminish each year—because that is the other reality. As the cost of health insurance goes up each year, the coverage goes down.

People know what I am talking about. When the health insurance company says we have a great plan for you but, incidentally, remember the cancer test you had last year, we will not cover anything related to cancer in the future, that is not much when it comes to insurance or protection or peace of mind.

They also know that many health insurance companies make this a deadly game of a battle between what your doctor says you need and what some insurance company bureaucrat is going to negotiate. You end up on the phone with some clerk in a distant location

debating as to whether there is coverage and whether they can go ahead with the procedure they think is important for you or someone you love very much in your family. That is the reality of where we are today. We have to deal with cost and deal with it in a fashion that is appropriate.

How do we deal with it? First, this system has a lot of money in it. We spend twice as much as any other country on Earth when it comes to health protection and health care. Yet when you look at the results, the actual survival rates for many of the serious illnesses that face us, it turns out that countries that spend a fraction of what the United States spends get better results. There is a lesson to be learned. There is waste in this system.

One of the articles that is making the rounds on Capitol Hill was written in the New Yorker magazine on June 1 by a Boston surgeon named Atul Gawande. He went to McAllen, TX, and tried to understand why the cost per Medicare patient there, at \$15,000 a year, was so high, dramatically higher than many other comparable cities in the State of Texas and around the Nation.

What he found, to his surprise and disappointment, was that the doctors and hospitals in those areas were bundling up and charging people as much as possible, ordering procedures that were unnecessary, doing things that were not called for. The reason was obvious: there was money to be made. As long as they kept piling the medical bills on the patients through Medicare, they received more reimbursement. They didn't have healthier people. They didn't have an outcome that justified it. But they made a lot more money in the process.

What the President has said to us is, with all this money in the system, we have to find ways to bring in more efficiency. It is one thing to say that 48 million Americans currently uninsured will receive protection. I think that is basic. That is moral. That should be one of our primary goals. But that costs money.

When the Republican leader comes up and argues this is going to be an expensive undertaking, what he is saying is we cannot afford to insure people in America. I think he is wrong. I think there are ways to do it, and we must do it because, honestly, if they don't have health insurance, they are still going to get sick. They are still going to a doctor or hospital and all of us are going to pay for it.

Right now we estimate that for an ordinary family in America, we are paying about \$1,000 a year more in health insurance premiums to cover those who are uninsured. In other words, the health insurance policy I have through the Federal Government with the Federal employees costs \$1,000 more than it ordinarily would so there is more money in the system to cover those uninsured. If we can bring those uninsured into insurance coverage, it

gives them peace of mind, it relieves this hidden tax on families across America, and it means, frankly, that providers—hospitals, doctors, and others—are going to be adequately compensated for the care they offer to currently uninsured people.

When President Obama comes to the AMA and talks about covering the uninsured, there is usually a cheer. That is 48 million more paying customers, people who will actually pay into our system. But he also talks about something that is not as popular with many health care providers and that is reducing the cost of this system.

What happened in McAllen, TX, is unacceptable; that you can have health care providers trying to run up the bill in an effort to make more money for themselves at the expense of the government, at the expense of health insurance companies but, frankly, not to the benefit of those who are being treated.

The Senator from Kentucky frequently comes here and talks about how much he dislikes—I will use that word—government-related health care. Let's make it clear. I do not know of anyone, including the President or leaders of Congress, calling for a government health care plan to cover everyone. That is not what we are asking for. We want to make sure there is private health insurance that is held accountable and is competitive so we can help bring down the cost. But to argue there is something fundamentally wrong with government-sponsored health care, even if it is just an option, a voluntary option for customers across America, is to ignore the obvious. There are 40 million Americans today protected by Medicare. Forty million seniors and disabled people who have quality health care because of a government plan that has been in place now for over 40 years. There are also a large number of our men and women who serve in the military protected by the veterans health care system, another government health care system, who believe—and I think rightly so—that they are receiving some of the best medical care in America. I do not believe the Senator from Kentucky is opposed to the Veterans' Administration and the health care it provides, but it is a government plan.

The same is true when it comes to the Children's Health Insurance Program. That is health insurance for individual children through private companies, but the Government has stepped in to make sure these kids are covered, and I, frankly, am very proud of the fact that when President Obama took office, we extended that coverage to 11 million uninsured children in America. That was a government effort to make the private health insurance effort in our country work better.

We have to get down to the bottom line here. Are we going to succeed or fail when it comes to health care reform? If we ignore the obvious and ignore the challenges, there is a genuine

chance we may come up short. But if we accept this historic challenge to come together on both sides of the aisle, I think the American people will cheer us on. They want to maintain what is good about the current health care system and fix what is broken. They want to make sure, at the end of the day, if they have health insurance they like, a plan they think is right for them and their families, that they can keep that. They want to make sure the health care reform is centered on patients and families and the doctor-patient relationship, not on a government bureaucracy. They want to end the health insurance company bureaucracies that are so frustrating and so expensive for families across America.

When the Senator from Kentucky, the Republican leader, comes to the floor and comes up with a series of criticisms about any attempt at reform, I have a question to ask him: What is your option? What would you do? Do you accept the status quo? Do you think this is as good as it can be? I do not. I agree with President Obama. We can do better.

The President said one last thing that I am going to say; that is, he said: If this were easy, it would have been done a long time ago. It is hard, and it will take bipartisan cooperation for it to succeed. I encourage my colleagues to join in that conversation at the Finance Committee, as well as at the HELP Committee, and I hope we can produce a product this year that shows we are going to move forward together to make sure we have affordable quality health care for every American.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the Democratic side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 11 minutes 24 seconds.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, many Senators on both sides of the aisle are working constructively to fix American health care. For several years, I have spent time listening to colleagues, going to the offices of 85 Senators and at least that many in the House, and to thousands of others in the public and private sectors, about their ideas for fixing American health care. My aim with these discussions has been to find common ground and to chart a path so that this Congress and this President can do something this country has never done before: enact real health reform.

Today, I come to the floor to lay out the specifics of real health care reform. The President said yesterday that there has never been a better opportunity to get the job done; to improve the lives of all Americans and guarantee quality, affordable coverage to all of our people.

The question now is will Democrats and Republicans in the Senate rise to this challenge? Will this Congress and the President overcome the fear tactics

that have derailed past efforts? But maybe equally as important: Will this Congress and our President dare to pass real reform?

The pitfall, as I see it, is that too often we have been afraid of failure. If we draft legislation with an eye only on what we think can get passed, on what we think the American people will buy, if we play it too safe, my fear is that we will miss the opportunity for real reform. I believe that passing a reform bill that does not reform the health care system is about as wrong as not passing any bill at all.

President Obama said yesterday he will only support legislation that "earns the title of reform." I agree with the President, which is why I am going to use this morning to lay down a similar marker for what I believe is necessary to "earn the title of real reform."

First, real reform means that all of us, and especially the powerful interest groups, must accept changes resisted in the past. Insurers are going to have to change the way they do business. Pharmaceutical companies will have to be more responsive to purchasers that insist on more value and transparency. Doctors and hospitals will be held accountable for the quality of care they provide. Malpractice suits will be held to stricter standards.

Individuals will have to take greater responsibility for their health. Real health reform means changing the way business is done in the private insurance market. It means an end to insurance companies cherry-picking, a practice where the companies take the healthy people and send sick people over to government programs more fragile than they are. No longer should anyone make money by denying care to someone who needs it. That is wrong, and this Congress will make it illegal.

Real reform means everyone is guaranteed coverage by their choice of insurer. Under any new system, insurance companies must be required to cover everyone and they must be required to price with fairness so you do not get discriminated against because of your gender or your health status or your age. It means you will no longer be denied coverage or charged more because you were sick 5 years ago or today or you might be sick 5 years from now.

Real health reform guarantees that all Americans can choose their doctor and their health plan. The President said yesterday: Real reform will give every American access to the insurance exchange where they can choose to keep the care they have or pick a better plan that meets their families' needs. That means if you like the care you have, you can keep it. But it also means that if you do not like the care you have, you can reject it. You can reject it and choose a better plan.

Real reform would not only cover the uninsured, but it will make the lives of all of those who have insurance cov-

erage better. Right now the majority of Americans who are lucky enough to have employer coverage have no choice in where they get their insurance. I believe these Americans deserve choices too.

Some might say that this undermines the employer-based system. No, it does not. Rather, it makes the employer-based system more accountable at the same time that it makes health care more portable. Real health reform means that if you leave your job or your job leaves you, you will not lose your health care coverage.

Real reform will once and for all end the entrepreneurial tax in which Americans are afraid to go into business for themselves because they cannot take their health care with them. The President himself said it best when he wrote in 2006, "With Americans changing jobs more frequently, more likely to go through spells of unemployment, and more likely to work part time or to be self-employed, health insurance can't just run through employers anymore, it must be portable."

Real reform will guarantee that all Americans can afford quality health care. No longer should families be forced to pay more for their health insurance premiums than they pay for their housing. Our goal should not be to exempt those Americans who cannot afford to pay, our goal should be to guarantee that every American can afford the health care they need.

Real reform will be affordable for the Nation and for our taxpayers. It will reduce current costs and bring the rate of health care inflation in line with economic growth. Failure to meet this test would result in massive new government obligations and no means to pay for them.

Real reform must end the health care caste system in which low-income Americans are treated as second-class citizens. No longer should low-income Americans have less access to doctors than their Member of Congress or any other American. Today, 37 million adults and 10 million children effectively lack access to a primary care physician. Those are Americans who have health insurance but who cannot find a doctor to care for them. Real reform means ending the caste system in America that, in my view, discriminates against the most vulnerable and most impoverished among us. Real reform means that when you need a doctor you will be able to see one.

Real reform will reward Americans for making smart choices. Americans should be rewarded for choosing the right insurer for their families, and they should be rewarded for choosing a healthy lifestyle. This means creating a health system that no longer focuses primarily on sick care, but puts a priority on prevention as well.

Real reform will change the incentives that drive behavior in the American health system. It will reduce the demand and desire for unnecessary health care services. Health care insti-

tutions will no longer profit from the quantity of procedures they run up but will instead be rewarded for quality care.

Real reform will take an axe to administrative costs. Americans will sign up just once for health care. They will have their premiums taken from their withholding so they do not have to worry about making payments. They will go into large efficient groups so they are no longer left on their own in the individual market.

In today's non-system, people are an afterthought to the self-perpetuating bureaucracy of medical billing, reimbursement fights, coverage fights, and outright fraud, waste, and abuse. Like the President said yesterday, real reform will: "Replicate best practices; incentivize excellence; close cost disparities." In effect, he wants to see health care dollars go to pay for quality, efficient health care. And that is what I have described today.

Real reform means providing care. It means guaranteeing that all Americans have good, quality, affordable coverage, coverage that is portable. It means ensuring we end the caste system so all Americans can see doctors when they need one. And it means creating a system that is more intent on keeping people healthy than profiting from illness.

The central question, when it comes to real reform, is not who pays, but how we pay. Because everyone knows that ultimately the American taxpayer is the one footing the bill. It is now Congress's job to create an accountable system that puts the focus where it belongs, not on misguided incentives, not on shedding risk, not on quarterly profits, but on providing quality, efficient care for all our people.

That is what Americans want from this debate about health care reform. That is what I think can bring Democrats and Republicans together, working with the President under the banner of real reform. The country deserves it. It is time for this Congress to give it to our people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, tomorrow the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions will begin consideration of a 615-page bill that seeks to reform our Nation's health care system. This bill, introduced by Senator KENNEDY and others last week, has very great ambitions.

We all agree that health care reform is necessary. We all agree that Congress must act. But we must not act recklessly. We must not act with haste and political expediency. Health care reform will affect each and every American and we must do it right. I strongly believe that we have to start over and act in a truly bipartisan manner to address the issue.

Unfortunately, the legislation before that committee seeks to enact a massive government-run health care program that intrudes into the lives of all Americans by making decisions on each American's choice of doctors, employer health plans, and insurance providers, and it leaves major questions unanswered.

Every American should know the answer to how much will this massive expansion of government cost. And every taxpayer should have a clear answer to how are taxpayers going to pay for this massive government expansion.

Yesterday the Congressional Budget Office released a letter which stated that the Kennedy bill, the bill now pending for markup beginning tomorrow in committee, would insure only one-third—would insure only one-third—of the 47 million Americans who are currently uninsured, for a cost of \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion—over 10 years.

Again that only insures one-third of the uninsured. Let me quote from the Congressional Budget Office report. It says:

Once the proposal [that is the bill that we are now considering in the HELP Committee] was fully implemented, about 39 million individuals would obtain coverage through the new insurance exchanges. At the same time, the number of people who had coverage through an employer would decline by about 15 million or roughly 10 percent, and coverage from other sources would fall by about 8 million. So the net decrease in the number of people uninsured would be about 16 million, because 47 million are without health insurance in America.

So this matches an executive summary entitled "The Impact of the 2009 Affordable Health Choices Act" which was completed by the HSI Network, done by Steve Parente, Ph.D., and Lisa Tornai, M.S.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. This study authenticates the Congressional Budget Office, because what it says is, if you want to insure every American, it is going to be \$4 trillion—not \$1 but \$4 trillion—over a 10-year period.

So to insure coverage for all Americans, as proposed in the legislation, it would cost \$460 billion annually or \$4 trillion over the next 10 years, according to a report issued last week, as I mentioned.

The best we can tell, the cost of the legislation that we are now considering is \$4 trillion. How are we going to pay for that? How are we going to pay for it? Is there a proposal yet, besides eliminating fraud, abuse, and waste?

It is unacceptable. It is not health care reform. I believe the CBO letter should be a wake-up call to all of us in this Chamber to scrap the current bill and start all over, and start all over in a bipartisan fashion with true negotiations.

Yesterday the President of the United States said the opponents of his

legislation or his proposal were fear mongering. I cannot agree with that assessment nor do I accuse the proponents of this bill of that motivation. This is not health care reform. Any bill that strips 23 million Americans of their current health care coverage and insures a mere third of the 47 million uninsured Americans is not what Americans are looking for in legislation.

Let me say, Americans are not calling for a massive government expansion. They are not calling for a new government insurance plan that will do away with existing private insurance plans or an act of a broad government panel exerting command and control of individual, small group and large employer health care plans. They are not calling for new tax cuts to health care services or penalties to individuals or small businesses if health coverage does not comply with Washington's standards. They are not calling for \$1 to \$4 trillion to be spent to fund the appetite of some who are hungry for more government intrusion into the daily lives of Americans.

Americans need health insurance, good and complete health care coverage, the security of knowing they have a job, and even better, a job where an employer can afford to provide health care coverage. If the employer does not provide coverage, we need to make it easier and affordable to get health care coverage for an American.

Two ideas: One, give every American family a \$5,000 refundable tax credit and let them go out and get an insurance policy that meets their needs. And let them go across State lines if they feel like doing it. That is pretty simple. It is not real complicated. It can be done in a bipartisan way in a matter of weeks.

That is not what is happening here, despite all of their calls, along with the President's, for bipartisanship. But it can be done if we wanted to solve the problem for the American people.

I believe it is time for Democrats and Republicans to come together and draft a bill that gets Americans the health care coverage needed at affordable rates. This should be our goal, ensuring that all Americans have coverage, not just 16 million as the Congressional Budget Office study indicates, but have everybody covered, not an unsustainable government expansion.

Again, I am calling on the White House and the Democrats to scrap this unsustainable bill and sit down and let us start from scratch. According to news reports in New York, Robert Gibbs states this morning, "This is not the Administration's bill," after the CBO letter came out.

Well, where is the administration's bill? We are supposed to be enacting legislation before the end of July. Where is the administration's bill?

We cannot afford this one. We cannot afford the one that is supposedly going to be enacted into legislation that will come to the floor of this Senate. It

does not do justice to our taxpayers and their children. Forty-two percent of U.S. voters say cutting the deficit is the most important priority for the country. The bill that is being considered tomorrow in the HELP Committee is an extraordinary step in the wrong direction.

So let me just say, scrap this bad bill. Pay attention to the Congressional Budget Office. Understand it does not achieve the goal of coverage. Understand the costs would be around \$4 trillion over a 10-year period for which, so far, there is almost no provision to pay for it. Let's sit down together and work together in order to provide Americans with the health care they need at a reasonable cost.

EXHIBIT 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2009 AFFORDABLE HEALTH CHOICES ACT
Independent Assessment by HSI Network
LLC, for Public Dissemination
SUMMARY SNAPSHOT

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) have proposed a health reform bill called the Affordable Health Choice Act (AHC) that seeks to reduce the number of uninsured and increase health system efficiency and quality. The draft legislation was introduced on June 9th, 2009. The proposal provided adequate information to suggest what the impact would be of AHC using the ARCOLA™ simulation model. AHC would include an individual mandate as well as a pay or plan provision. In addition, it would include a means-tested subsidy with premium supports available for those up to 500% of the federal poverty level. Public plan options in three tiers: Gold, Silver and Bronze are proposed in a structure similar to that of the Massachusetts Connector, except that it is called The Gateway. These public plan options would contain costs by reimbursing providers up to 10% above current reimbursement rates. There is no mention of removing the tax exclusion associated with employer sponsored health insurance. There is also no mention of changes to Medicare and Medicaid, other than fraud prevention, that could provide cost-savings for the coverage expansion proposed. Below, we summarize the impact of the proposed plan in terms of the reduction on uninsured, the 2010 cost, as well as the ten year cost of the plan in 2010 dollars.

HELP Affordable Health Choices Act

Insurance is reduced by 99% to cover approximately 47,700,000 people.

Subsidy—Tax Recovery = Net cost: \$279,000,000,000 subsidy to the individual market; \$180,000,000,000 subsidy to the ESI market with; Net cost: \$460,500,000,000 (annual); Net cost: \$4,098,000,000,000 (10 year)

Private sector crowd out: -79,300,000 lives.

The underlying simulation model used is ARCOLA™, a proprietary version of a health reform coverage and cost assessment analytic engine. A peer-reviewed presentation of the core model structure is summarized in the journal Health Affairs and a longer version is available as a DHHS report at www.ehealthplan.org

SCORING COMPONENTS

Major policy components considering for scoring:

Employers would have to offer health insurance or pay a tax not as yet specified.

Individuals would have to be covered by a qualified plan or pay a tax.

Medicaid for everyone up to 150% of poverty.

Sliding scale subsidy from 150% to 500% of poverty.

The government would define a qualified plan with 3 levels of coverage: gold, silver and bronze. We assume the subsidy would be priced at the silver level of benefit design.

All plans must use modified community rating: premiums can vary only by geographic region (to be defined), family structure, actuarial value of benefits, and age (maximum 2:1 range).

Public plan that pays Medicare rates +10%. Small-employer tax subsidy

SUMMARY

The plan lowers the uninsured significantly, to less than 1% of the population, but not without a cost of over four trillion dollars over 10 years. There are no provisions in the legislation to offset this course. Even if the most generous estimate of the employer sponsored tax exclusion (\$300 billion per year, including collecting FICA contribu-

tions from employers) were used and combined with fraud estimates and block granting all of Medicaid (acute and long term care), this would be a challenging proposal to finance with budget neutrality. Finally, the public plans will be quite successful in recruiting large numbers of Americans. They will also likely crowd out at 79 million individual contracts with existing private insurers.

Detailed Breakout of AHC Legislation Impact from ARCOLA™

	Status Quo Population	Proposal Population	Affordable Health Choices Act Impact	
			2010 Total Impact	Population Impact
Individual Market				
Insured	16,182,877	57,513,571	\$279,903,791,139	11,572,054
Uninsured	41,843,646	501,918	0	-41,341,728
		Subtotal	\$279,903,791,139	
Group Market				
Insured	162,665,411	168,980,727	\$180,626,259,236	-70,763,315
Uninsured	6,773,521	443,524	\$0	-6,329,997
		Subtotal	\$180,626,259,236	
		Total	\$460,530,050,376	
Total Market				
Insured	178,848,288	226,494,298	\$460,530,050,376	
Uninsured	48,617,167	945,442	0	-47,671,725

**2009 Affordable Health Choices Act
2010 Dollar Estimates by Plan Choices**

	Status Quo Population	2010 Population	2010 Fiscal Impact	Delta
Individual Market				
HSA	6,764,409	8,837,503	\$24,523,097,130	2,073,094
Public Gold	0	21,634	\$38,352,668	
Public Silver	0	15,384,939	\$85,340,451,551	
Public Bronze	0	14,352,067	\$80,151,337,191	
PPO High	57,525	1,121,641	\$7,691,906,410	1,064,116
PPO Low	9,009,693	6,569,646	\$18,899,814,008	-2,440,047
PPO Medium	351,250	11,226,141	\$63,258,832,181	10,874,891
Uninsured	41,843,646	501,918	\$0	-41,341,728
			\$279,903,791,139	
Group Market				
HMO	38,902,944	25,212,667	\$18,220,965,760	-13,690,277
HRA	4,628,425	3,584,030	\$2,636,475,136	-1,044,395
Employer-sponsored HSA	141,186	57,501	\$43,016,344	-83,684
Opt-out HSA	277,905	2,261,246	\$6,230,527,020	1,983,341
Public Gold	0	11,159,097	\$4,940,047,142	
Public Silver	0	38,123,622	\$47,241,576,558	
Public Bronze	0	27,795,913	\$32,108,463,133	
Opt-out PPO Low	245,762	651,234	\$398,087,278	405,472
PPO High	17,286,666	19,528,447	\$26,951,344,787	2,241,781
PPO Low	2,023,263	996,385	\$424,070,922	-1,026,878
PPO Medium	87,320,502	38,739,485	\$41,431,685,157	-48,581,017
Turned Down - Other Private	11,838,759	871,099	\$0	-10,967,659
Turned Down - No insurance	6,773,521	443,524	\$0	-6,329,997
			\$180,626,259,236	
		Total Subsidy:	\$460,530,050,376	

ARCOLA™ TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION

The ARCOLA™ model is a national health policy impact micro-simulation model designed to estimate the impact of health policy proposals at federal and state levels. The model predicts individual adult responses to proposed policy changes and generalizes to the US population with respect to: (1) health insurance coverage and (2) financial impact of the proposed changes.

This model was first used for the Office of the Assistant Secretary (OASPE) of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to simulate the effect of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) on take-up of high-deductible health plans in the individual health insurance market (Feldman, Parente, Abraham et al, 2005; Parente et al, Final Technical Report for DHHS Contract HHSP233200400573P, 2005). The model was later refined to incorporate the effect of prior health status on health plan choice—a necessary step if one wants to predict enrollment more accurately. The latest model also used insurance expenditures from actual claims data to refine premiums and then predict choices again with the new premiums. The model then iterates the choice model until premiums and choices converge, and then finds an equilibrium state. A subsequent change to the model permitted state-specific predictions of policy changes as well as total federal health policy impact.

MODEL COMPONENTS & DATA SOURCES

There are three major components to the ARCOLA™ model: (1) Model Estimation; (2) Choice Set Assignment and Prediction; and (3) Policy Simulation. Often, more than one database was required to complete the task. Integral to this analysis was the use of consumer directed health plan data from four large employers working with the study investigators.

The model estimation had several steps. As a first step, we pooled the data from the four employers offering CDHPs to estimate a conditional logistic plan choice model similar to our earlier work (Parente, Feldman and Christianson, 2004). In the second step we used the estimated choice-model coefficients to predict health plan choices for individuals in the MEPS-HC. In order to complete this step, it was necessary first to assign the number and types of health insurance choices that are available to each respondent in the MEPS-HC. For this purpose we turned to the smaller, but more-detailed MEPS Household Component-Insurance Component linked file, which contained the needed information. The third step was to populate the model with appropriate market-based premiums and benefit designs. The final step was to apply plan choice models coefficients to the MEPS data with premium information to get final estimates of take up and subsidy costs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam President, this week the Senate will be consid-

ering the Travel Promotion Act, which is an important bill for my home State of Florida.

Every year, millions of tourists travel to the United States from overseas, helping our economy, generating revenues for States and communities, and creating job opportunities for millions of Americans. But for most of this last decade there has been a huge dropoff in visitors to the United States from other countries. Between 2000 and 2008, the U.S. tourism industry has experienced an estimated 58 million lost arrivals, \$182 billion in lost spending, \$27 billion in lost tax receipts, and \$47 billion in lost payroll. We have also lost 245,000 jobs. One in eight Americans is directly or indirectly employed by the travel industry. The industry contributes \$1.3 trillion to the U.S. economy, and the industry contributes \$115 billion in tax revenue.

In Florida, home to Walt Disney World, Universal Studios, many beautiful beaches, the Everglades, some of the best fishing and snorkeling in the world, and the oldest settlements in North America, the tourism industry employs no less than 750,000 Floridians and accounts for nearly 25 percent of all of the State's sales tax collections. Last year, the United States had 633,000 fewer international travelers than we had in the year 2000. Florida has taken a harder hit, losing 1.3 million visitors over that same period of time.

Numbers do not lie. Our lack of attention to self-promotion is costing us money, jobs, and opportunities. And it is not that people are not traveling. The fact is, people are traveling to some destinations other than the United States. The world competition for the travel dollar is keen. Countries all over the world are doing all they can to attract visitors to their countries. We are competing in a world marketplace.

This is an alarming trend we are seeing in the United States, and it clearly hurts our economy. But it also has an impact on our image around the world. Studies show a person's opinion of our country is greatly improved when they visit our country. We are our own best ambassadors. But when fewer people visit here, there are fewer opportunities for others to see what our Nation has to offer and what we are all about. So increased travel to the United States is not only good for our Nation, it is also good for the way in which we portray ourselves to the world.

One of the best ways to address this is to create a comprehensive campaign to promote the United States as a travel destination. This is a way of reversing this current trend. This is a way of bringing back some of the declines to a better day so we can increase jobs and opportunities in our country.

Here is an example of what other nations spend to promote themselves in the tourism market around the world. Here is what we are competing against. This is what the United States is up against as we look to compete for the

travel dollar. Our close neighbor of Mexico spent \$149 million promoting travel to Mexico. Our other close neighbor, Canada, spent \$58 million in promoting travel to its country. China spent \$60 million in promoting travel to its country. Australia spent \$113 million. The countries of the European Union collectively spent \$800 million on self-promotion. How much has the United States spent? We have spent absolutely nothing. We spend nothing in promoting our tourism.

For years, sectors within the agricultural industry have used so-called checkoff programs to promote their products. We have heard the slogans: "Pork, the other white meat." "Beef, it's what's for dinner." "Milk, it does a body good." These are familiar slogans created by industry-sponsored campaigns. Producers kick in their own money to create a marketing campaign that benefits all producers. We need the same thing for our tourism, which is why I urge my colleagues to support moving forward on the Travel Promotion Act. It will benefit our economy, it will complement our Nation's diplomatic efforts and, perhaps most importantly, it will help to create new jobs.

The Travel Promotion Act will enable the United States to become its own ambassador by establishing a public-private campaign to promote tourism abroad. The campaign would be led by an independent, not-for-profit corporation governed by an 11-member board of individuals appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. Each would represent the various regions around the Nation and bring their expertise in promoting international travel. The program will not use taxpayer money but will instead rely on user fees paid by foreign tourists and in-kind contributions from corporate partners.

Additionally, the act will increase coordination among the Commerce, State, and Homeland Security Departments to streamline the entry and departure procedures for our foreign tourists. You see, not only are we not promoting ourselves, we are also doing a lot to complicate travel to our country. Because of those things which were done as a necessity post-9/11, we have created a lot of layers of complication for foreign travelers to visit our country. We have to continue to have the kind of protection about who visits our land to protect our homeland, but at the same time we need to use some common sense about how this is done and incorporate some modern technologies to ensure that the travel experience to the United States is not cumbersome, is not complicated, and that it is transparent and enjoyable for those who come to visit us.

In today's economy, every visitor counts. In the competitive world we live in, every competitive dollar that can be spent out there promoting travel to the United States will inure to the benefit of the job creation we will see in places such as my home State.

When you consider that visitors from overseas spend an estimated \$4,500 every time they visit the United States, more visitors will mean more jobs for Americans at a time when unemployment continues to rise.

So I truly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill as we work toward increasing our Nation's presence as a tourist destination around the world. I hope, as the week unfolds, we will have an opportunity to engage in conversation and discussion and debate about this very important tourism bill, which will help most States of this country.

The fact is we want Florida to be a significant tourism destination. We are proud of that in our State, but the fact is that States around the country all can benefit and do benefit greatly from foreign tourists visiting our country. It is a great, green way of promoting jobs and opportunities in our country and one I think is long overdue. If we are going to compete effectively with countries abroad, we must, in fact, also be competitive in how we promote and advertise ourselves to the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 12 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I am looking for a way to offer an amendment to the health care bill that would sentence every Senator who votes to increase Medicaid eligibility to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level to a term of 8 years as Governor in his or her home State, so they can have an opportunity to manage the program, to raise taxes, and to find a way to pay for that sort of proposal. If we Senators were to increase Medicaid in that way, and go home, we would find first that Medicaid is a terrible base upon which to build an improved health care system, because it is filled with lawsuits. It is filled with Federal court consent decrees that sometimes are 20 and 25 years old and take away from the Governor's and the legislature's authority to make decisions. It is filled with inefficiency. It is filled with delays. Governors request waivers to run their systems, and it may take a year or more for approval from the Federal Government for relatively simple requests. And finally, it is filled with an intolerable waste of taxpayer money because of fraud that is documented by the Government Accountability Office. As much as 10 percent of the entire program—\$32 billion a year—according to the Government Accountability Office is lost to fraud. That is the Medicaid Program.

The second thing a Senator who goes home to serve as Governor for 8 years

would find is that increasing coverage in this way will require much higher State taxes at a time when most every State is making a massive cut in services, and a few States are nearly bankrupt. For example, in my State of Tennessee, if the Kennedy bill were to pass, which would increase Medicaid expansion by 150 percent and increase reimbursement rates to 110 percent of Medicare, it would require, based on our estimates, a new State income tax of about 10 percent to pay for the increased costs just for our State, as well as perhaps adding another half a trillion dollars or so to the Federal debt.

Finally, if we were to base new coverage for the 58 million people now in Medicaid, and others who need insurance, upon this government-run Medicaid Program these Americans—who are the people we are talking about in this debate and who are the ones we hope will have more of the same kind of health care the rest of us have—we would find that a large number of them would have a hard time finding a doctor. Today 40 percent of doctors already refuse to provide full service to Medicaid patients because of the low reimbursement rates, and if we simply add more to that Medicaid Program, these people will have an even harder time getting served.

There is a better idea. Instead of expanding a failing government health care program which traps 58 million of our poorest citizens in that government-run program that provides substandard care, the better way to extend medical care to those low-income Americans now served by Medicaid is to give them government tax credits, or government subsidies, or vouchers, or money in their pockets they can use to purchase private health insurance of their choice. That sort of option for health care reform is before the Senate, if it could only be considered. It has been offered on one end by Senator COBURN and Senator BURR. It has been offered at the same time by Senator GREGG of New Hampshire. It has been offered in a bipartisan way by Senator WYDEN and Senator BENNETT who have offered a proposal that would basically give these dollars to the people who need help, let them buy their insurance, and according to the same Congressional Budget Office that said the Kennedy proposal costs at least 1 trillion more dollars, the CBO has said that Bennett-Wyden would cost zero more.

I ask that I am informed when I have 1 minute left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, during the last 6 months, the four words we have heard most in Washington are "more debt" and "Washington takeover," and all four words apply to the health care debate. We have seen a Washington takeover of banks, of insurance companies, of student loans, of car companies, and now,

perhaps, of health care. The President insists on a government-run insurance option as part of a health care reform plan which would inevitably lead to a Washington-run health plan.

Why would it do that? Well, putting a government-run and subsidized plan in competition with our private health insurance plans would be like putting an elephant in a room with some mice and saying: OK, guys and gals, compete. I think we know what would happen. The elephant would win the competition and the elephant would be your only remaining choice.

As for more debt, the Congressional Budget Office, in a letter sent to Senator KENNEDY, estimated that his bill, which is the only legislation the Senate Health Committee is considering, would add another \$1 trillion during the next 10 years in order to cover 16 million uninsured Americans, leaving 30 million uninsured. That is another \$1 trillion over the next 10 years that, according to yesterday's Washington Post, already is nearly three times as much as was spent in all of World War II. The Post said the proposed new debt over the next 10 years, before we get to the health care bill, is three times as much as we spent in World War II. The Congressional Budget Office estimate didn't even consider the cost of the Kennedy bill's proposals to expand Medicaid coverage.

So let's talk about Medicaid. Every State offers it. It provides health care in a variety of ways to low-income Americans who are not eligible for Medicare. The Federal Government pays about 60 percent of the costs and writes most of the rules; the States pay the rest. Fifty-eight million low-income Americans are trapped in Medicaid. It is the only place of any significant size where we don't have competition in our health care system. Think of the elephant in the room.

It was my experience as Governor—I believe it is for most Governors—that it is not only an administrative mess with substandard care, the Medicaid Program, but its costs have spiraled out of control, threatening the viability of public universities and community colleges because there is no money left for the States to support them.

Here is what would happen in Tennessee if the Kennedy bill passed, according to the State of Tennessee's Medicaid director. Our State costs would go up \$572 million if we increased coverage to 150 percent of Federal poverty. If the Fed pays for this, the Fed's cost would be \$1.6 billion—I mean the Federal budget paying for all of it, because normally the Federal budget pays two-thirds, the State one-third. If the State has to also provide Medicaid payments to physicians at 110 percent of Medicare, this would add another \$600 million in costs to the State of Tennessee. Thus, the proposal of the combination of the Health and the Finance Committees' bills that are being considered would be 1.2 billion new dollars for Tennessee. If you add the Federal Government's increase in costs

just for the Tennessee program to which the Tennessee program was expanded, it would be \$3.3 billion.

So you can see why the Kennedy bill has been called so expensive. That is not all. The Finance Committee has been discussing turning back to the States by 2015 these increased costs, although the Finance Committee is talking about a smaller expansion of coverage. So imagine a Senator going home to the State of Tennessee—it won't be me, because I have already had the privilege of being Governor—but say if one went back to be Governor of Tennessee, what would one find if we passed the Kennedy bill as it is now proposed? We would find a bill by 2015 of 1.2 billion in today's dollars, and where would the Governor get the money? Well, when one Governor proposed a 4-percent State income tax in Tennessee in 2004, a 4-percent income tax would bring in 400 million new dollars. We need \$1.2 billion under the Kennedy bill to pay for the expansion of Medicaid. So to raise nearly \$1.2 billion, a new State income tax of more than 10 percent would be needed, if all other services were held flat, and the Governor has already said that most State functions will see a decrease in funding after the stimulus money goes away.

This same problem would be true for all States. The National Governors Association says if we assume that all individuals under 150 percent of poverty are covered and there is no change in reimbursement rates, the cost to the States would be \$360 billion more over the next 10 years. If you also increase the reimbursement rate for physicians from say 72 percent to 83 percent, the Governors Association says the new cost is \$500 billion more over 10 years.

Then there is the fraud in the Medicaid Program. The Government Accountability Office says 10 percent of it is fraud—\$32 billion a year—about three-fourths of the amount we spend on prescription drugs for all seniors. Then there is the problem of access of care, with 40 percent of doctors already not being willing to provide full service to patients who are on Medicaid. So why would we expand this government-run program when it is filled with inefficiencies, delay, and waste, when it would bankrupt States, when it would add hundreds of billions of dollars to the Federal debt, and when it would provide substandard service when, instead, we could pass the Coburn-Burr bill, or the Gregg bill, or the Wyden-Bennett bill and give to the 58 million low-income Americans who are trapped in a failing government program the dollars they need to purchase private health insurance much like the rest of us have?

I hope I can find a way to offer an amendment that would require any Senator who votes for a 150-percent increase in Medicaid, who says that Medicaid expansion will go to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, will be sentenced to go home and serve for 8 years

as Governor of his or her State so they can find out what it is like to manage such a program or to raise taxes to pay for it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the letter from Douglas Elmendorf of the Congressional Budget Office to Senator KENNEDY of June 15 stating that his bill would add \$1 trillion more over the next 10 years to the debt, and that doesn't even include the Medicaid expansions I have talked about.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wall Street Journal of yesterday talking about State budget gaps, which shows what dire straits many States are in be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2009.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education,
Labor, and Pensions, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) have completed a preliminary analysis of the major provisions related to health insurance coverage that are contained in title I of draft legislation called the Affordable Health Choices Act, which was released by the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) on June 9, 2009. Among other things, that draft legislation would establish insurance exchanges (called "gateways") through which individuals and families could purchase coverage and would provide federal subsidies to substantially reduce the cost of that coverage for some enrollees.

The attached table summarizes our preliminary assessment of the proposal's budgetary effects and its likely impact on insurance coverage. According to that assessment, enacting the proposal would result in a net increase in federal budget deficits of about \$1.0 trillion over the 2010-2019 period. Once the proposal was fully implemented, about 39 million individuals would obtain coverage through the new insurance exchanges. At the same time, the number of people who had coverage through an employer would decline by about 15 million (or roughly 10 percent), and coverage from other sources would fall by about 8 million, so the net decrease in the number of people uninsured would be about 16 million.

It is important to note, however, that those figures do not represent a formal or complete cost estimate for the draft legislation, for reasons outlined below. Moreover, because expanded eligibility for the Medicaid program may be added at a later date, those figures are not likely to represent the impact that more comprehensive proposals—which might include a significant expansion of Medicaid or other options for subsidizing coverage for those with income below 150 percent of the federal poverty level—would have both on the federal budget and on the extent of insurance coverage.

KEY PROVISIONS RELATED TO HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

Subtitles A through D of title I of the Affordable Health Choices Act would seek to increase the number of legal U.S. residents who have health insurance. Toward that end, the federal government would provide grants to states to establish insurance exchanges

and—more importantly—would subsidize the purchase of health insurance through those exchanges for individuals and families with income between 150 percent and 500 percent of the federal poverty level; those subsidies would represent the greatest single component of the proposal's cost. The proposal would also impose a financial cost on most people who do not obtain insurance, the size of which would be set by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The draft legislation released by the HELP Committee also indicates that certain features may be added at a later date. Because they are not reflected in the current draft, however, CBO and the JCT staff did not take them into account. In particular, the draft legislation does not contain provisions that would change the Medicaid program, although it envisions that the authority to extend Medicaid coverage will be added during Senate consideration of the bill. (By itself, adding such provisions would increase the proposal's budgetary costs and would also yield a larger increase in the number of people who have health insurance.) The draft legislation also indicates that the committee is considering whether to incorporate other features, including a "public health insurance option" and requirements for "shared responsibility" by employers. Depending on their details, such provisions could also have substantial effects on our analysis. (A summary of the key provisions that were included in this analysis is attached.)

IMPORTANT CAVEATS REGARDING THIS PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

There are several reasons why the preliminary analysis that is provided in this letter and its attachments does not constitute a comprehensive cost estimate for the Affordable Health Choices Act:

First, this analysis focuses exclusively on the major provisions on health insurance coverage contained in certain subtitles of title I of the draft legislation. Although other provisions in title I, along with provisions in the other five titles of the legislation, would have significant budgetary effects, the analysis contained in this letter and its attachment is limited to the provisions in subtitles A through D regarding health insurance coverage.

Second, CBO and the JCT staff have not yet completed modeling all of the proposed changes related to insurance coverage. For example, the proposal would allow parents to cover children as dependents until they are 27 years old, and our analysis has not yet taken that provision into account. (Other instances are listed in the attachment.) Although this analysis reflects the proposal's major provisions, taking all of its provisions into account could change our assessment of the proposal's effects on the budget and insurance coverage rates—though probably not by substantial amounts relative to the net costs already identified. As our understanding of the provisions we have analyzed improves, that could also affect our future estimates.

Third, the analysis of the proposal's effects on the federal budget and insurance coverage reflects CBO's and the JCT staff's understanding of its key features and discussions with committee staff—but does not represent a full assessment of the legislative language that was released by the committee. Although our reading of the draft language has informed our analysis, we have not had time to complete a thorough review of that language, which could have significant effects on any subsequent analysis provided by CBO and the JCT staff.

In particular, the draft legislation includes a section on "individual responsibility" that would generally impose a financial cost on

people who do not obtain insurance—but is silent about whether people are required to have such coverage. On the basis of our discussions with the committee staff, we understand that it was the committee's intent to impose a clear requirement for individuals to have health insurance, and this analysis reflects that intent. However, the current draft is not clear on this point, and if the language remains ambiguous, that would affect our estimate of its impact on federal costs and insurance coverage.

Fourth, some effects of the insurance proposals that we have modeled have not yet been fully captured. For example, we have not yet estimated the administrative costs to the federal government of implementing the proposal or the costs of establishing and operating the insurance exchanges, nor have we taken into account the proposal's effects on spending for other federal programs. Those effects could be noticeable but would not affect the main conclusions of this analysis.

Fifth, the budgetary information shown in the attached table reflects many of the major cash flows that would affect the federal budget as a result of the proposal and provides our preliminary assessment of its net effects on the federal budget deficit. Some cash flows would appear in the budget but would net to zero and not affect the deficit; CBO has not yet estimated all of those cash flows.

LIKELY EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal would have significant effects on the number of people who are enrolled in health insurance plans, the sources of that coverage, and the federal budget.

Effects on Insurance Coverage. Under current law, the number of nonelderly residents (those under age 65) with health insurance coverage will grow from about 217 million in 2010 to about 228 million in 2019, according to CBO's estimates. Over that same period, the number of nonelderly residents without health insurance at any given point in time will grow from approximately 50 million people to about 54 million people—constituting about 19 percent of the nonelderly population. Because the Medicare program covers nearly all legal residents over the age of 65, our analysis has focused on the effects of proposals on the nonelderly population.

People obtain insurance coverage from a variety of sources. Under current law, about 150 million nonelderly people will get their coverage through an employer in 2010, CBO estimates. Similarly, another 40 million people will be covered through the federal/state Medicaid program or the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Other nonelderly people are covered by policies purchased individually in the "nongroup" market, or they obtain coverage from various other sources (including Medicare and the health benefit programs of the Department of Defense).

According to the preliminary analysis, once the proposal was fully implemented, the number of people who are uninsured would decline to about 36 million or 37 million, representing about 13 percent of the nonelderly population. (Roughly a third of those would be unauthorized immigrants or individuals who are eligible for Medicaid but not enrolled in that program.) That decline would be the net effect of several broad changes, which can be illustrated by examining the effects in a specific year. In 2017, for example, the number of uninsured would fall by about 16 million, relative to current-law projections. In that year, about 39 million people would be covered by policies purchased through the new insurance exchange. At the same time, about 147 million people would be covered by an employment-based health

plan, 15 million fewer than under current law. Smaller net declines (totaling about 8 million) would occur in coverage under Medicaid and CHIP and in nongroup coverage because of the subsidies offered in the exchanges.

Budgetary Impact of Insurance Coverage Provisions. On a preliminary basis, CBO and the JCT staff estimate that the major provisions in title I of the Affordable Health Choices Act affecting health insurance coverage would result in a net increase in federal deficits of about \$1.0 trillion for fiscal years 2010 through 2019. That estimate primarily reflects the subsidies that would be provided to purchase coverage through the new insurance exchanges, which would amount to nearly \$1.3 trillion in that period. The average subsidy per exchange enrollee (including those who would receive no subsidy) would rise from roughly \$5,000 in 2015 to roughly \$6,000 in 2019. The other element of the proposal that would increase the federal deficit is a credit for small employers who offer health insurance, which is estimated to cost \$60 billion over 10 years. Because a given firm would be allowed to take the credit for only three consecutive years, the pattern of outlays would vary from year to year.

Those costs would be partly offset by receipts or savings from three sources: increases in tax revenues stemming from the decline in employment-based coverage; payments of penalties by uninsured individuals; and reductions in outlays for Medicaid and CHIP (relative to current-law projections).

The proposal would not change the tax treatment of health insurance premiums. Nevertheless, the reduction in the number of people receiving employment-based health insurance coverage, relative to current-law projections, would affect the government's tax revenues. Because total compensation costs are determined by market forces, CBO and the JCT staff estimate that wages and other forms of compensation would rise by roughly the amounts of any reductions in employers' health insurance costs. Employers' payments for health insurance are tax-preferred, but most of those offsetting changes in compensation would come in the form of taxable wages and salaries. As a result, the shift in compensation brought about by the proposal would cause tax revenues to rise by \$257 billion over 10 years. (Those figures are generally shown as negative numbers in the attached table because increases in revenues reduce the federal budget deficit.)

The government would also collect the payments that uninsured individuals would have to make. CBO and the JCT staff assume that the annual amount, which would be set by the Treasury Secretary, would be relatively small (about \$100 per person). Moreover, individuals with income below 150 percent of the federal poverty level would not have to pay that amount. As a result, collections of those payments would total \$2 billion over 10 years.

Finally, although the proposal would not change federal laws regarding Medicaid and CHIP, it would affect outlays for those programs. CBO assumes that states that had expanded eligibility for Medicaid and CHIP to people with income above 150 percent of the federal poverty level would be inclined to reverse those policies, because those individuals could instead obtain subsidies through the insurance exchanges that would be financed entirely by the federal government. Reflecting those reductions in enrollment, federal outlays for Medicaid and CHIP would decline by \$38 billion over 10 years.

I hope this preliminary analysis is helpful for the committee's consideration of the Affordable Health Choices Act. If you have any questions, please contact me or CBO staff.

The primary staff contacts for this analysis are Philip Ellis, who can be reached at (202) 226-2666, and Holly Harvey, who can be reached at (202) 226-2800.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

Attachments.

A SUMMARY OF THE KEY PROVISIONS OF THE HELP COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL

Congressional Budget Office, June 15, 2009

Most of the proposal's key provisions would become operative in a state when that state establishes an insurance exchange (called a "gateway") through which its residents could obtain coverage; such exchanges might start offering health insurance in some states in 2012; all exchanges would be fully operational by 2014.

The proposal is assumed to require most legal residents to have insurance (though the draft language is not explicit in this regard). In general, the government would collect a payment from uninsured people, but individuals with income below 150 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL) would be exempt and the payment would be waived in certain other cases. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) assumed that the annual payment amount, which would be set administratively, would be relatively small (about \$100 per person).

New health insurance policies sold in the individual and group insurance markets would be subject to several requirements regarding their availability and pricing. Insurers would be required to issue coverage to all applicants, and could not limit coverage for preexisting medical conditions. In addition, premiums for a given plan could not vary because of enrollees' health and could vary by their age to only a limited degree (under a system known as adjusted community rating). Existing policies that are maintained continuously would be "grandfathered."

There would be no change from current law regarding Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

Insurance policies covering required benefits that are sold through the exchanges would have actuarial values chosen by the Secretary of Health and Human Services from specified ranges within three tiers. (A plan's actuarial value reflects the share of costs for covered services that is paid by the plan.) CBO and the JCT staff assumed that the chosen actuarial values would be 95 percent (for the highest tier), 85 percent (for the middle tier), and 76 percent (for the lowest tier). Plans would be allowed to offer added coverage or benefits for an extra premium.

The subsidies available through the exchanges would be tied to the average of the three lowest premium bids submitted by insurers in each area of the country for each tier of coverage. For people with income between 150 percent and 200 percent of the FPL, the subsidies would apply to that average bid for the highest-tier plans; for people with income between 200 percent and 300 percent of the FPL, the subsidies would apply to that average bid for the middle-tier plans; and for people with income between 300 percent and 500 percent of the FPL, the subsidies would apply to that average bid for the lowest-tier plans.

The subsidies would cap premiums as a share of income on a sliding scale starting at 1 percent for those with income equal to 150 percent of the FPL, rising to 10 percent of income at 500 percent of the FPL. Those income caps would be indexed to medical price inflation, so that individuals would (on average) pay a higher portion of their income for exchange premiums over time. Individuals

and families with income below 150 percent of the FPL would not be eligible for those subsidies. (The proposal envisions that Medicaid would be expanded to cover those individuals and families but the draft legislation does not include provisions to accomplish that goal.)

Subsidies would be delivered by the Department of Health and Human Services via the insurance exchanges with some provisions for income verification. Subsidy amounts would be determined using a measure of income for a previous tax year, implying that subsidies received for a given year (for example, in 2013) would be based on in-

come received two years prior (for example, in 2011). Individuals might be eligible for larger subsidies if their income declined significantly in the intervening period or if other extenuating circumstances arose. (The draft legislation's provisions regarding verification of income are unclear, which is reflected in the analysis.)

The proposal does not include a "public plan" that would be offered in the exchanges, nor does it contain provisions that would require employers to offer health insurance benefits or impose a fee or tax on them if they did not offer insurance coverage to their workers.

In general, individuals with an offer of employer-sponsored insurance would not be eligible for exchange subsidies under the proposal. However, employees with an offer from an employer that was deemed unaffordable could get those subsidies; because the exchange subsidies would limit the share of income that enrollees would have to pay (as described above), CBO and the JCT staff assumed that an "unaffordable" offer from an employer would be one that required the employee to pay a larger share of income for that plan than he or she would have to pay for coverage in an exchange.

6/15/2009

Preliminary Analysis of HELP Committee's Insurance Proposal

NOTE: Figures in table do not reflect all elements of the proposal (see text)

EFFECTS ON COVERAGE OF NON ELDERLY PEOPLE^a

(Millions of people, by calendar year)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Current Law										
Medicaid/CHIP	40	39	39	38	35	34	35	35	35	35
Employer	150	153	156	158	161	162	162	162	162	162
Nongroup	13	12	12	12	13	14	14	14	14	15
Other	14	14	14	14	14	15	15	15	15	16
Uninsured	<u>50</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>54</u>
TOTAL	267	269	271	273	274	276	277	279	281	282
Change (+/-)										
Medicaid/CHIP	-1	-1	*	1	-4	-3	-2	-2	-2	-2
Employer	2	2	-1	-7	-14	-14	-15	-15	-15	-15
Nongroup/Other	*	*	-1	-2	-5	-5	-5	-6	-6	-6
Exchanges	0	0	5	17	38	38	38	39	39	40
Uninsured	-1	-1	-3	-9	-15	-16	-16	-16	-17	-17
Post-Policy Uninsured ^b	49	51	48	42	36	35	36	36	37	37
as a Share of Non elderly	19%	19%	18%	15%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%

EFFECTS ON THE FEDERAL DEFICIT^{a,c}

(Billions of dollars, by fiscal year)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2010-2019
Exchange Subsidies	0	0	17	66	148	183	196	209	223	237	1,279
Employer Subsidies ^d	4	8	8	5	4	7	7	6	6	7	60
Payments by Uninsured Individuals	0	0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Medicaid/CHIP Outlays	-1	-2	-1	2	-6	-7	-6	-6	-6	-6	-38
Tax Revenue Effects of Coverage Changes ^e	1	2	-2	-15	-30	-37	-40	-43	-45	-48	-257
NET IMPACT	4	7	21	58	116	146	157	166	177	189	1,042

* = Less than 0.5 million people or spending/savings of less than \$0.5 billion

Notes: a. Components may not sum to totals because of rounding. b. The count of uninsured people includes unauthorized immigrants and people eligible for, but not enrolled in, Medicaid. c. Positive numbers indicate increases in the deficit, and negative numbers indicate reductions in the deficit. d. The effects on the deficit from employer subsidies include their impact on taxable compensation. e. Increases in tax revenues reduce the deficit.

Sources: Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation.

The proposal would offer subsidies to small employers whose workers have low average wages and who offer health benefits to those workers. The amount of the subsidy would vary with the size of the firm (up to a limit of 50 workers), and firms that contribute larger amounts toward their workers' health insurance would receive larger subsidies. The credit would be available indefinitely, but firms would be eligible to take the credit for only three consecutive years at a time.

KEY PROVISIONS NOT YET TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

There are several features of the proposal that CBO and the JCT staff have not yet reflected in their budget estimates. The most significant features of the proposal that have not yet been estimated would do the following:

Require insurers to offer dependent coverage for children of policyholders who are less than 27 years of age.

Delegate authority to a Medical Advisory Council to establish minimum requirements for covered health benefits and to determine the level of coverage that individuals would need to obtain in order to qualify as having insurance.

Require insurers to maintain a minimum level of medical claims paid relative to premium revenues (otherwise known as a "medical loss ratio"), or to repay certain amounts to policyholders; the HHS Secretary would have the authority to set the minimum medical loss ratio.

Apply "risk adjustment" (a process that involves shifting payments from plans with low-risk enrollees to plans with high-risk enrollees) to all health insurance policies sold in the individual and group insurance markets.

Allow employers to buy health coverage through the exchanges.

Require health insurance plans participating in the new exchanges to adopt measures that are intended to simplify financial and administrative transactions in the health sector (such as claims processing).

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 15, 2009]

STATES' BUDGET GAPS ARE ANOTHER TEST FOR WASHINGTON

(By Jonathan Weisman)

As the White House eagerly scans the economic landscape for signs of recovery, a looming drought in the form of state budget deficits could make any "green shoots" wilt.

States face a cumulative shortfall of \$230 billion from this year through 2011, and there is little sign in bailout-weary Washington of any attempt to create yet another aid program to solve that problem. But if the federal government did want to hold that drought at bay, it has options: passing another stimulus plan; assisting states in the bond market; assuming a greater share of Medicaid payments. If the recovery stalls a few months from now, those may suddenly become central to the rescue efforts.

While discouraging talk right now of any federal response to state budget woes, the Obama administration is anxiously eyeing state efforts to close persistent budget gaps. So far, 42 U.S. states have slashed enacted budgets to cope with rising demand for services and plunging revenue, according to the National Governors Association. About half have also raised taxes.

Those policies run counter to Washington's efforts to prime the economic pump, with a \$787 billion stimulus plan, plus hundreds of billions of dollars more in new lending, mortgage relief and other efforts. About \$246 billion of the stimulus funds are already going to the states, to offset rising Medicaid costs, stave off education cuts and help with infrastructure problems. Friday, the Treasury made \$25 billion in bond authority avail-

able for state and local governments under the Recovery Zone Bonds program, a little-known piece of the massive stimulus law.

But all that money will start drifting away next year, when the administration hopes a recovery will be taking hold. And that is exactly when states anticipate their fiscal problems could be even worse. "The states have so few options to respond," said Nick Johnson, director of the state fiscal project at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal think tank. "Drawing down reserve funds, various accounting gimmicks—those options are either gone or won't do enough. The remaining options threaten to slow the recovery."

If Washington were inclined to help, the easiest approach would be a second stimulus bill pouring more money directly into state coffers. But with a federal budget deficit approaching \$2 trillion, there is little chance of that.

So creativity is in order.

House Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank has been searching for low-cost ways to step in. His staff has looked into a raft of measures to loosen state borrowing and lower the interest rates state governments must offer on their bonds. The Massachusetts Democrat would like to create a reinsurance fund, financed through premiums paid by bond sellers, which would offer bond purchasers additional assurance that their money is safe.

Legislation also could mandate that ratings companies such as Standard & Poor's would have to use the same criteria to rate state bonds as are used to rate corporate bonds—a requirement that doesn't exist now, sometimes to the disadvantage of states. "Where there's the full faith in credit behind these municipal bonds, where the full taxing power of a state or city is behind them, they never default," Mr. Frank said, yet the bonds are "treated as if they're risky."

In the short run, the Treasury or Federal Reserve could use existing programs established to prop up consumer borrowing to underwrite state bond offerings, he said. That would bring more lenders into the state bond market and lower interest costs for cash-strapped states.

President Barack Obama suggested in a recent C-SPAN interview that some kind of clever bond-market moves may be in the works. "We are talking to state treasurers across the country, including California, to figure out are there some creative ways that we can just help them get through some of these difficult times," he said.

But crafting the right balance would be tough.

Treasury officials have told California state legislators that the U.S. is monitoring the situation but isn't keen to provide assistance, according to people familiar with the matter. "It's hard to help just one state," says a government official. On the other hand, there is worry about setting up a broad short-term assistance program that some fret could turn into a permanent federal subsidy.

The move to bail out California—or any other state—is made harder by the current political climate, particularly opposition from home-state Republicans on Capitol Hill.

Rep. John Campbell, one of four California Republicans on Mr. Frank's committee, said a federal intervention would only halt state efforts to come to terms with budgets and could create incentives to spend even more. "The states are kind of on their own because the bullets are out of the federal gun," he said, "not because they couldn't print some more money but because I hope there's a recognition that printing and borrowing more money is going to have extremely negative consequences."

In response, Mr. Frank shrugs: "How am I going to get representatives from Pennsylvania and New York to send money to California if Republicans from California are fighting it?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 15 minutes from now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I decided to come to the floor to talk about a couple of things. One is health care reform and the other is the stimulus package.

We are seeing attacks from the party of no, the Republican Party, every day on this floor, and I believe the purpose is to derail health care reform. I think it is perfectly legitimate to debate how we do it, but I think when everything is stripped away, you are going to see the Republicans as the party of the status quo.

In relation to health care reform, the status quo has to go, because it is hurting our people. I will put a couple of facts out there that are irrefutable; they are just facts. The fact is, if we don't act, soaring health care costs are unsustainable for our families. In this great Nation, we pay twice as much as any other nation for our health care. The fact is we must turn this around. As the wording is now, we must "bend that cost curve," because we cannot sustain the situation as it is. It is hurting our families. Premium rises are unbelievable. We all know it in our own circumstances. And we know the uninsured keep growing. Why? Because they cannot afford the premiums or maybe companies won't take them because they may have had high blood pressure or something, and they don't get the coverage they need. So they don't avail themselves of prevention.

We have too much obesity in this country among our kids and adults. We know that prevention in and of itself could bend that cost curve. If someone understands nutrition and diet, and they get help in making sure they change their lifestyle or that their kids don't eat sugar and fattening foods all the time, it has an enormous impact on what happens to them when they get older. Diabetes is a major problem. We can turn that around, along with the heart risks that go with it later on, and the stroke risks that go with high blood pressure. These things can be controlled.

We took a first step in prevention when we passed the bill on smoking

which, for the first time, will give the FDA the ability to regulate cigarettes and keep these products away from our kids, who are lured into smoking. You know how it is, because I am sure everybody knows someone who has this addiction, how very difficult it is—those folks who want to quit have such a hard time. Clearly, if we have prevention as the name of the game, we are going to see a decrease in costs, we are going to see healthier families, and we should see lower premiums.

The question is: If we do nothing, can we sustain what happened? If we do so, it ought to stress prevention and also make sure that the insurance companies are kept honest. How do you do that? It seems to me you want to make sure we have some kind of plan out there that has to live by the same rules as the private sector, be it a cooperative, a public plan, but it should live by the same rules so we can test and judge whether our people are getting ripped off when they get these huge increases in their premiums. We also need a plan that covers the uninsured, however we deal with it, because there is no question about it that when people are uninsured, they are still going to get the health care they need. No doctor is going to turn them away when they show up in the emergency room with a stroke or heart condition that probably has not been looked at for a long time. The signs of a stroke you can find through blood pressure taking. If they haven't done that, when they show up there, who pays for it? The fact is, those costs come right back home to us. Somebody has to pay for it. That is reflected in the premium.

So here is the point. I don't think it is that complicated. If you stress prevention, and if you have a plan out there—a nonprofit plan—that can keep the insurance companies honest and make sure they are not overcharging us, and if you cover the uninsured, I think those are the principles I am looking for. I don't think it is that complicated. But we hear our colleagues on the Republican side come out to the floor day in and day out bashing public plans.

Let the Republicans introduce a bill to repeal Medicare. That is a public plan. Our seniors love it. The Republicans fought it in the 1960s. The Democrats passed it under Lyndon Johnson. Why don't they come here and say they want to repeal Medicare?

Another public plan is veterans' health care. It is a government plan. Why don't they come here and put forward a proposal to completely do away with veterans' health care? I will tell

you, the veterans in this country will rise up—the Republican veterans, the Democratic veterans, the Independent veterans, the old and young veterans. Why don't they do that, instead of coming here and saying public plans are bad?

How about SCHIP, the public plan that allows our children to be covered, our poor kids? Why don't they come here and say our children should not be covered and let's repeal it?

How about our military? They get free health care through the public domain. Should we now cancel that and contract it out?

Look, I am for a robust debate. I am for a bipartisan bill. I want to work toward that. But let me tell you this: If we don't get 60 votes for something, we cannot quit around here. We cannot allow a terrible crisis toward the end of life bankrupt our families. More than half of our families who file bankruptcy do it because of a crisis in their health. We cannot afford that. The fact is that we are on the verge of being able to do something but not if the party of no comes here every day and bashes every idea and starts frightening the American people. They will have their chance, but I hope we won't stop. We will have to figure out a way to do it with a majority vote. That is my feeling. This is too important an issue. Our families cannot take it. They cannot take a circumstance where they are now already paying a third of their money for their mortgage. Are they going to pay another third, or half, for health care? What is left over to live a life and support their kids?

Come on, get over it, party of no. Come to the table and work with us. Don't bash every idea President Obama lays down on the table. He is the President. Give him a chance to move this forward.

THE STIMULUS PROGRAM

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, speaking of bashing things, my last commentary until we vote is this:

Senator COBURN has put out a report in which he bashes the stimulus program. I think it is very important for the American people to understand a few things. One, a couple of his examples are right on target, and we always expect there will be a couple of things that would happen that were wrong. The administration is aware of that. We tried to get on top of it and stop it. But we lost over a trillion dollars from our economy and we put in this stimulus package—about \$787 billion—so we can make sure that this great recession doesn't turn into a great depression.

That is why we have I think 30 inspectors general overseeing this program.

Despite that, I understand Senator COBURN. He was never for the stimulus. He said let the American people work their way through it, that government should stay out. That is fair. Now he is bashing the stimulus program. All of the work he has done thus far has identified .7 percent—not even 1 percent—that was a problem. Some of those are way off base. I want to talk about some of them in California that he has highlighted and has bashed:

First, \$200,000 to place restrooms at a Black Butte Lake, California park. Excuse me. Maybe there is something wrong with me, but I think having a clean restroom in a State park that is safe and available is quite important. But he says that is ridiculous. It creates jobs to build that, and it is an important hygienic issue that I think needs to be addressed.

He talked also about a State park. This is near and dear to my heart. It is \$620,000 to build a State park for our children in Long Beach, CA. I don't know about Mr. COBURN in Oklahoma—they have fewer people there, true. I have a State of 37 million people. We have a lot of kids. We have a lot of kids who get in trouble after school and who drop out of school. We have a problem. They love to skateboard. As a matter of fact, we had a former gang in Oakland come forward and actually construct it themselves. Building a State park for our kids is not a boondoggle. It is a safe place for them to go, and you create jobs when you do it.

We are installing energy efficient runway guidance lights at the San Diego Airport. Yes, energy efficient lighting saves money. As a matter of fact, this thing has a payback. It cost \$5 million. It has a payback of 2 to 5 years. When you put in efficient lighting, there is a payback. It uses less electricity and it lowers the cost. But, no, Senator COBURN bashes that. Those are some examples of what he is bashing just in my State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a document entitled "Funding Notification By Program" for my State of California.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDING NOTIFICATIONS BY PROGRAM

The table below presents breakdown of total dollars allocated to a state by program. Programs are identified by the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number and the program title provided in the agency report.

STATE: CALIFORNIA

CFDA number	Program	Allocated
84.394	State Fiscal Stabilization Fund	\$5,960,267,431
93.778	MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	1,991,907,534
84.391	IDEA Part B Grants to States	1,226,944,052
84.389	Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	1,128,225,993
14.258	Tax Credit Assistance Program	325,877,114
14.317	Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program Special Allocations	305,037,547
66.458	Clean Water SRF	286,285,800
81.041	State Energy Program (A)	226,093,000
17.260	WIA Dislocated Workers	221,906,888

STATE: CALIFORNIA—Continued

CFDA number	Program	Allocated
14.257	Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program	189,086,299
17.259	WIA Youth Activities	186,622,034
81.042	Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons (A)	185,811,061
66.468	Drinking Water SRP	159,008,000
16.803	Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Formula Program— http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryact.html	135,641,945
14.885	Public Housing Capital fund Stimulus (Formula)	117,918,838
14.253	CDBG Entitlement Grants	112,675,396
16.804	Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Formula Program— http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryact.html	89,712,677
17.258	WIA Adult Program	80,117,954
84.386	Educational Technology State Grants	70,805,622
93.703	Health Center Integrated Services Development Initiative	63,688,867
84.126	Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	56,470,213
84.393	IDEA Part C Grants for Infants and Families	53,233,307
17.207	Employment Service/Wagner-Peyser Funded Activities	46,970,564
84.392	IDEA Part B Preschool Grants	41,028,219
84.033	Federal Work Study	20,657,189
93.659	Adoption Assistance	19,904,604
66.805	LUST Trust Fund Program	15,577,000
14.882	Native American Housing Block Grants (Formula)	15,033,342
14.907	Lead-based Paint Hazard Control in Privately-Owned Housing	14,999,190
93.658	Foster Care—Title IV-E	13,888,000
16.588	Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) Recovery Act STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program— http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/BJA/recovery.html	13,298,809
10.579	Child Nutrition Discretionary Grants Limited Availability	12,864,683
10.569	The Emergency Food Assistance Program (Food Commodities)	12,411,681
10.561	State Administrative Matching Grants for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance	10,795,187
14.255	CDBG State's Program and Non-Entitlement Grants in Hawaii	10,652,033
16.802	Office of Justice Programs (OP) OVC FY09 VOCA Victim Compensation Formula Grant Program (Compensation)— http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryact.html	8,110,055
93.707	ARRA—Aging Congregate Nutrition Services for States	6,585,441
17.235	Senior Community Service Employment Program	4,293,139
16.800	Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program— http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryact.html	4,233,003
84.399	Services for Older Individuals who are Blind	3,707,078
93.705	ARRA—Aging Home-Delivered Nutrition Services for States	3,242,063
10.568	The Emergency Food Assistance Program (Administrative Costs)	3,110,696
16.801	Office of Justice Programs (OJP) OVC FY09 VOCA Victim Compensation Formula Grant Program (Assistance)— http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryact.html	2,931,000
66.454	Water Quality Planning (604b)	2,830,700
14.908	Healthy Homes Demonstration Grants	2,624,992
66.040	State Clean Diesel Grant Program	1,730,000
84.398	Independent Living State Grants	1,623,087
84.401	Impact Aid Construction	1,428,766
17.265	Native American Employment and Training	\$236,970
Total		\$13,462,105,063

Mrs. BOXER. If you go through this, you will see in the largest State of the Union, which is suffering with an 11.2 percent unemployment rate, projects that are putting people to work today and doing good things. There is a medical assistance program; a clean water State revolving fund grant; a State energy program, which is putting people to work; weatherization assistance for low income; working with the youth; and it goes on and on. There are safe drinking water grants, a law enforcement grant, adoption assistance grant, and a foster care grant.

Why is my colleague not coming down here and saying he did find less than 1 percent of a problem, but these other things are good, and these other things are putting people to work and they are saving our children, saving our environment, and saving energy?

It is the party of no. No, no, no, a thousand times no. The American people understand that we on this side of the aisle, and our President, in reaching across the aisle, are going to continue to work for change. Change means getting out of this mess we are in right now—this deep recession. We are going to continue to do it. They are going to say no, no, a thousand times no. We will work with them when they want to work with us. If they don't, we have to figure out a way to bring the change and jobs to America, the energy efficiency to America, and all that is good that the American people deserve.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Morning business is closed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the hour for debate prior to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1023 be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield the floor.

TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 71, S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009.

Byron L. Dorgan, Tom Udall, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Kay R. Hagan, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Roland W. Burris, Benjamin L. Cardin, Bill Nelson, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Daniel K.

Inouye, Blanche L. Lincoln, Ron Wyden, Bernard Sanders, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Nelson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote.

The yeas and nays resulted— yeas 90, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Akaka	Bingaman	Cardin
Alexander	Bond	Carper
Barrasso	Boxer	Casey
Baucus	Brown	Chambliss
Bayh	Brownback	Cochran
Begich	Burr	Collins
Bennet	Burris	Conrad
Bennett	Cantwell	Corker

Cornyn	Kohl	Reid
Crapo	Kyl	Risch
Dodd	Landrieu	Roberts
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Sanders
Enzi	Leahy	Schumer
Feingold	Levin	Sessions
Feinstein	Lieberman	Shaheen
Gillibrand	Lincoln	Shelby
Graham	Lugar	Snowe
Grassley	Martinez	Specter
Hagan	McCain	Stabenow
Harkin	McCaskill	Tester
Hatch	McConnell	Thune
Hutchison	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Inhofe	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Inouye	Mikulski	Vitter
Isakson	Murkowski	Voinovich
Johanns	Murray	Warner
Johnson	Nelson (NE)	Webb
Kaufman	Nelson (FL)	Whitehouse
Kerry	Pryor	Wicker
Klobuchar	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—3

Bunning	Coburn	DeMint
---------	--------	--------

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd	Ensign	Kennedy
Durbin	Gregg	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 3. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that any recess time or morning business time count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered. Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, during these tough economic times, American families expect and deserve that we will do everything we can to get the economy moving again. Of course, that involves investing in our country, investing in our infrastructure. It involves getting our financial system in order. It involves getting credit moving again. But we should not forget that one out of eight Americans is employed in the travel industry.

I chair the subcommittee of Commerce, that deals with tourism issues, and I cosponsored the bipartisan legislation to bring new visitors and new spending and new jobs to the United States. I thank Senator BYRON DORGAN for his leadership and hard work on this bill, and I also thank Senator ENSIGN for his leadership.

I spoke last week, when we first started talking about this bill, about the importance of the tourism and travel industry to our economy. Tourism creates good jobs that cannot be outsourced. It increases sales for local businesses, and it brings in tax revenue for local and State economies.

As I said, one out of every eight Americans is employed by our travel

economy. Each year, travel and tourism contribute approximately \$1.3 trillion to the American economy. The travel economy contributes \$115 billion in tax revenues to State, local, and Federal Governments, and last year travel and tourism exports—which means the people coming into the U.S. to enjoy our beautiful country—accounted for 8 percent of all U.S. exports. In fact, tourism is one of the few economic sectors where we enjoy a substantial trade surplus.

But things are not going as well as they could or they should, especially when it comes to bringing international travel to the United States. I know you know that, Madam President, coming from the State of New York. I see the Senator from Michigan. I have seen their recent ad campaign on “Enjoying Pure Michigan.” But we need to bring more people to this country.

What does this mean? What is the problem? As you can see, while more people around the world are traveling—there were 48 million more global overseas travelers in 2008 than there were in 2000—633,000 fewer visited the United States. That is unfortunate. You can see more people around the world are traveling, but fewer are coming to our country. What does that really mean?

Since 2000, the U.S. share of the world travel market has decreased by nearly 20 percent, costing us hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in revenue. You can see what happened here in our country. This chart is in millions of dollars—\$26 million brought in in 2000, only \$25.3 million in 2008; while for the rest of the world, \$124 million for the rest of the world in 2000—up to \$173 million in 2008.

When a traveler decides to visit another country, to visit someplace besides the United States, there is a ripple effect across our economy. Fewer airline tickets are sold, fewer cars are rented, hotels and lodges rent fewer rooms, tourist attractions have fewer visitors, local businesses miss out on sales and opportunities, workers lose their jobs, and it goes on and on.

The decline in international travel, combined with the current economic downturn, is hitting our country’s travel industry hard. Last year, nearly 200,000 travel-related jobs were lost, and the Commerce Department predicts we will lose another 247,000 jobs this year. We are not talking about the CEOs of the airline companies. These are hard-working Americans—the people who work in the hotel rooms, the cooks, the janitors, the shop workers, the people who own little flower stores next to the hotels. They are the ones making the beds. They are the ones making the meals. These are the people we should think about when we talk about the bill before the Senate today.

The question before us today is how can we bring international visitors to the United States because—do you know how much they each spend when they come? Something like \$4,500 when

they come to our country. That is \$4,500 that provides jobs for those janitors and maids and shop owners.

We have just as much, if not more, to offer travelers than anyplace else. We have stunning national landmarks, such as the Grand Canyon—and the Statue of Liberty in your home State of New York, Madam President—centers of fun and entertainment from Las Vegas to Disney World, scenic country towns and the bright lights of the big cities and those quiet moments in those little towns in my home State of Minnesota. But we need to do a better job of promoting the United States as a premier travel destination. We have to face it. We are in a competition for international travelers, but we are not competing.

Look at what is going on around the world when it comes to tourism. Here are some examples: Yemen has their own tourism promotion for their country. Of course, the Bahamas—I think many of us have seen those on TV. I certainly have. You see Tourism Australia. I have seen a few of those ads. South Africa, Taiwan, Scotland, India—these countries are promoting themselves internationally to bring in other visitors.

What do we have right now in our country? We do not have a centralized promotion of our country for tourism. Countries around the world make tourism a national priority because they see it brings jobs to their country. They spend millions of dollars on promotion and programs and senior officials to coordinate national tourism policy. For example, Vietnam, Egypt, New Zealand, Lebanon, and Jamaica have ministries of tourism. Germany has a National Tourist Board, and Australia has a “Tourism Australia” program. In 2005, Greece spent more than \$150 million on travel promotion; France spent \$63 million. That is what we are up against.

The Travel Promotion Act would level the playing field so we can compete with the rest of the world and recapture that lost market share. It will create the Corporation for Travel Promotion, a public-private partnership to promote the United States as an international travel destination and finally establish a coordinated national travel program.

Under the direction of a board of directors made up of representatives from the States, the Federal Government, and the travel industry, the corporation would be in charge of a national travel promotion, a program with goals to encourage travel to the United States, to communicate our country’s travel policies, and to promote international exposure for parts of America that do not have the resources to promote themselves.

As I mentioned earlier, our loss in the share of the world travel market is not a new phenomenon. It actually started after September 11, where, for good reasons, security measures were put into place, but some of those good

reasons have turned into very difficult times for tourists to come over, and that is what needs to be fixed. That is why part of this bill would make it easier for tourists to get their visas, make it easier for them to visit the country. A lot of times it is just expediting the checks that need to be made, making sure they can get their visas, just as they can get one to go to Canada or Mexico or other countries.

The bill will establish the Office of Travel Promotion in the Department of Commerce to work with the Corporation for Travel Promotion and secretaries of state and homeland security to make sure that international visitors are processed efficiently.

America is a country that wraps its arms around those who come to visit us, and this bill will make sure international visitors know they are welcome and wanted. The Travel Promotion Act is about more than just encouraging travel. It is also about building our economy. This bill is expected to bring in 1.6 million new international visitors each year. Since international visitors, as I noted, spend an average of \$4,500 per person while they are here, this is a huge boost to our economy. That money from overseas coming into our economy, into our towns and cities, into our small businesses is new money. If they are not going to come and spend it here, they are going to go to one of these countries—to the Bahamas, South Africa, Australia. That is new money coming into our country.

The U.S. Travel Association estimates this bill will create 40,000 new jobs, and economists at Oxford Economics expect the bill to generate \$4 billion in new spending and \$321 million in new tax revenue.

Just as important as how much it will generate is how much it will cost, which is zero for American taxpayers. This bill comes at no cost to the taxpayer. It will be paid for by a combination of private sector contributions and a \$10 fee on international travelers entering the United States of America—zero cost, big benefit.

The Congressional Budget Office just released a report that estimates that this bill will reduce budget deficits by \$425 million over the next 10 years—that is the bill pending before this body today. The math is undeniable. For no cost to the taxpayer, we can boost travel, boost the economy, and reduce the deficit. That is why this bill has such strong bipartisan support in the Senate. It also has the support of numerous organizations such as the U.S. Travel Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It has many newspaper endorsements. As you can see, newspapers in every part of the country support this legislation. I will read just a few. The Sacramento Bee:

The country needs to reclaim its status as a global magnet for visitors, even in the post 9/11 climate, and Congress can help by pass-

ing the Travel Promotion Act by the end of this year.

Dallas Morning News, September 6:

The Travel Promotion act is a sensible first step toward putting the welcome mat back on America's doorstep.

Orlando Sentinel:

Our position, charging international travelers \$10 to pay for promotion of travel to bring in all that money makes sense.

Detroit Free Press, September 25, 2008:

Doesn't it make sense to encourage, at no cost to taxpayers, foreign visitors to come here and leave some money? There's no good reason not to pass this bill.

Finally, I leave the best to last, Duluth News Tribune, Duluth, MN, May 18, 2009:

Ideas to bolster economic recovery without plunging the nation any deeper into debt would be welcomed by taxpayers from coast to coast.

I know firsthand how important tourism is for the city of Duluth. It has had some very difficult economic times in the seventies and eighties. At one point it was so bad there was a time there was a billboard that someone put outside Duluth that said, "The last one to leave, please turn off the lights."

That is what they were dealing with. They bolstered their economy through tourism.

I was just up there. I did a field hearing there and they have actually seen an increase in their convention and business travel this year. Maybe a few people are going to places such as Duluth. Businesses are cutting back a little. But the important part of this is that you have one town just like so many across the country that has benefited from tourism.

This is what we are talking about across the country. I wonder why we didn't pass this earlier, why we haven't been able to get this through. I can't answer this question. It makes no sense to me. Sometimes people don't want to talk about tourism because they don't think it is important, but when one out of eight Americans is employed in this business it is important.

I urge my colleagues to support it. I hope we can get it through intact. I hope we will have a minimum number of amendments and we can simply do something good in a bipartisan way that will help increase jobs in America where one out of eight people is employed.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask that the Senate recess until 2:15, as under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, just prior to lunch, we had a vote on a cloture motion. The vote was 90 to 3. It was not some significant piece of public policy that will shake the Earth, it was a vote on the question of whether we could actually proceed to something called the Travel Promotion Act.

For those who do not know how the Senate works, you have to have a motion to proceed. Normally, a motion to proceed to a bill such as this would be done by unanimous consent and take just a nanosecond, no problem, a motion to proceed approved, proceed then to the bill, have a debate on the bill, and then vote on the bill.

But this is something called the Travel Promotion Act, which I will describe. It is bipartisan. I have offered it along with Senator JOHN ENSIGN, a Republican from Nevada. The two of us, along with many other cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, believe this is an important piece of legislation for the Senate and for the Congress to pass. Despite that, we had to have a vote this morning on the motion to proceed: Shall we proceed to this? A cloture motion had to be filed. It took 2 days to ripen, and then we had a vote. It was 90 to 3. The answer was yes by 90 to 3. And now we have 30 hours postcloture that we have to wait until we can get to the bill. And then have another cloture motion filed. It is the most unbelievable, Byzantine example of how this place has sort of fallen off the rails—requiring cloture motions to be filed on things that then get a 90-to-3 vote, and then there is a requirement that we have to spend the next 30 hours waiting until we can actually get to the bill. Unbelievable. But it is an example of what has happened here. And the minority is requiring this of every single piece of legislation. It is a way to require the Senate to walk through wet cement and make almost no progress at all. I guess when you get nothing done and then you are able to boast that nothing has happened, maybe some people feel good. It does not make me feel very good.

But having complained about it, now let me at least describe what this bill is. We will get to the bill this week. It will have taken a difficult route to get there. Judging by the 90-to-3 vote, I assume ultimately, when the Senate passes this legislation, we will have very strong support because it is a bipartisan piece of legislation.

I am told Senator ENSIGN has had to leave today as a result of a family matter. I think Senator MARTINEZ will be coming to the floor, who is also a cosponsor of this legislation. I appreciate

very much working with Senator ENSIGN and Senator MARTINEZ; on this side, Senator REID, the majority leader, a strong cosponsor, and so many others as well.

Let me describe what this issue is. The fact is, there is an effort to attract international tourism around this world. Why is that the case? Because international tourists; that is, people who visit other countries, spend a lot of money and create a lot of jobs. They support airlines, support hotels, support recreation facilities and theme parks. Plus, they have a chance to understand a little about that country before they go back home. So many countries around the world are very actively engaged in saying: Come to our country. They have very aggressive, very sophisticated promotion campaigns saying: Come to our country. We do not, but they do.

Here is an example of India: One special reason to visit India in 2009. Anytime is a good time to visit the land of Taj. But there is no time like now. Incredible India.

Well, India is very interested, very promotional, saying: Come to India.

But it is not just India. Here is Ireland, big promotional campaign: Go where Ireland takes you.

A beautiful photograph of the majesty of Ireland.

An example of Australia: Looking for an experience to remember? Arrived. Departed. An adventure we will never forget. Go find yourself in Australia.

All over the world we have campaigns now, very aggressive campaigns, saying: Come to Italy. Vacation in Italy. Come to Great Britain. Come to Spain. See the wonders of Spain.

Why are countries doing that? Well, it is interesting. The average international traveler spends about \$4,500 on an overseas trip. When they go to a country, they spend money. This creates jobs. So countries are aware of that, and they are very active in trying to encourage travelers to come to their country. Not so with our country so much since 9/11/2001. In fact, it is interesting that in 2008 we had 633,000 fewer people come to this country from overseas than we had in 2000. Let me say that again. In 2008, 633,000 fewer people from overseas came to visit our country than in the year 2000. In fact, here is an example of what is happening around the world: visitors to the United States—this is 2000 to 2008—a 3-percent decrease; visitors to other countries in international travel, a 40-percent increase. The fact is that we are losing ground and losing shares of the international travelers' tourism dollars and the ability also to explain to them a bit, by having them see this country, what America is all about.

Well, why is that happening? Headlines like this post-9/11/2001. We are very concerned about people coming into this country, and we tightened the visa requirements so that there were long lines and very long waits in order to try to come to this country. Here are some of the headlines:

Sydney Morning Herald: "Coming to America is not easy."

The Guardian: "America—more hassle than it's worth?"

The Sunday Times in London: "Travel to America? No thanks."

Look, the fact is, we want to change that.

This legislation is bipartisan. A group of us Republicans and Democrats who want to create jobs in this country and want to attract international tourism to this country want to change this perception that somehow international travelers are not welcome here.

So here is what we believe. We believe that to have people come to this country is to see its wonders. It is the only one like it on the face of this planet. It is an extraordinary place. There is so much to see and so much to do. And when we have done polling, and so on, when international travelers leave this country, they have an unbelievably positive impression of the United States of America, and that is very important. At a time when there has been so much discussion about our country going it alone and doing this or that, we have suffered some in international areas. But the fact is, inviting international tourism to our country is job creating, it produces a boost to our economy, but it also allows people to come here and understand what this country is about and inevitably leave with a great impression.

Here is what we do with this piece of legislation. We set up a nationally coordinated travel promotion program. I might say that if somebody says: Well, you are going to set up something new, well, you know what, the Congressional Budget Office has a score for this. They have to decide what everything costs or what the consequences of everything will be.

This is one of the few pieces of legislation to be brought to the floor of the Senate that the Congressional Budget Office estimates would actually reduce the budget deficit by half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Let me say that again. This is one of the few pieces of legislation you are going to get a chance to vote on that reduces the Federal budget deficit by \$425 million in the next 10 years.

How does it do that? Well, the fact is, it creates a private-public partnership and it establishes a corporation for travel promotion which will be an independent nonprofit corporation governed by an 11-member board of directors appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. It also creates an Office of Travel Promotion in the Department of Commerce to develop programs to increase the number of international visitors to our country. It sets up a travel promotion fund, and that is financed by a private-public matching program. The Federal contributions will be financed by a \$10 fee paid by foreign travelers from visa waiver countries, and it will be collected in the electronic system for travel authorizations which already exists.

Let me make the point that many other countries do exactly this. It does not in any way retard international travel. Australia charges a \$37 departure fee; Guatemala, \$30; Mexico, \$11 to \$38; Thailand, a \$14 departure fee. And the list goes on. We are suggesting a very modest \$10 fee for international travelers, from the visa waiver countries, and that will finance this piece of legislation that we have had now to file a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to this issue and for which there was a 90-to-3 vote, an affirmative vote.

Here is some discussion about our legislation.

I introduced this in the last session of the Congress. We had over 50 cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats. We have reintroduced it now with wide bipartisan cosponsorship.

The Detroit Free Press says:

Doesn't it make sense to encourage, at no cost to taxpayers, foreign visitors to come here and leave us with some money? There's no good reason not to pass this bill.

The Dallas Morning News says:

The Travel Promotion Act is a sensible first step toward putting the welcome mat back on America's doorstep.

The Orlando Sentinel says:

Our position, charging international travelers \$10 to pay for the promotion, makes sense.

The Los Angeles Times:

Considering that the U.S. spends hundreds of millions of dollars on public diplomacy with dubious results, and nearly nothing on promoting tourism, it might do well to invest a little money in wooing travelers.

The list goes on of newspapers that have endorsed the legislation.

This has been a pretty difficult decade for our country in many ways. Our country was attacked on 9/11/2001. Several thousand innocent Americans were killed by terrorists. Following that, we suffered a recession almost immediately, then a war in Afghanistan, and then a long protracted war in Iraq that cost an enormous amount of money and was very controversial all around the world. It has been a very difficult decade.

As I indicated when I started, 8 years later, we have so many fewer visitors coming to the United States. I think during part of this decade there was a notion by some that we were not welcoming visitors to the United States; we did not want them to come here very much.

That was not true, but I think that was a sense of some: You want to come to the United States, get in line, it is going to take a long time to get a visa. Why? Because we are concerned. We are screening everybody. We are doing all of these kinds of things. Well, the fact is, no one ever intended to decide we were not going to welcome people to this country. By far, the most effective way to describe to the world what America is about and the unbelievable values that exist and the openness and the wonders of this great democracy, by far, the best way to do that is to say

to people from around the world: Come here. Vacation here. You are welcome here. We want you here, to experience and visit America and some of the best attractions and some of the best people and be a part of what we are and then go home and remember what the United States is about.

So that is what we are trying to do. It has been too long, but finally we are now putting together a piece of legislation that says: We are not willing to go through another 8 or 10 years like the last 8 or 10 years where our share of international tourism dramatically decreased.

We want the next 8 or 10 years to show a substantial increase in people from around the world coming to visit America. And the fact is, it will create substantial numbers of jobs. That is important. I mean, as you know, we ran into a financial ditch, have an economic crisis of sorts. The number of unemployed Americans rises every month, and we are hoping that turns around soon. But in the meantime, this is something constructive and positive and concrete we can do to try to boost this economy. It does not even cost money. This will save almost half a trillion dollars in the next 10 years by reducing the Federal deficit.

Again, I wish some of my colleagues were not deciding to see if they could run everybody through the traps for the next few days before we get to what I think will be a very positive vote on a very constructive idea that will benefit this country. But if it takes 4 days or 2 days or 1 day, whatever the moment, I think most of us will feel as if we have done something good for the country.

In the midst of all of the other very controversial issues and very important issues, some of which are urgent, the questions of: How do you rein in increasing health care costs? What do you do about a country that is 70 percent dependent on oil that comes from foreign countries? What do you do about the issue of protecting our climate and climate change? How do you deal with the Federal budget deficit that seems galloping out of control? There are all these big issues.

In the middle of all that—all of which, in my judgment, we are required to address in order to put America on a different course toward a better future—in the middle of all that, this piece of legislation, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, might be one small glimmer—just one small bit of hope—for more bipartisanship rather than less. Because this piece of legislation is so persuasive about the interests of this country, we have Republicans and Democrats who have come together to say: Let's do this. Let's do this in the interest of this country's economic future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for approximately 16 minutes as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the distinguished Acting President pro tempore.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. President, last week, I came to the Senate floor to talk about the flawed process of our current attempts to reform the health care system in this country and the urgent need to fix those flaws.

Those efforts included a letter—my letter—which every Republican member of the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—signed requesting some very reasonable steps to be taken by Chairman BAUCUS, Chairman KENNEDY, and Senator DODD, who is standing in for our friend and colleague, Senator KENNEDY.

We asked the chairmen to release the details of their plans to reform health care. We asked them to do so in a timely manner to allow us time to read and understand the policies and to get reactions from our constituents, i.e., the people who will benefit or will not benefit, not to mention the providers of health care. We asked them to give us the estimates of how much their plans would cost and how it would impact everyday Americans. Finally, we asked them to identify how they intended to pay for these plans.

It was my sincere hope that by receiving this information we could better participate in the quest to ensure that every American—every American—has meaningful access to health care, not to mention patient choice.

Well, unfortunately, the health care reform process has been so corrupted by artificial timelines and a “hurry up” and a “riding hell for leather” mentality that it threatens to destroy a health care system that has served most Americans very well.

The American health care system represents one-sixth of our economy, which has been repeated many times on this Senate floor, offers health insurance coverage to 250 million Americans, and employs over 16 million people. It leads the world in medical innovations that save lives inside as well as far outside our borders. So this actually is an international health care bill.

President Obama has recognized that most people are happy with their health care. Obviously, they would like some changes, some reforms. But he has repeatedly assured them: If you like what you have, you can keep it.

Well, because changes to this system have the potential to impact every sin-

gle American citizen and citizens of other nations, it seems to me we must ensure we protect the best of its features when we consider changes to shore up its deficiencies.

Careful consideration is required. That is why we ask for more details. That is why we ask for more time. To date, our requests for more information have not been met, and I think I am starting to understand why.

Yesterday afternoon, the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, released its first preliminary analysis of the bill we are scheduled to begin marking up in the HELP Committee tomorrow. Let me repeat this: Yesterday afternoon—less than 24 hours—if you are a HELP Committee staffer, you are looking at your watch, and you are wondering how come you do not have more time—the Congressional Budget Office released its first preliminary analysis of the bill that we are scheduled to begin marking up tomorrow.

I said in my previous speech, maybe we need a “process czar,” a “fair play czar” around here. We have 25 czars in the Obama administration. Maybe we need a czar around here to at least be fair, give us more time, give us more consideration, let us know what we are going to be voting on.

Before I talk about the results of the CBO's analysis of the Kennedy-Dodd legislation, I need to point out this analysis is incomplete. It is incomplete because, despite our persistent requests for more information from our Democratic colleagues and friends, one day before the markup of possibly the most important health care bill ever to cross the Senate floor, they have not released the complete legislation.

In fact, even when the HELP Committee begins our markup tomorrow, we will not have a complete picture of what we are marking up. The most contentious components of the bill will not be released until sometime on Thursday morning—leaving us around 30 hours to digest these significant policies, vet them with our people back home, take the specifics back home to the health care providers and every constituent who certainly is interested and wants to know the details, and then file amendments to see if we can do better, see if we can actually correct some things we think are headed in the wrong direction.

I said it is hard to digest all of this in 30 hours. This is not digestion, this is not indigestion—this is heartburn. It may develop into a malady much more serious than that.

Most egregious perhaps is the fact that we will most likely be considering these major reforms without any idea of how much they will cost or how they will affect the current system. But, as I said, I am starting to wonder whether that is not part of the plan, which leads me back to yesterday's CBO release analyzing the cost and effect of just one of the six titles to the Kennedy-Dodd health care reform bill—and an incomplete title at that.

According to CBO, the incomplete sections of title I will cost \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion. That is just for one incomplete title of this bill. What will we get for this staggering investment, for a title with a purpose ostensibly to expand health care coverage to the estimated 47 million Americans currently lacking insurance?

According to CBO, we will only cover 16 million more Americans. Let me say that again. According to CBO, we will only cover 16 million more Americans. That does not seem like a very good return for a bill that seeks to cover three times that many people.

Instead of extending health insurance to 47 million uninsured, we are leaving tens of millions still uncovered. And the CBO says that figure is around 37 million people. So you can see we have some flaws in this approach on this bill.

In addition, CBO says that 15 million people would lose their employer-sponsored insurance and another 8 million—again, this is the CBO analysis—would lose coverage from their current source.

Whom are we going to trust around here? At least when we asked the CBO to give some specifics, they are providing some specifics; that is, 15 million people would lose their employer-sponsored insurance and another 8 million would lose coverage from their current source. That is 23 million people. That is a lot of folks. As I said, President Obama has consistently promised: If you like the health insurance plan you have, you can keep it. Not those 23 million.

Under the Kennedy-Dodd bill, 23 million Americans who may like what they have cannot, in fact, keep it—again, according to the CBO, non-partisan.

I cannot even imagine how much more this bill will cost taxpayers when CBO figures in the rest of the initiatives my friends across the aisle wish to add. I am positive, under the complete plan by my colleagues, millions more Americans will not be able to keep the insurance they like.

That is because in addition to the plans that have already been released, they want to establish a new government-run, taxpayer-financed insurance plan that is estimated to replace private insurance for over 100 million Americans. They want an expansion of Medicaid for everyone up to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. They want to enact dozens upon dozens of new programs.

For example, title III of this bill includes—listen to this—a \$10 billion per-year-cost in mandatory spending—mandatory spending; this is on the appropriators' side—for something called a Prevention and Public Health trust fund for the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, with very little, if any, direction on what the money would be used for.

This is unprecedented and amounts, in my view, to a slush fund, regardless of any description.

Another section provides an unknown amount of money—“such sums as may be necessary”—to fund something called a community makeover—excuse me—a community transformation grant to build grocery stores, sidewalks, and jungle gyms.

Sidewalks, jungle gyms, grocery stores? This is a health care bill, not a rural development bill. I am shocked by the numbers that have come out so far, and they are just the beginning.

Well, come to think of it, maybe it is related to health care. Maybe if you build a better sidewalk, people could walk on that sidewalk, pass the jungle gym, exercise on the jungle gym, go to the grocery store, have mandates to buy nothing but fruits and vegetables, come back past the jungle gym, exercise some more, and since the sidewalk is fixed, they could go home, and we would help cure the obesity factor we face today. Maybe that is the tie. Maybe that is the tie.

I am shocked, as I said, by the numbers.

One independent group—now listen again to this; you have to listen to this—the group called HSI Network in Minnesota has estimated that the cost of the Kennedy-Dodd bill in its entirety could be \$4 trillion—\$4 trillion. The Lewin Group has estimated that up to 119 million Americans could lose their private insurance coverage under a government-run plan.

I am willing to bet the American public will be as shocked as I am once they understand what has been lurking, lurking, lurking under the banner of reform. The refusal to release information such as this until the very last possible minute, under an unjustifiably accelerated timeline, leaving no time for Senators, let alone the American public, to examine the merits of this plan, makes me think the “health care emperor has no clothes.”

Let me repeat what the CBO has said. Sixteen million Americans newly insured—a good thing—but 37 million Americans still not insured. Twenty-three million Americans lose what they have for \$1 trillion. This is the wrong direction. This is the wrong direction. We ought to say: “Whoa.” Put a sign up in both committee rooms that says: “Whoa,” and put a sign underneath it that says: “Do no harm.”

To add to this concern I have and the frustration I have in regard to health care reform, CongressDaily reported Tuesday, June 16—that is today—that CBO scored a recent version of the Senate Finance Committee—this is Finance, this is not Health. This is not the one I am talking about; this is the Finance Committee, and I have the privilege of serving on both—that their overall proposal is at \$1.5 trillion over 10 years, not \$1 trillion, according to several sources. This is a typical news story. The committee's timeline to release and mark up the legislation could slip on the news. Senate Finance Chairman MAX BAUCUS cautioned today the CBO numbers, which he did not con-

firm, were on a bill that is about 2 weeks old and the bill has evolved since then. The chairman indicated it is unlikely he will release a draft of his committee's bill Wednesday, as he previously estimated—that is tomorrow. The high score could add more credence to an insurance co-op proposal offered by Senate Budget Chairman KENT CONRAD as an alternative.

So we don't know. Is it \$1.5 trillion or is it \$1 trillion? We don't know. And if an offhand comment, which may or may not be private, but I don't think anymore anything should be private in regard to health care reform—the chairman indicated, I think, it was a comment in response to Senator SNOWE, who said, How do we vote for this bill in committee if we don't know how much it costs and how it is going to merge with the Health Committee's bill. Basically the answer coming back, as everybody knows is, This bill isn't going to be written here, this bill isn't going to be written in committee; it is going to be written in conference. It is called “trust me.”

I don't see how we can have much trust when “the emperor has no clothes.”

I yield the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. I also ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for what I hope will be 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Finally, I will have two separate subject matters I wish to cover.

Mr. President, I didn't plan on responding to my colleague from Kansas, and I won't today, but I still think on health care we have a long way to go. There is still a lot of work to be done in the committee I am a member of, the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and an awful lot of work to do still in the Finance Committee. So we will leave that for another day. But in a general sense, I think what we are all trying to do—I know my colleagues on the Democratic side are trying to do this—is to make sure that at the end of this debate, the bill that emerges from the Congress has a couple of basic principles. One is it gives people choice in their health care. If you like what you have, you get to keep it, and if you don't like what you have, you have a choice; and that the bill also reflects a cost reduction which is essential if we are going to move forward; and finally, that we provide the kind of quality, affordable health care that every American has a right to expect that we would try to provide in this bill.

If we keep that in mind, I think we can get to the right place. We have an awful lot of work to do, and I think

there are some conclusory statements that have been made in the last couple of days which don't reflect the reality, which is we have a lot of proposals, we have draft bills, but we don't have a final product yet, so we have a way to go.

IRANIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. President, the first subject I wish to discuss is the Iranian elections. I wish to convey some brief remarks on the remarkable events we have been witnessing unfolding in Iran in the last couple of days. It is too soon to tell what will happen. We do not know if Iran's brittle theocratic regime will hear out the voices of reform emanating in such powerful fashion from the streets of Iran today. We do not know if a credible investigation of serious electoral irregularities will occur, but I am confident that the events of this past weekend will be recorded in the history books as a major milestone for the democratic aspirations of the Iranian people. While the hard-liners who continue to rule Iran today may further entrench their power in the coming days, they are only planting the seeds for their ultimate defeat by their response to the democratic voices with the kind of force and suppression we have seen play out on television.

It is a promising sign that Iran's supreme leader has called upon the all-powerful Guardian Council to review the electoral results and assess the claims of serious irregularities, including vote rigging and ballot fraud, in the national election. However, we should not get our hopes raised that justice is imminent.

In the last Iranian Presidential election in 2005, there were also serious questions of fraud raised after Mr. Ahmadinejad came out of nowhere to win the Presidency following a runoff vote. Yet the final results of that investigation were never published, and thereafter Mr. Ahmadinejad's declared victory stood firm. Because of that precedent, I am skeptical that the Iranian regime will engage in an honest review of this election count.

President Obama and his senior national security team have refrained from extensive commentary on the election in recent days. That is as it should be. The U.S. Government should not give the Iranian regime any flimsy rationales for further crackdown on protestors and reformist leaders. However, administration officials, led by Vice President BIDEN, have made clear that the strategy of diplomatic engagement with Iran's leadership to bring a peaceful resolution of Iran's nuclear program will continue, regardless of who may comprise that leadership or how they may have assumed power. That, I believe, is the right strategy. We must deal with Iran as it is, not as we may wish it to be. For far too long, the United States deprived itself of the power of its diplomacy on the mistaken insistence that Iran agree to a set of preconditions before talks could even commence. Talking to your enemy can

never be viewed as a concession. The United States spoke to the Soviet Union during the worst excesses of the Cold War, but diplomacy cannot be the only option that the United States pursues with Iran. The President knows this and has reaffirmed that other options are open to the United States on multiple occasions.

Any effective strategy toward Iran must offer the regime a clear choice when it comes to its nuclear program, and here is the choice; it is either one or the other. Come into compliance with the multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions and reap the benefits of economic engagement and warmer diplomatic ties, choice No. 1. Or choice No. 2 for the Iranian regime: Face continued economic sanctions and international isolation that will steadily worsen if Iran continues to engage in illicit nuclear activities. It is either one or the other, and the regime has a choice to make before the world. Effective diplomacy is successful if it can fully convey that choice to the decisionmakers in Iran.

The Congress can also play a useful role here in elucidating the consequences Iran faces when it makes its choice on its nuclear program. Some might call it the "good cop, bad cop" strategy; I simply prefer to call it diplomatic leverage that our negotiators can employ if and when they do sit down at the table with Iranian representatives.

For those reasons, I am proud to have joined my colleague SAM BROWNBACK in introducing the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act. This legislation would authorize State and local governments as they see appropriate to direct divestment from, and prevent future investment in, companies that hold investments of \$20 million or more in Iran's energy sector.

There is a growing divestment movement across the country in response to Iran's accelerating nuclear program, its support of Hamas and Hezbollah, and hateful statements against Israel perpetrated by its President and others in Iran's senior leadership. Unfortunately, the Federal courts have ruled that divestment actions undertaken against a single nation may not predict the President's constitutional authority to enjoy exclusive authority over our Nation's diplomatic relations; thus, State and local governments undertake divestment measures with some legal jeopardy. The Justice Department has taken legal action against State and local governments in cases involving other nations. This act, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, protects the rights of State and local governments to ensure that their pension funds and other investment funds are not invested in companies that do business with a regime such as Iran. It is carefully targeted to focus only on financial ties with Iran's energy sector, to hit Iran where it is economically most vulnerable.

The bill includes a sunset provision to lift this authorization once the

President certifies that Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism and has ceased the pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. I am proud to have assumed the lead Democratic role on this legislation, taking over for President Obama, then Senator Obama, who served in the lead role when he was in the Congress.

Secondly, let me also take a brief moment to comment on the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of which I am proud to be a cosponsor with the majority of the Senate. The bill would clarify existing legal ambiguity by authorizing the President to sanction foreign firms involved in supplying Iran with refined gasoline and/or assisting Iran with increasing its refining capacity.

Iran is forced to import as much as 40 percent of its annual gasoline consumption due to the fact that much of its refining infrastructure was destroyed during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s. Economic sanctions in place since then have limited outside foreign investment. Targeting Iranian gasoline consumption is a promising venue for increasing our leverage on Iran's leadership. The Iranian people, I believe, may question why the regime prioritizes a nuclear program condemned by the international community at the cost of serious gasoline shortages in Iran.

The images in recent days have been stirring. Just yesterday we witnessed a procession of hundreds of thousands of Iranians, both young people dressed in modern attire and elderly women wearing traditional veils, marching in silence throughout downtown Teheran. Indeed, whenever a chant or shout emerged from the crowd, it was quickly hushed by the crowd, seeking to avoid any provocation for the riot police standing watch to move and break up the march. It is easy to forget, with all the incendiary rhetoric from leaders such as Mr. Ahmadinejad, that the Iranian people remain fundamentally pro-American and envy our democracy and personal liberties.

This week is a dark moment for the Iranian people as their legitimate aspirations for greater reform have been apparently sidetracked by the regime. But I am optimistic on their future and look forward to the day that the United States and Iran can once again be at peace and enjoy mutual respect for and with one another.

Mr. President, I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 11 minutes. Mr. CASEY. So I have more time than I thought I did. That is good news.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT

Mr. President, I wish to move to a second topic in the remaining time I have with regard to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but especially in regard to some of the attacks that have been leveled in recent days.

In just over 100 days now, the Recovery and Reinvestment Act is already at

work doing many things, such as providing immediate relief for hard-hit communities and families; secondly, creating and saving jobs; and thirdly, jump-starting thousands of shovel-ready projects across America. Our economic problems were not created in 100 days and they will not be solved in 100 days or even in a little more than 100 days. But thanks to the Recovery Act, we are meeting the greatest economic challenge in a generation head on.

There are early signs of progress across the country. Just a couple of examples of immediate relief measures under the act are providing stability for hard-hit families.

First, the Make Work Pay tax credit has increased take-home pay for 95 percent of working families; 95 percent of working families in America are benefiting from that. I note that in Pennsylvania the number is 4.8 million households are benefiting from that tax credit. Second, unemployment benefits have increased by \$25 a week. Third, COBRA health insurance premiums have been cut by 65 percent. Fifty-four million older citizens across the country have received \$250 in emergency relief checks in the mail. Finally, in this section, food assistance benefits have increased by 13 percent, just when vulnerable Americans need them.

Tax credit and other Recovery Act incentives are starting to drive new consumer spending and creating new product demand. Energy efficiency and renewable energy tax credits are providing fresh opportunities for manufacturers and contractors that make or install green products. And the \$8,000 first-time home buyer tax credit is proving to be a bright spot for the hard-hit housing industry.

The Recovery Act aid to State governments is helping to protect critical safety net programs and saving teaching and law enforcement jobs. Over half of the States have qualified for the State fiscal stabilization funds that are saving teaching jobs and improving education.

State governments are making up shortfalls in Medicaid funds, thanks to the Recovery Act.

Infrastructure improvement projects funded by the Recovery Act are bringing new jobs to hard-hit communities.

Over 20,000 Recovery Act projects across the country have been approved already. In Pennsylvania, just two quick examples: \$725 million for highway projects has been allocated and \$600,000 for airport grants.

The Recovery Act commitments to develop and commercialize new technologies that will be the foundation of the new economy are starting to boost confidence and spur some private sector investment across the country.

Businesses are converting crisis to opportunity because of the promise they see with the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act is already making life a little easier for families and businesses

like these, and work is just getting started.

Last week, President Obama and Vice President BIDEN announced the Roadmap to Recovery, 10 new major projects that will define the next 3 months of the Recovery Act. Here is what the 10 are: help 1,129 health centers in 50 States and 8 territories provide expanded service to approximately 300,000 patients; begin work on 107 national parks; start rehabilitation and improvement projects at 98 airports and over 1,500 highway locations throughout the country; fund 135,000 education jobs, including teachers, principals, and support staff; begin improvements at 90 veterans medical centers across 38 States; hire or keep on the job approximately 5,000 law enforcement officers; start 200 new waste and water systems projects in rural America; begin or accelerate cleanup work at 20 Superfund sites from the National Priority List; create 125,000 summer youth jobs; finally, begin 2,300 construction and rehabilitation projects at 359 military facilities across the country.

Billions of dollars in Recovery Act programs that will shape the economy of the 21st century will launch in the weeks and months ahead—for example, \$8 billion for high-speed rail; \$4.7 billion to connect more Americans to broadband Internet; \$4.5 billion to make a nationwide smart energy grid a reality; \$800 million to accelerate the use of biofuels and bring them to market; and \$300 million to expand the Nation's fleet of alternative-fuel vehicles through the Clean Cities Program.

These investments will get our economy moving today in a way that will change our economy for tomorrow. The road to recovery is long and our economic problems won't be solved overnight, but with every dollar invested and every project started under the Recovery Act, we are getting one step closer.

I will conclude with one further comment. Just as was the case when we voted on the Recovery Act, it was a choice between are you for the Recovery Act or for the status quo? Fortunately, enough of us voted for it so we could jump-start the economy, get it out of the ditch and back on the road to recovery. We still have a long way to go, and there is a lot more work to do, but so far the news is positive in communities across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and I know in your home State of Illinois, Mr. President, and across the country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I wish to applaud my colleague from Pennsyl-

vania because he shared not only our dreams for the recovery—or, as we call it in Arkansas, the “jump-start” bill—but, more importantly, not just our dreams but the things that are actively happening in our States, the great things, whether it is highway projects or for us in Arkansas the new market tax credits, which have been a tremendous boost for capital infusion into small businesses and for entrepreneurs. We can also look at the SBA 7(a) Loan Program, which is tremendous for small businesses. Education alone—I met with principals and administrators last week when I was home, talking about the opportunities for education and the infusion of resources coming from the Recovery Act, along with water projects and broadband. The Senator from Pennsylvania did an excellent job in mentioning those and, most importantly, focusing on the fact that this will help us get our country and our economy back on track and get Americans back to work or keep them in the jobs they are clinging to. I appreciate him coming to the floor and mentioning some of that, all of which many of us have been seeing as we travel home to our States over the weekend or during the breaks.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the Senator.

(The remarks of Mrs. LINCOLN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 186 are located in today's RECORD under “Submissions of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.”)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

SYSTEMIC RISK REGULATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the state of our financial system and to provide some thoughts on systemic risk regulation, as we set about crafting an overall reform to our financial regulatory approach.

Yesterday, Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and the Director of the National Economic Council, Lawrence Summers, published an editorial in the Washington Post laying out the broad outline of their proposal for regulatory reform. I share their views on how we arrived at this moment. I share the broader goals they discussed and look forward to working with the administration on comprehensive and timely regulatory reform. However, I wish to speak today about one area where I disagree, and that is how to address systemic risk.

Let me step back for a moment.

In the past 2 years we have witnessed events that have shaken our financial system to its core, altered our markets in ways that we still struggle to understand, and imposed costs that will burden our economy and our taxpayers for decades to come. We have grown numb to the news, but let me briefly recount these events.

The investment banking sector that built our capital markets has collapsed. Two of our largest investment banks have failed. Another has merged

with a commercial bank to avoid failure. Two others became commercial banking organizations.

Our residential mortgage finance sector has collapsed. The largest mortgage banks in the country have failed. Our two largest savings and loan associations have failed. Our two largest housing GSEs are operating under Federal Government conservatorship.

Our commercial banking sector has avoided collapse only through the infusion of hundreds of billions of dollars in equity support from the U.S. Treasury and massive liquidity support from the FDIC and the Federal Reserve. And despite these interventions, some of our largest commercial banks continue to face an uncertain future and dozens of smaller commercial banks have failed. Our insurance sector has been badly damaged. The largest insurance organization in the United States has been nationalized to avoid collapse. Other major insurers have received billions of dollars from the Treasury.

The magnitude of the events of the past 2 years strains comprehension. I believe what we have seen over the last couple years is the equivalent, in economic terms, of the 100-year flood. Millions of families and retirees have lost their financial security. Millions of people are out of work. Each day, we read about more layoffs, more losses, more bankruptcies, and more bank failures. We call this a financial crisis, but for the American people it is a very personal crisis of lost homes, derailed careers, forgone education, deferred retirement, communities less cared for, and at its core, the confidence of the American people has been shaken.

This crisis has uncovered the flaws of our current regulatory model and has revealed a shadow financial system which lies beyond the current regulatory structure.

We all share the hope that we will soon return to healthy, competitive financial markets and a vibrant economy. We have seen some positive signs that markets are stabilizing. But for our long-term prosperity, we do need a new model. What has happened to our financial system and our economy should not have happened. We must find and adopt reforms that will ensure that it never happens again.

We cannot shrink from the needed reform because it will be difficult or because some will oppose it. Right now there is a lack of faith in our system or its long term prospects. You can see that in our bond markets. We are not turning to the financial sector as a source of positive innovation so that the broader economy can grow. You can see that in the lack of credit in our markets, and the jobs lost every month.

To innovate and create jobs, not only in the financial system but across our whole economy, we do need comprehensive reform. Quality will attract capital, but only change will restore the quality of our markets.

This is the fundamental challenge facing the Banking Committee, of

which I am a new member. However, before I joined this Banking Committee, before I joined this August body, I did spend 20 years in the private sector around the financial system, taking companies public, looking at and learning about the markets. So I came to this body, I believe, with some background. But only since that time have I learned how complex the problems and the challenges are of trying to get financial reregulation or financial reform right.

Since joining the Banking Committee, I have been working to educate myself, meeting with a range of experts to learn more about the issues and to collect their thoughts on potential solutions to financial reregulation. There are a number of things we must do, including providing full regulatory coverage for all markets, ending too big to fail with a robust resolution authority, and ending regulatory arbitrage.

Today I would like to speak about one issue I discussed at length with these experts—systemic risk regulation. I hope, in the coming days, to come back to the floor and discuss other parts of securities and banking regulation.

“Systemic risk” is a term that, quite candidly, probably most of us even around the financial markets had not even heard of or thought very much about until the last couple years. Obviously, systemic risk is not the only area we need to address, but it is an area in which the current system has unequivocally failed.

Systemic risk is a tricky concept. Systemic risk is not a specific kind of risk at all. It is a catchall phrase that includes risks of all kinds, united only by the possibility that if left uncontrolled, they could have consequences for entire markets or even our entire financial system. Counterparty exposures can present systemic risk. So can interest rate shifts. So can bad laws and regulations. Because they come in all shapes and sizes, we should not expect to control systemic risks with a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach.

Our current system has failed to provide checks and balances and has replaced healthy competition with a system where a handful of firms are called too large to fail, and these so-called too-large-to-fail firms can threaten the safety of the entire system and, unfortunately, enjoy an implicit or even now even more explicit government guarantee that destroys any notion of market competition.

Secretary Geithner and Professor Summers have proposed empowering the Federal Reserve to manage systemic risk. But as I have discussed this approach with a number of experts, they have raised a number what of what I think are very serious and legitimate concerns.

My primary concern with placing this added new responsibility with the Federal Reserve is structural. There are already tensions between the Federal Reserve’s responsibilities for the

conduct of monetary policy and its responsibilities for bank supervision. No less an authority on this matter than Paul Volcker told the Joint Economic Committee last year that broadening the Federal Reserve’s responsibilities “would be a way of destroying the Federal Reserve in the long run, because it does need independence.” Adding this additional responsibility on the Federal Reserve, I believe, is a step too far.

My other concern is rooted in the governing philosophy of this country, which I think has, quite honestly, served us well. That philosophy is that too much economic power placed in one place puts our system of government at risk.

Our Founding Fathers opposed that concentration of power, economic or otherwise, and favored a system of checks and balances. Thomas Jefferson famously wrote that “[t]he Central Bank is an institution of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution.” That is why America, unlike so many European countries, never created a single, all-powerful national bank. We have, consequently, even since that time, resisted creating that all-powerful central bank. The experience of countries which have concentrated too much power in one entity I think should serve as cautionary tales.

Also, we should not ignore that the Fed has had some responsibility for systemic risk regulation under the current structure. Over the course of the past year, we have seen the Federal Reserve and the Treasury strike private deals with our largest and most powerful financial institutions—deals that might have protected the shareholders and creditors of those banks, but, consequently, by those actions, put smaller and less powerful and often better run institutions at a competitive disadvantage and undermining the long-term vitality of our financial system.

An old African proverb says that when elephants dance, the grass gets trampled. We have a trampled grass problem at this point, and I don’t think we can solve it with bigger elephants, whether those bigger elephants are regulators or institutions. If we do not give the Federal Reserve the responsibility for systemic risk regulation, what should we do instead?

I believe the answer to this question has two parts. The first part is that many systemic risks already lie squarely within the responsibilities of the day-to-day financial regulators. We did not just discover systemic risks. We have been discovering them for generations. We have passed laws to deal with them, and we have entrusted those laws to the administration of substantial regulatory agencies.

We need to make sure our current regulators, the folks who, for the most of the last century, have done their jobs well, have clear missions, including managing risks within their regulated institutions and markets, and we

must ensure that these regulators do their jobs.

But that is only half the problem. Even if we get the day-to-day prudential regulator to be more efficient in evaluating particular institutions' risk profile, we have to recognize that some part of systemic risk may lay outside of the regulator's day-to-day responsibilities and actually fall between the cracks of our existing regulatory system.

Working with folks across the financial spectrum, they have suggested the creation of a systemic risk council. I don't mean to claim on this floor that a systemic risk council is a silver bullet, but it avoids the pitfalls of entrusting the systemic risk responsibility in one agency that already has responsibilities and can be a potential source of conflict. Instead, a council can see across the horizon and gather all the information and expertise can flow to it, thereby addressing our stovepipe problem of our various regulatory agencies and making sure, as well, by having this council, it would have the intrinsic conflicts that would come if you also have to have responsibility for monetary policy. Making sure we have this council would also avoid the very real challenge of regulatory capture. Let me briefly outline this concept.

Our belief would be the systemic risk council would consist of the Treasury Secretary, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and the heads of the major financial regulatory agencies. It would be charged with the responsibility for working to improve our understanding and control of systemic risks and, in a narrow set of circumstances or emergencies, it would have the ability to act.

People would say: What does this look like? It builds on the model of the President's working group on financial markets. The idea is, the systemic risk council would have an independent chair appointed by the President and approved by the Congress and supported by a permanent staff. The best analogy of the systemic risk council might be the resemblance it might bear to the National Transportation Safety Board or the National Security Council. Just as the NTSB leaves rule-making on a day-to-day basis to the FAA, the systemic risk council would leave most of the day-to-day rule-making to the financial regulatory agency.

I understand criticism of the council's approach today is we don't just want a debating society at moments of crisis. That is why it needs this independent chair, independent staff, and resources. We must ensure it could act.

It would have the authority to review every bit of information that the individual, prudential, day-to-day Federal regulatory agencies possess, to require those agencies to collect information from the institutions they regulate.

It would also have, as I mentioned, an independent staff capable of analyzing this data, understanding how

the pieces of the regulatory system work together, and then at that council level, at that staff level, feed that information up to the council so it could identify weaknesses or gaps within our system or potential systemic risks that might be arising outside the purview of the independent Federal regulatory agency.

The council would also have the authority to require the financial regulators to develop clear, written plans for dealing with potential financial crises. In effect, it would have the potential to ask any institution to come forward with a winddown resolution plan for its particular circumstances. These plans would be created in advance of any crisis, maintained and even simulated from time to time to make sure they are adequate.

Again, if we put in place these kinds of credible plans to handle the potential failure of every systemically important financial institution, then we will no longer have the excuse that we have constantly heard over the last few months: Gosh, it is tough we have to put up this much public money to support this institution, but it is too big to fail.

As we have seen time and again in this crisis, because we didn't have these plans in place, unfortunately, the American taxpayers have taken on unfounded, quite honestly, financial risk in shoring up these institutions.

Because a systemic risk council would not directly interact with our major financial institutions on a day-to-day basis, it would be less prone to capture than the financial regulatory agencies. During normal times, the council could help to determine how to regulate new products and markets in order to minimize regulatory gaps, regulatory arbitrage, and the blind spots that currently exist in our system. As we know at this point, too many of those blind spots exist and have allowed the creation of some of the financial products that led to the financial meltdown we have seen.

The council will not identify firms that are too big or too large to fail but instead will work to prevent firms from becoming too large to fail. It would do this specifically in two ways.

First, it would have the authority to establish systemwide, counterparty exposure limits, increased capital requirements, reduced leverage, and strengthened risk management requirements—all of these, in effect, to put not an absolute prescription but at least barriers on those institutions that choose to get so large that they might potentially fall into that "too big to fail" category.

Second, it would ensure that the resolution authority would be able to resolve any institution that got to that size and then potentially posed a systemic risk.

In a crisis, the council could work with its member organizations to promote coordinated and comprehensive responses. The systemic risk council's

responsibilities would be clear and focused. Systemic risk would be its only job.

Using a council, prudential regulators would remain empowered and responsible for systemic risks that arose in their jurisdiction. If they encountered a risk that extended beyond their authority they could go to the council to ensure coordinated and comprehensive action. On top of that, if the evidence of risk is spread across different agencies like pieces of a puzzle, the council would have the information and expertise to spot it, and the ability to coordinate action in order to address it.

What I am proposing today boils down to a simple, commonsense idea. If we want to do something constructive about systemic risk, we should create a mechanism that can help ensure our regulators do their jobs on a day-to-day basis, avoid conflicts of interest, and fully leverage our existing regulatory resources to promote the proactive identification and control of systemic risks.

Let me acknowledge at the outset that there are many details that still need to be worked out, and I will, as I mentioned, have a series of other ideas of how we can modernize our financial system in the coming weeks ahead. But I believe the general approach I have outlined today, in terms of a systemic risk council, hopefully, will spark the debate so we do not simply default to further empowering an already extraordinarily important and critical institution, in terms of the Federal Reserve, without a thorough debate about this issue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the problems with the current state of health care in America are well known. Republicans do not need to be convinced of a case for reform. We hear from our constituents who have concerns about their own health care dilemmas and those of their neighbors and we all agree the millions of uninsured Americans need access to high-quality health care. But though we all agree on the need for reform, we have disagreements on how best to accomplish our goals.

Republicans favor a patient-centered approach that allows individuals to choose their own insurance, keep it if they like it, and never have to get permission from a Washington bureaucrat to get the test or treatment their doctor says they need. President Obama wants Congress to pass a sweeping new Washington-run health care system that we believe would jeopardize the care most Americans already have. Such a system would likely lead to the collapse of private insurance and replace it with an enormous Washington bureaucracy that would ration health care for all Americans.

I have discussed my concerns that Washington-run health care would diminish Americans' access to quality

care, lead to denials, shortages, and long delays for treatment, and would give power to Washington to dictate what medications and procedures Americans could get and when they could get them. It is already in the works.

A recent National Institutes of Health project description states:

Cost-effectiveness research will provide accurate and objective information to guide future policies that support the allocation of health resources for the treatment of acute and chronic conditions.

“Allocation of health resources” is a euphemism for rationing—denying care based on cost. To that end, Senator MCCONNELL and I have introduced legislation that would bar the Federal Government from using comparative effective research to delay or deny care to anyone. That is a bare minimum that we should do to prevent rationing of care. Our bill, incidentally, is endorsed by the American Medical Association.

Mr. President, government-run and rationed approaches have caused much pain to people in other countries—in Canada, for example. In an article for the Manhattan Institute’s *City Journal*, Dr. David Gratzler wrote of the long waits that Canadians endure for just about any procedure or diagnostic test: seniors who lay on stretchers for 5 days in a hospital waiting room; a 3-year wait list for a hernia operation; a 2-year delay for sleep apnea treatment; a year-long delay for a hip replacement, and so on.

It is one thing for Washington to take over car companies. Getting it wrong there usually would not lead to life-or-death problems. But it is an entirely different matter to allow Washington to go into business as the Nation’s health care provider. Who is going to protect you when they get it wrong? To whom are you going to appeal?

In his health care speeches, President Obama has stressed that if you like your current health care, you can keep it if you don’t want to get on the Washington-run plan. That sounds all well and good, but it would not play out that way, according to health experts.

The Lewin Group produced a study that shows, if enacted, the President’s public option—the government-run insurance company—would displace 119 million happily insured Americans. Their companies could take the easy route and simply pay a fine, tell their employees to sign up for Washington-run health care, even if they do not want it. How does that square with the President’s assurances that patients will get to keep what they have?

Most insured Americans like their coverage. A May 14 Rasmussen poll shows that 70 percent of Americans rated their coverage as excellent—70 percent. Another 23 percent rated it as fair. So most folks are happy with their current insurance and would not appreciate being pushed into Washington’s health care bureaucracy, with all

of its complex rules and hours of waiting on hold and webs of impenetrable bureaucracy.

Then there is the matter of cost. How much will it cost to add 47 million people to the health care rolls? Who will pay? To not know the answers to these questions is to be fiscally irresponsible. Yet we don’t even have precise estimates from the Congressional Budget Office whose responsibility it is to tell Congress how much legislation will cost the taxpayers. The preliminary estimate of the Congressional Budget Office shows that only a part of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee bill will cost \$1 trillion, but it only reduces the number of uninsured by 16 million people—\$1 trillion for 16 million people. The remainder of the bill, by the way, has not even been scored.

My math shows that is \$62,250 per person, and that only covers about one-third of the 47 million who are said to lack insurance. It doesn’t take into account the estimated 119 million insureds who will be switched from the private coverage they currently have to the government program. So what will the total cost be?

Mr. President, there is another concern that hasn’t been much discussed but needs to be raised. It is a major concern for America’s seniors. Over the weekend, the administration proposed trimming Medicare’s budget to pay for this new public plan. This is exactly the wrong thing to do and can only mean one thing: rationing and waiting lists for America’s seniors. Seniors want Congress to strengthen Medicare, make it more efficient and, importantly, make it solvent. They want it to serve as intended—to pay for the health care of seniors. They do not want its resources drained to pay for a massive new plan for the 47 million uninsured, plus the 119 million currently insured but soon to be displaced into the government system.

Seniors rightly ask: Won’t the new demands for care greatly diminish the quality of care seniors now receive and lead to dangerous waits for tests and treatment?

President Obama has acknowledged that Medicare’s promises of treatment are financially unsustainable. We learned recently that Medicare’s liability; that is, the amount of benefits promised that are not covered by taxes, is \$38 trillion over the next 75 years. One lesson we can draw from Medicare’s financial troubles—and veterans health care, for that matter—is that health care plans run by Washington bureaucrats are not very efficient or cost effective. They have no incentive to be. In fact, the economic principle of “the tragedy of the commons” applies. Since the money doesn’t belong to any one individual or group, no incentive exists to be cost efficient, to eliminate waste, or to streamline the bureaucracy.

Another way to say it is: Who washes their rent-a-car?

Mr. President, seniors and veterans, private insurance holders, small businesses, and employers that insure their workers, the uninsured—in fact, all Americans—should be given the chance to review, discuss, and provide feedback on any legislation as important as this health care reform. It will affect the way we all get our health care.

I look forward to an ongoing dialogue about the health care reform that we all want, but we must not rush to churn out and then hastily pass a plan that will lead to rationing and the displacement of millions from the insurance they currently enjoy. It is of paramount importance that the principles of quality care, choice, freedom, and putting patients first triumph in the reform we all want.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I think virtually everybody in our country understands that America is in the midst of a major health care crisis. We have 46 million Americans without any health insurance. We have even more who are underinsured, and we have, in addition to all of that, some 60 million Americans—20 percent of our population—who do not have access to a doctor on a regular basis. The result of that particular fact is that we lose over 18,000 Americans every year, Americans who die needlessly—who should not die—because they do not go to the doctor when they should and get the treatment they need. That is six times every single year the number of people we lost on 9/11—people who should not die because they do not have access to a doctor.

Mr. President, in the midst of this horrendous lack of coverage—unique, I should mention, among major nations on Earth—the United States spends far more per capita on health care than any other nation, and those costs continue to soar. So when people make international comparisons of the United States with other nations on how well or not well we are doing—and that is good to do—we should always remember we are spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as any other country. There is certainly something wrong and dysfunctional about a system which spends so much and yet leaves so many people uninsured, underinsured, or without access to a doctor or a dentist or other preventive health care.

At \$2.4 trillion and 18 percent of our gross domestic product, the skyrocketing cost of health care in this country is unsustainable both from a personal point of view—the needs of individual Americans—and also from a

macroeconomic perspective of what is happening to our entire economy. At the individual level, the average American today spends about \$7,900 per year on health care. Can you believe that? Close to \$8,000 per person on health care?

We all know folks who are out there making \$20,000, \$25,000, or \$30,000 a year, and we are spending, on average, almost \$8,000 per person.

Despite that huge outlay—unprecedented in the world—a recent study found that medical problems contributed to 62 percent of all bankruptcies in 2007. I should add that most of the people who went bankrupt had health insurance. They had health insurance. But what they had was inadequate health insurance.

From a business perspective—as opposed to the needs of an individual—General Motors spends more money on health care per automobile than they do on steel—more money on health care than on steel—which might lead us to understand why they are where they are today.

Small business owners in the State of Vermont and around this country are forced to divert hard-earned profits into health coverage for their employees rather than new business investments. Many small businesses are trying to do the right thing for their employees, spending more than they have for health coverage so they do not have the money available to make the investments they need to make their businesses grow. The result of that, of course, is as a result of soaring health care costs—going up 10, 15, 20 percent a year—many small- and medium-size businesses are cutting back drastically on their level of health care coverage or, in some cases, they are doing away with it entirely.

More and more businesses in America are simply saying: I cannot afford to provide health insurance to my workers. Despite all of that—that we spend almost twice as much per person on health care as any other country—people will say: Since you spend all that money, the results must be great. But that is not the case. The bottom line is we get poor value for what we spend.

According to the World Health Organization, the United States ranks 37th in terms of health system performance. We are far behind many other countries in terms of such important indices as infant mortality, life expectancy, and preventable deaths.

So we are spending almost double what any other country on Earth is spending. We have 46 million without any health insurance, we have more who are underinsured, we have thousands who die because they cannot get to a doctor, and then in many other health care outcomes we are behind many other countries around the world—some of which are spending far less per person than we are spending.

It seems to me, as the health care debate in Congress heats up, we as a nation have to ask two fundamental ques-

tions. Different people will have different answers to them, but here are the two questions I think we have to ask: First, as a nation, should all Americans be entitled to health care as a right? That is the first question.

Honest people will have differences of opinion. Some people will say: You know what. Some people have big cars, some people have small cars. Some people have big houses, some people have small houses. Some people have good health insurance, some people have no health insurance. That is the way life goes. Some people hold that view.

I do not. I think in America we should understand that every single person should be entitled to quality, comprehensive, affordable health care. In fact, I think most Americans believe the same thing.

Second, if we are to provide quality health care to every man, woman, and child in this country, how do we do it in a way that does not bankrupt the Nation? How do we do it in a cost-effective way? Those are the two questions that we have to ask ourselves.

I think the answer to the first question is pretty clear and, in fact, it is one of the reasons Barack Obama was elected President of the United States. Most Americans do believe all of us should have health care and nobody should be left out of the system. We have a hard time understanding that Joe Smith who works for one company has good health care, and his neighbor, Mary Evans, who works for another company, does not have any health insurance at all. What sense is that?

I think as a nation we are coming to understand all of our people are entitled to health care as a right, as Americans, and the challenge we face is how do we do it in a cost-effective way. In that regard, I think—and I obviously speak just for myself—the evidence is overwhelming that we must end the private insurance company domination of health care in our country and move toward a publicly funded, single-payer, Medicare-for-all approach. I think the evidence is overwhelming that if you want universal, comprehensive, quality health care for all people, that is actually the only way you can do it.

Our current private health insurance system is the most costly, wasteful, complicated, and bureaucratic in the world. Just today—not yesterday, just today—I spoke to an individual who has a law degree, a very smart guy. His wife has a Ph.D. They went through the Federal employee benefit package. Between a Ph.D. and a lawyer, they spent hours trying to figure out what particular program could work best for them.

All over America, people are spending countless hours trying to figure out: Is it this program? Is it that program? I am young; I might not get sick but, you know, I have a history of cancer in my family. Should I get comprehensive? Should I get a high deductible? If I am a small business I can only

negotiate this, if I am General Motors I can self insure. What should I do?

The answer is, there are 1,300 separate private insurance companies in America peddling thousands and thousands of different plans. Let's be very clear, if in fact, anybody has not caught on yet; the function of a private health insurance company is not to provide health care. It is to make as much money as possible. That is what its reason for existence is about.

In fact, when a private health insurance company denies health care, it makes more money. In fact, the record is pretty clear that private health insurance companies have given bonuses to people, their own employees, who are successful in throwing people off of the insurance policy because those people were running up high health care costs. Thus, we have the insane phenomenon of something called a pre-existing condition.

What a term that is, preexisting condition—meaning a person cannot get coverage for the illness they need to be covered for most. The person who had cancer 3 years ago and is worried about a recurrence of cancer—sorry, we can't provide insurance to you.

Then you have other circumstances where somebody gets really sick, runs up a high medical bill, and the insurance company says: Oh, we don't want to continue your policy because we had to pay out so much money. We want to go to some young guy who can run the marathon and promises us never to get sick. Those are the guys we want to cover.

This is an insane system. It is a wasteful system. It is a bureaucratic system. How many people are spending half their lives on the telephone, arguing with insurance companies to cover the claims they thought they were covered for? So people on one end of the phone are spending huge amounts of time and money doing that, and at the other end of the phone we are paying someone to tell us we don't have coverage for what we thought we did have coverage.

With thousands of different health benefit programs designed to maximize profits, not provide health care, private health insurance companies spend an incredible 30 percent of each health care dollar on administration and billing, exorbitant CEO compensation packages, advertising, lobbying, and campaign contributions.

One of the lovely things the insurance companies do and the pharmaceutical companies do is, after they rip you off and they make huge profits, they take some of that money to hire all these fancy guys in Washington, DC, to protect the status quo.

The bottom line is—and all of the evidence makes this clear—public programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, the SCHIP Program, and the Veterans' Administration are administered for far less money than are private health insurance companies.

In recent years, while we have experienced an acute shortage of primary

health care doctors, nurses, and dentists, we are paying for a huge increase in health care bureaucrats and bill collectors. Here is the insanity, the dysfunctionality of the current system: We do not have enough primary health care doctors, we don't have enough dentists, we do not have enough nurses, we do not have enough medical personnel—we don't have enough of those people, but over the last three decades we have seen an explosion in the number of health care bureaucrats and people who are bill collectors.

To my mind, I would rather see somebody hired who can help somebody get well or prevent disease, not somebody on the telephone billing or arguing about what we owe or do not owe. The fact is, over the last three decades the number of administrative personnel has grown by 25 times the numbers of physicians—25 times more bureaucrats than physicians. We do not need health care bureaucrats pushing paper. We need primary health care doctors delivering babies, taking care of the elderly, and taking care of those people who are sick.

Not surprisingly, while health care costs are soaring, so are the profits of private health insurance companies. From 2003 to 2007, the combined profits of the Nation's major health insurance companies increased by 170 percent. Health care costs are soaring, profits of the health insurance companies are also soaring, and while more and more Americans are losing their jobs and health insurance, the top executives in the industry are receiving lavish compensation packages. It is not just William McGuire, the former head of United Health, who several years ago accumulated stock options worth an estimated \$1.6 billion.

OK, \$1.6 billion a few years ago for the CEO of United Health and we do not have enough money to provide health care to people who are uninsured? It is not just the head of Cigna, Edward Hanway, who made more than \$120 million in the last 5 years. The fact is, CEO compensation for the top private health insurance companies now averages over \$14 million apiece.

Moving toward a national health insurance program which provides cost-effective, universal, comprehensive, and quality health care for all will not be easy. It is the major political struggle that we face right now. The powerful special interests—and they are all over Capitol Hill. The lobbyists are here. In the midst of the recession, I would suggest that while unemployment in general is soaring, my strong guess is that unemployment for health care lobbyists and pharmaceutical industry lobbyists is going down. Those guys have plenty of work, and they are making plenty of money. I am quite confident that those lobbyists will wage an all-out fight to make sure we maintain the current dysfunctional system which enables them, the insurance companies and the drug companies, to make millions and billions of dollars in profits.

In recent years they have spent hundreds of millions on lobbying, campaign contributions, and advertising with unlimited resources. We have no reason to believe they will not continue to spend as much as they need. But at the end of the day, as difficult as it may be, the fight for a national health care program will prevail. Decade after decade, all over this country people fought for a civil rights movement which said we will judge human beings not on their color but on their character, who they are as a human being. The struggle for women's rights went on decade after decade before women had the right to vote or had a seat at the table.

In my view, the struggle for health care is the civil rights struggle of today, and I believe 30 years from now, 50 years from now, people will look back and say: I don't believe there was a time in America where people who got sick couldn't find a doctor, where people went bankrupt because they committed the crime of being sick or having cancer. I do not believe that.

Our job is to bring that day when every American has health care as a right in a comprehensive, cost-effective manner. Our job is to make that day come sooner rather than later. If we work together and if we have the courage to stand up to the big money interests who want to maintain the status quo, we, in fact, can do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

TREASURY BOND YIELD UPDATE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago I spoke on the floor about the unprecedented budget deficits this country is now facing and the fact we are spending money we do not have. I specifically discussed the impact that is having on Treasury yields.

What we know is that President Obama's budget has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office, which is our group, and I think they do a pretty good job. They take pride in being independent and fair. The head of it was selected by the Democratic majority in the Senate. It is certainly not a Republican organization. They are just fair, trying to do the best they can to try to calculate the numbers.

What they calculated was that at the rate of deficit spending we are now undertaking, the total American debt will double in 10 years, from \$5.7 trillion to over \$11 trillion. In 10 years it will triple to \$17 trillion.

That is a lot of debt. You might ask how do you do that? How do you spend more money than you take in? The way we do it is we borrow it, just like other people do. The Government borrows it. The way it does is, it puts out an auction or sale of Treasury bonds or bills, T-bills they call them, and people buy those things if they choose to do so, and the Government pays them a

certain interest rate, whatever the interest rate is at the time.

On short-term debt instruments—short term are under a few months—those interest rates are still rather low because people are panicked over the economic situation. They are afraid to put their money in the stock market, so they bought Treasury bills. Other people around the world did too. They are not getting much interest, but they believe the Government will pay them back in dollars, eventually.

So what has been happening to the 10-year Treasury bill, one of the foundations of our borrowing, is the rate has continued to go up. Two weeks ago, I pointed out that the 10-year Treasury yield had increased 54 percent this year, at that time from 2.4 percent in January, to 3.7 percent. Barron's, a major financial publication, predicted a few weeks ago that Treasury yields could top 4 percent this year.

Well, guess what. Treasury yields topped 4 percent last week. The Wall Street Journal in a front-page article on June 11 said that the 10-year Treasury yield briefly hit 4 percent yesterday afternoon before closing at 3.94 percent. That would be a 67-percent increase in the Treasury bill interest rate just this year.

Why are the rates going up? It seems there is some disagreement between Washington and Wall Street. The Wall Street Journal article says this:

Many policymakers see the rise in Treasury yields as a sign that investors are optimistic that the economy is on the mend. But many market participants say higher long-term bond yields indicate investors are increasingly worried about inflation.

So I interpret that to mean that the Washington politico crowd, looking to see a positive vision here, say it is because the economy is doing better. And that could be a factor. But the folks on Wall Street, who are buying the T bills, say differently.

Is the government responsible for this increase in interest rates? It seems that is a real possibility. The Federal Reserve is creating inflation concerns through its massive asset purchase program. The Fed plans to purchase \$1.25 trillion in mortgage-backed securities, \$200 billion in Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae debt, and \$300 billion in Treasury bills this year. Since there are not enough people who want to buy the Treasury bills, the Federal Reserve is stepping in and buying them in an attempt to keep the rate down.

So far the Fed has purchased \$481 billion in mortgage-backed securities, and \$130 billion in Treasuries. The intention of the program is to reduce the Treasury yield and interest rates, but it may be backfiring. A Forbes.com article on May 28 quotes former Federal Reserve Governor Lawrence Meyer on how this kind of action could actually have a different impact. It could actually cause inflation and even cause a rise in the Treasury bond yield.

This is what he said:

This can become counterproductive. To the extent that you stoke inflation fears and you

get an inflation risk premium built in [to the bond yield] you can't ease that away. You do have to be careful and more measured than that.

In other words, when there is a perception which may be reality that not enough people are willing to buy these Treasury bonds at lower rates, because they think even 4 percent may not be enough because they may fear that inflation is going to be 6 or 7 percent down the road, they do not want to lock themselves in for 10 years at a 4-percent interest rate that is below the inflation rate. So the Fed steps in and buys some of this to keep it low, and that may be having the perverse incentive of causing a belief to occur in the marketplace that inflation is on the way, and scares people even more.

Also let me say this about the voluntary purchase of Treasury bills by citizens of the United States, people in China, the Middle East, and around the world. They do not have to buy Treasury bills. We are going to be offering amounts, these kinds of bills, in volume we have never offered before in the history of the Republic.

So the question is, who wants to buy them? Who wants to hold a mortgage on the United States? What if we inflate our currency? Maybe 4 percent is not enough. Maybe they want more. Maybe China, which had a huge trade surplus a few years ago, is deciding they are not going to buy so many Treasury bills in the United States. Maybe they decide they need to invest in their own economy, which is not doing as well as it has done in the past.

The same about the Middle East. They used to have huge reserves of American money as a result of the high price of gasoline and price of oil on the world market. That price dropped some. So perhaps they do not have as much money to buy our Treasury bills either.

So who is going to buy them? We are not talking about a little bit, we are talking about going from \$5 trillion in total debt today to \$11 trillion in 5 years, and \$17 trillion in 10 years. So we are talking about over \$10 trillion in new debt we have to sell to someone in the world market.

Also, what is the impact of the Federal Reserve, that entity we have created by law, when they buy Treasury bills? What occurs there? I remember hearing Mr. Bernanke, the Federal Reserve Chairman, talking about this on "60 Minutes." Some of you may have seen him being interviewed on that program. I went back and had the transcript of that program called up, and we reviewed it. It is what I thought he said. In response to reporter Scott Pelley's question, Chairman Bernanke said about the Fed's programs:

It's much more akin to printing money than it is to borrowing.

Mr. Pelley replied:

You've been printing money?

And Mr. Bernanke replied:

Well, effectively.

And he added:

And we need to do that, because our economy is very weak and inflation is very low.

So if you want to know the definition of printing money, that is it. Some people say that is not a fair thing to say; we are not printing money. Mr. Bernanke says we are printing money. He is the Chief of the Fed. He is the guy who does it.

Why does this matter to the average American? Even those who are not planning to buy a Treasury bill any time soon will be affected. That is because mortgage interest rates—what we pay to borrow money to buy a house with—track the 10-year Treasury yield. So as the 10-year Treasury goes up, mortgage rates go up too, and it is much harder for people to buy a home or to refinance. Or if you want to sell a home, it is harder for the person who wants to buy it to borrow the money. He has got to pay considerably more for a house in the interest rate. In fact, according to the Wall Street Journal, 30-year mortgage rates have gone up 16 percent in the past 2 weeks, from 5 percent to 5.79 percent. This is the money, when you go out, you have to borrow money to buy a house with. What we need to happen in America is people buying homes and taking them off the market.

There is a huge difference between 5 percent and 6 percent. On \$100,000, 5 percent interest would be \$5,000 a year you pay in interest; \$400-plus a month. On 6 percent interest, it is \$6,000 a year, or \$100 more a month on \$100,000. For a \$200,000 mortgage it would be twice that. It would be \$2,000 or \$3,000 more a year you would pay in interest alone because the rate went up a bit.

We were hoping that the interest rates would stay low to encourage people to buy homes, encourage people to refinance, and be able to live a better life. The Wall Street Journal article said that this increase—from 5 to almost 6 percent—will cut the number of people with an incentive to refinance their homes and save money by paying less interest by half.

Let me mention one more thing. One of the things that is interesting in all of this is the impact our spending has had on the economy. We all hoped it would have a pretty dramatic impact. But it is not being nearly as effective as people thought. Even I thought we would have some impact in the short term.

But I believe that CBO is correct. When we passed the \$800 billion stimulus package that was supposed to put money out into the economy to build roads and bridges, we found out only 4 percent of the money went to roads and bridges, 96 percent went to other kinds of government spending, but that \$800 billion was supposed to create a good bit of jobs and get this economy moving.

I want to say things are not going as well as we would like. I remain optimistic. The Fed is doing all of these things, the spending is coming along. Surely we are going to have a benefit from that in the near term.

But this shows the deficit surge. The deficit, by which I mean how much more money we are spending than we take in. This goes through March of this year. You can see how the deficit is increasing, how much our shortfall is. And by March, it has already topped \$953 billion.

That is more than twice the biggest deficit President Bush ever had. And he was criticized for his deficit. That is twice. We have not gotten to the end of the fiscal year yet.

What the CBO projects—this is our own Congressional Budget Office, their numbers, and they are running the tally of how much we are spending and how much is coming in. They calculate by the end of the year the deficit will be \$1.8 trillion, which is about four times the highest deficit President Bush ever had.

I say that because people say: Well, President Bush had deficits too. Yes, he did. A lot of that was not justified, in my opinion. But we never had deficits like this in the history of the American Republic. And you do have to borrow this money.

This is in March. By September 30, we are looking at a deficit of \$1.8 trillion this year alone. And the whole debt of the American Republic, since its founding, is about 5.7 trillion before this year started. What is that? That is one-third in 1 year.

We hoped that spending and this activity would help improve the unemployment rate. But you can see, it is going up. It was 6.6 and it has gone up to 8.5. Well, it is not 8.5 percent. That was in March. The latest number is 9.4 percent.

So I do not know how much real boost we have gotten from this reckless spending. So much of it we knew was not job creating, and we debated that. It was clear that a lot of this was the kind of spending that would not create jobs. As I said, you heard about roads and bridges. Well, only 4 percent of the money went to roads and bridges. A lot of it went to all kinds of programs that are not job-creating programs. So I am concerned about that.

This is a vibrant country, and I think we have the capability of bouncing back from hard times. I will just say, we are at 9.4 percent unemployment. Unemployment in the early 1980s, under President Reagan, when they had to break the back of surging inflation, they broke the back of 13-percent inflation. Unemployment hit 10.8 percent. So it is not as bad as it was in the 1980s, and we bounced back from that, and we can bounce back from this.

But I have to say to my colleagues, if we do not have fiscal sanity in how we do our business, if we do not have a possibility of showing growth in revenues from economic growth and the containment of spending—and our deficits are surging for as far as the eye can see—then I am not sure we will have the kind of healthy, robust resurgence we would normally expect to occur after a recession.

Look at these numbers. This is very disturbing. We borrow all this money, and we spend it today. I know a great lawyer who has written a book, "The Case for Character." He said: This is a question of character, what I am going to talk to you about here. It is a question about the moral character of the Congress and the President of the United States and how we approach our duties in a responsible manner.

In 2009, this year, we expect that the taxpayers of the United States—on the \$5.7 trillion we have borrowed—will pay \$170 billion in interest. That is a total loss. That is money that goes out to people who have loaned us money. It is interest, just like on your credit card or on your mortgage—\$170 billion. And look how it goes up. This is a chart I have of the interest each year. And 10 years from now, if we follow the President's budget, it will be \$806 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

All right. That is just money. How much is that? How much is \$806 billion? Let me tell you what we do today. The Federal highway bill is about \$40 billion. The Federal aid to education in all its forms is about \$100 billion. So now, since we take money from the future, and we spend it today in a reckless way, I think, to get some sort of hope for stimulus we have not seen much of, we are going to saddle the people in 2019 with an annual debt payment of \$806 billion—10 times the Federal education budget, 20 times-plus the highway budget. So we do need to be focused on this issue.

Let me say one more thing. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the deficit is supposed to drop down in 2 or 3 years, but already it looks as if we will not meet those numbers. The economy is not as strong as they were projecting. It was a rosy scenario. But they project about \$600 billion is what the deficit will be 2 or 3 years from now—30, 40 percent higher than anything President Bush ever had—\$600 billion. Then it starts up again, and it goes up to the 10th year. And in the 10th year, under the scoring of the President's budget by the Congressional Budget Office, the deficit will be over \$1 trillion in that year—\$1.1 trillion.

That is not sustainable. And they are not projecting an economic slowdown. They are projecting modest growth over that period of time, solid growth for the last 5 years during this period. If we have a recession, presumably the deficits would be even larger than that.

I guess I would say to my colleagues, this is a matter we need to start thinking about. It cannot be ignored. Nothing comes from nothing. If you get money to spend today, you must spend every dollar of it with care because you have borrowed it from the future, and somebody has to pay it back. It is not free money. Maybe it feels as if it is free today because we did not have to pay higher taxes or we did not cut some other spending program to get

the money to do what we would like to do with it. We just borrowed it. But borrowing has consequences.

Every year from here on out, that \$806 billion will go up probably because in 2019 they expect not a balanced budget but an annual deficit of that year to be over \$1 trillion. So the thing is going to continue to worsen. If we do not make some changes, this will continue.

By the way, this does not include the spending we are talking about on health care, which you heard a speech about earlier. I will say this about it: the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee has released details on a bill. According to CBO, what they have released so far scores at \$1 trillion. Oh, we just got another \$1 trillion not calculated in these numbers. "Well, everybody just needs to have health insurance." So who is going to pay for it?

We have to be smart. We have to see how we can improve health care, get more people insured, create a better system with the absolute lowest possible cost because we cannot continue this kind of reckless spending. Instead of learning a lesson from the already surging deficits, we seem to be blithely going on with a huge new spending program on top of that.

The American people, I think, are uneasy. They think we are out of control up here. They do not think they have ever seen anything like this: deficits the likes of which we have never seen in peacetime.

The U.S. Government passed a bill last fall that was supposed to buy toxic mortgages from banks, and now they bought a controlling share in General Motors. How did this happen? Did Congress ever vote on that? No. We did not vote on it. They took advantage of the language in that bill, which I was opposed to and voted against. One of the reasons I opposed it was because it was too broad and an unbelievable abrogation of congressional power to the Secretary of Treasury, who had already helped lead us into financial catastrophe. But people in panic, they all voted and gave him this power.

Did anybody know we were going to use that money to buy an automobile company? No. In fact, Secretary Paulson at one point was asked at a hearing: What about buying stock in banks? This was supposed to be helping the banks. In the House committee, he said, no, we did not want to buy stock in banks. But a week after that bill passed, he was buying stock in banks. And they have not yet begun to buy toxic mortgages. Maybe they will begin soon. They say they have a plan now.

I am saying the American people are right to be concerned about the reckless, irresponsible behavior of this government in Washington. I hope they will continue to watch what is going on. I hope the American people will speak out and let the folks up here know they expect us to do something more than deal with the problem next week. They expect us to be thinking

about the long-term health of the American economy.

I heard a well-known financial expert say: Well, you know what? I am not saying there will be reckless inflation occurring, although some people are predicting that. He said: After President Reagan broke inflation and we got the economy on a sound track, the economy grew at about 3 percent a year and inflation was about 2 percent. He said: What I am worried about is that what we are going to see in the next 10 years is inflation at about 3 percent and growth at about 2 percent. That is not good. You want your growth to exceed the inflation rate.

I do not know what will happen. I cannot predict it. But I know this: We are going to have less money to spend on the things we need because we are going to have to be paying a huge amount in interest. Those are real concerns. This matter is not going away. I believe the American people are becoming more and more attuned to these matters. That is what the Tea parties were about—a sort of spontaneous reaction by the American people saying: What are you guys doing up there? Surely you know this is not the way to handle America's business.

I will say, I am going to continue to report on things that are developing. Surely we will begin to see some improvement in the unemployment rate and maybe some economic growth in the weeks to come. You would normally expect that when you pump the kind of money we have pumped into this economy. But in the long run, this begins to drag down the gains you make in the short run. That is what I am saying.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office said—analyzing the stimulus package alone—it would increase our GDP, our growth for 2 to 3 years, but if you took that over 10 years, the economy would grow less over the 10 years than if we had no stimulus package at all. That is because when you borrow money, not only do you have to pay interest on it, but it crowds out borrowing from the private sector.

If a corporation wants to borrow money through the issuance of bonds, they are having to compete with the Treasury bills that are now paying 4 percent, and they will have to pay a good bit more because people think the Treasury bills are better, safer investments than some private corporate bonds. It hurts the private sector because now they are paying considerably higher interest rates to get people to loan money to them instead of loaning it to the U.S. Government.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to share this. I hope and pray we can all figure out a way to work together to do a better job of being stewards of this economy. It is a high responsibility we have. No one knows everything. No one has a perfect answer to it. We are going to have to go through some tough times. I think that is clear, and there is no need to sugar-coat that.

I am not blaming President Obama for everything that has gone wrong, and he inherited so much of this. I have talked about Secretary Paulson. I do not think Secretary Geithner is any better. He was Secretary Paulson's top adviser when they came up with this plan last fall.

But, at any rate, we need to get our heads together and know one fundamental thing: Nothing comes from nothing. There is no free lunch. If you borrow money to spend today, there will be a cost in the future, and those costs can outweigh the benefits that are occurring today.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, we live in a world divided. International tension, mistrust, and even war too often separate Nation from Nation. But every 2 years, 10,000 athletes from more than 200 countries come together to celebrate the human spirit. They meet in competition, arriving on the world stage from all five inhabited continents. Each of these five continents is represented by a single-colored circle—a ring intertwined with four others to form the familiar symbol worn by every Olympic athlete. The Olympic and the Paralympic games are a powerful force for world unity and a boon to any city that hosts them.

In 2016, the summer games will bring millions of dollars and the international spotlight to one of four world cities. Selected by the U.S. Olympic Committee from a broad field of candidate cities, Chicago is one of only four finalists for the 2016 Olympics, along with Madrid, Rio de Janeiro, and Tokyo. The International Olympic Committee will make their final selection this October.

We must work hard to bring the Olympic games back to the United States. There is no greater honor than representing your country on the world stage. I am convinced there is no greater city in the world than Chicago.

As President Obama and I can both attest, Chicago is a diverse and inclusive city. Situated on the banks of the beautiful Lake Michigan, it is the jewel of the Midwest. Chicago has always been a global leader in culture, art, architecture, commerce, sports, and even cuisine.

The Olympic spirit is alive and well in Chicago. The Chicago 2016 Olympic Committee recognizes the importance of the games and in renewing old friendships around the world, as well as establishing new ones. This ideal and the value of the “friendship through sports,” is at the heart of the city's Olympic bid. It is a city I am proud to call home, and it showcases much of what makes this country so great. That is why it is the ideal site for the Olympic and the Paralympic games.

For the athletes, world-class training facilities and event locations would be very close together, allowing for convenience and ease. For visitors, out-

standing public transportation and modern infrastructure would make all events readily accessible and easy to attend. For residents of the city and people across the United States, Chicago would shine on the world stage, and millions of dollars would pour in from across the globe.

Especially if we pass S. 1023, promoting travel to the United States and relaying better information to visitors, Chicago will be the clear choice for the International Olympic Committee in October.

This important legislation, known as the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, would create a nonprofit corporation as well as a government Office of Travel Promotion. These organizations would work together to encourage business, leisure, and scholarly travel to the United States, restoring important components of our struggling economy.

Travel and tourism, which generates as much as \$1.3 trillion in the United States every year, has been on the decline since 2001, although the same industries have grown in many other countries. We must act swiftly to protect the 8.3 million American jobs that are directly related to travel and tourism. This means welcoming more overseas visitors each year—visitors who already spend \$142 billion inside the United States on an annual basis.

An increase in international tourism would increase the profile of the Chicago Olympic bid. The 2016 Olympics, in turn, would generate even more international tourism in Illinois and across the country. S. 1023 would help this massive influx of visitors travel into the United States with ease. This would create jobs, increase tax revenue, and build stronger friendships across the globe.

There are few international spectacles as singular and as inspiring as the Olympic and the Paralympic games. A force for unity in a world divided, these competitions have the power to bring us together as one people, celebrating the human spirit with one voice.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator DORGAN and Senator ENZI in supporting S. 1023. This legislation would help to bring visitors from all over the world to the United States and would also help bring the 2016 Olympics to Chicago, IL, because I have a special interest in bringing those Olympics to my hometown.

Thank you. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, every year thousands of people travel to Colorado to enjoy some of the most exciting recreation opportunities

in the world. Although my home State is known for its skiing, we are a summertime destination with 4 national parks, 5 national monuments, and 41 State parks for travelers to enjoy. Visitors can go white-water rafting down the Colorado River or hike and climb in the magnificent Rockies. We have Wild West ghost towns, historic railroads, and American Indian cultural sites to visit.

Obviously, travel and tourism is an incredibly important sector of Colorado's economy. For every \$1 million spent in Colorado by domestic and international travelers, 11 jobs are created. Travel and tourism generated \$13.7 billion in revenue in 2007 in Colorado alone, and almost 150,000 Coloradans owe their jobs to that industry.

That is why today I rise to express my support for the Travel Promotion Act of 2009. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, which has strong support from Members across the aisle, and I look forward to voting for its passage later this week.

While I have listed just the beginning of the numerous reasons to visit Colorado, the truth is that our tourism and travel industry has suffered in recent years. Many people do not realize it, but across our great country our tourism industry never fully recovered after September 11, particularly when it comes to travel from outside our country into the United States. That compares with this fact: Travel around the world has dramatically increased in the past decade while travel to the United States has dropped. In 2008, we welcomed fewer visitors to our country than we did in the year 2000. Why? Part of the problem is that visitors from overseas have been confused by the new procedures for entering our country. Foreign visitors also say they don't think we are making much of an effort to attract international travelers. That is costing communities across our country billions of dollars in lost revenue. In fact, one study suggested over \$182 billion has been lost since September 11, 2001.

In my State of Colorado, the travel and tourism industry is a strong economic engine. It is one we have to keep strong and in which we have to invest. Part of that is in changing the perception that the United States is not interested in hosting foreign tourists. That is the point of this legislation. The legislation before us would help revive international travel to the United States so we can get that economic engine revved up to its full capacity.

The purpose of the bill is to sell travel to the United States to overseas tourists, including areas that are not well-known destinations. Of course, the Presiding Officer's State is also a place where we want to attract people to its wonderful beaches and wonderful historical sites in the great State of Delaware.

Let me tell you quickly some of the details in this legislation. It would establish a Corporation for Travel Promotion which would be an independent,

nonprofit corporation governed by an 11-member board that the Secretary of Commerce would appoint. It would create an Office of Travel Promotion in the Department of Commerce to develop the programs to increase the number of international visitors to the United States. And it would set up a travel promotion fund which would be financed by private-public matching dollars. Much of the cost would be borne by international travelers who would pay a \$10 fee collected through the electronic system for travel authorization.

Other countries are spending billions of dollars on travel promotions. Those of us who sponsored this legislation and hopefully will vote for it overwhelmingly at the end of this week think we should stay competitive with other countries. The Travel Promotion Act would directly contribute to the economic recovery of our travel and tourism industry. It would spur job growth, and it would contribute to the tax base of local, regional, and State governments, many of which are forced to make, as we know all too well, drastic cuts in this tough economic time.

As well, before I close, I wish to mention that there are nonfinancial benefits to international travel as well. I wish to quote that great American Mark Twain. He said:

Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness.

America's image in the world, as we know, has suffered greatly over the past several years, but travel to our country, to America, is one of our most effective tools of public diplomacy. Studies have shown over and over that when people come to our country, they return home with a very positive view of not just our country as it is described in the books but the landscapes and the people and the way we live our lives. In addition to helping strengthen our economy, this bill would strengthen our place in the world.

I end by thanking and acknowledging the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, the ranking member, Senator HUTCHISON, and Senator DORGAN for quickly bringing this legislation to the floor. I look forward to the passage of the Travel Promotion Act so we can continue to get travel and tourism and, of course, our economy back on track.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, once tourists come to West Virginia, they often return. From the Appalachian Trail to the Monongahela National Forest, the beauty of our State is unparalleled and our people are welcoming.

Tourism in West Virginia also creates jobs. As a result, our State spends money to promote West Virginia in the surrounding States as a tourist destination. But we surely would welcome more international tourists as well.

Increasing overseas travel and tourism is a shovel-ready economic stim-

ulus that will create thousands of jobs across the country—including West Virginia. With the dollar at a low compared to other currencies, America is a bargain. We are open and ready for business. Unfortunately, the rest of the world doesn't know it.

Compared to other countries, the United States fails to effectively advertise and promote itself overseas as a tourism destination. In 1992, the United States attracted 9.4 percent of all international tourists; in 2007, the United States attracted only 6.8 percent. Since 2000, the United States' share of international travelers has declined by 20 percent.

Meanwhile, the rest of the world is promoting itself—often employing the best Madison Avenue techniques used for marketing heart medications and luxury cars. We all see enticing television advertisements to visit Italy, Greece, Jamaica, Ireland, Canada, Australia and Brazil. But few residents of those countries see advertisements enticing them to come to the United States—and to spend their money in the United States.

If the United States had simply kept pace with global travel trends, 58 million more overseas travelers would have visited the United States between 2000 and 2008. Those travelers would have generated 245,000 tourism jobs in 2008 alone.

The average overseas visitor to the United States spends \$4,500 per visit. That means every 23,000 overseas visitors pump \$100 million into the U.S. economy.

We have spent billions of dollars to prevent the collapse of industries and billions of dollars to put people to work. But today, through the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, just \$10 million will plant the seeds for leveraging private sector investment to increase the number of U.S.-based tourism jobs.

Americans always have had a healthy skepticism about the role of government—what it should do and what it shouldn't do. To promote travel and tourism, we have long thought that the private sector—the companies that make money from tourism—should promote themselves. And some of the larger private sector players have promoted their specific interests overseas.

But a private sector effort to fund a general "Come to America" campaign targeting overseas travelers has never fully materialized. When a resort or theme park spends advertising money overseas, they want the viewers to visit their destination, not just the United States. Some of our larger States promote themselves overseas. But, as you would expect, the advertisements entice foreigners to visit their States.

As a result, potential tourists overseas may not be aware that the United States has far more to offer than California, New York, and Florida. They likely have never heard of hiking, rafting, or fishing in the mountains of West Virginia. For anyone who has not

enjoyed those activities in my State, you are really missing something special.

Because the hotels and tourist destinations of States like West Virginia cannot effectively launch their own international promotional campaigns, we must find a mechanism to pool and leverage resources so that these States become part of the international tourism economy.

After the terrorist attacks of 2001, the subsequent security measures deterred overseas tourists. Many of those entry problems have been corrected now. But the negative perception still remains. Potential foreign tourists still are reluctant to deal with what they believe will be a difficult time entering the United States. No private sector company—and certainly not the hotels and tourist destinations in the States I have mentioned—will spend their own money to promote the improved process for entering the United States. Only a national, coordinated campaign—with some help from the Federal Government—can accomplish that goal.

We have occasionally appropriated one-shot advertising campaigns to promote the United States overseas. But the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 will create a sustained and stable public-private sector partnership in which Federal seed money is leveraged to increase private investment to promote tourism overseas.

The bill would establish a travel promotion fund that is capitalized by a \$10 fee paid by foreign travelers from visa-waiver countries. The bill would require the travel industry to match those contributions—50 percent in 2011 and 100 percent thereafter. The fund would receive \$10 million in Federal seed money for 2010. The new fee for foreign travelers would cumulatively provide the means to lure them to the United States, but is too small to have any impact on an individual's decision whether to come to the United States.

The funds would be used for overseas advertising campaigns to promote travel to the United States, including to areas not traditionally visited by overseas tourists. More importantly, the advertising campaigns would educate potential foreign travelers about U.S. visa and entry policies. Removing fears about entering the United States would dramatically increase tourism among overseas residents who might consider a range of vacation choices. If foreign tourists better understand U.S. entry and visa policies, the more likely it is that they will come to the United States—and the more likely it is that they will spend their money here, creating the jobs we so desperately need.

Drug companies and luxury automakers spend billions of dollars on advertising for one reason: it works. The State of Florida estimates that its own State travel promotion campaign returns \$3 in increased sales tax revenue for every dollar spent on promotion. The countries advertising foreign tourist destinations on American television

every night would not spend the money to do it but for one reason: it works. The United States—with so many spectacular destinations—must embark on its own worldwide promotion program because it will work.

A sustained and stable tourism promotion program is a small investment that will generate huge dividends when foreign tourists spend their money in the United States, generating jobs and local revenue. Foreigners visiting the first time have the potential to become repeat visitors and will tell their friends to visit as well.

In addition to stimulating jobs, we will improve America's image around the world through tourism. People who visit the United States are more likely to have a favorable opinion of America when they return home. Developing that kind of good will in a changing world makes travel promotion worthwhile.

I would like to thank the sponsors of this bill: Senator DORGAN, Senator INOUE, Senator REID, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator BEGICH, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator BENNET, Senator UDALL of New Mexico, Senator UDALL of Colorado, Senator ENSIGN, Senator MARTINEZ, and Senator VITTER.

America is open for business. The people who work in our tourism industries are ready to work. Now we need to tell the world.●

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on vote No. 208, had I been present for the vote, I would have voted aye on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed on the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, S. 1023.

JEFFERSON AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor this year's winners of the annual Jefferson Award for Public Service and particularly four winners from my home State of Delaware.

The Jefferson Awards were created in 1972 to serve as a kind of Nobel Prize for voluntarism and community service in America. Named for our third President, whose embodiment of our Nation's spirit of community and service continues to inspire, these awards are presented annually for both national and State winners.

The mission of the State Jefferson Awards is to recognize unsung heroes in our communities who give their time and their care in service to others. On the national level, Jefferson Awards are bestowed upon those who have contributed significantly to advancing these principles. Past winners include Colin Powell, Bill and Melinda Gates, Oprah Winfrey, and Sandra Day O'Connor.

This year, four outstanding Delawareans have won Jefferson Awards. They have contributed to voluntarism in the "First State" through innovative programs and a dedication to inspiring their fellow citizens to service.

Elaine Chester, of Wilmington, has won a Jefferson Award for creating a program through the Delaware Divi-

sion of Family Services to help low-income children receive new, wrapped holiday gifts. She matched local children in need with Delmarva Power employees interested in sending gifts.

Over the last few years, under Elaine's leadership, this program has expanded to become one of the largest corporate gift drives in Delaware. It benefits hundreds of children annually, including those who are terminally ill. Since its expansion to nursing homes, the elderly now receive gifts from Delmarva Power employees as well.

Leonard Young, also of Wilmington, earned his Jefferson Award for his tireless promotion of public health and wellness initiatives. His encouragement of others to get regular preventive health screenings has led many Delawareans to incorporate healthy living into their daily routines.

Leonard has spent a great number of hours educating youth about the dangers of substance abuse and how to prevent violent behavior in relationships. He is a leader in the community, and his involvement in various public health endeavors is far-reaching.

I am especially proud that this year's national winner of the Jefferson Award for Outstanding Service by a High School is the Salesianum School in Wilmington, DE. Its efforts were led by two seniors, Robert Liszkiewicz and Dominic Taglione.

The two led their classmates in an effort to increase youth voluntarism, and they gave their time to mentoring local students, volunteering with the Blue/Gold Foundation for Delawareans with intellectual disabilities, and helping at the local Ronald McDonald House for families with children undergoing medical treatment. The efforts of Robert, Dominic, and their fellow students at Salesianum have established a lasting program for youth voluntarism based on the principles of the Jefferson Awards.

I am privileged to have the opportunity to meet Elaine, Leonard, Robert, and Dominic at a Senate reception today honoring Jefferson Award winners from across the country. I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating their achievements, their commitment to serving local communities, and their embodiment of that greatest American quality of service above self.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRANIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as Chairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commis-

sion, which has had decades of experience monitoring election and promoting democracy and human rights, I would like to take a moment to speak on a troubling matter that has filled headlines around the world in the last few days.

We have all seen the images. Violence and mass protests are erupting across Iran following the hasty vote count of a deeply flawed presidential election process in that country. Yet another unfortunate chapter is unfolding before our eyes that reinforces Iran's record as a police state and totalitarian regime more concerned with keeping its tight grip on power than yielding to the will of the people.

I stand with President Obama calling for the government to exercise restraint and the violence to end. Regrettably, at least seven people have been killed and countless others injured. We may never know the true results of this election, given the lack of international monitoring. But what we do know is that in the last few days we have witnessed tens of thousands of Iranians raise their voices in protest to ensure that their vote meant something.

On Friday, voters in Iran lined up in unprecedented numbers to choose their next president. I, like many others, was dismayed on Saturday to hear the ruling clerics rush to announce that Mahmoud Ahmadinejad had won reelection by a large margin. Regardless of the limited official scope of his duties, President Ahmadinejad's consistent pattern of noxious remarks and his belligerent attitude inject understandable tension around the Middle East and beyond. He has used the presidential podium to instigate conflict with the international community, pursue acquisition of nuclear weapons, and spew hatred and intolerance toward Israel and the United States.

I cannot say and will not say what could have been or should have been if any other candidate was elected, but there is no doubt whatsoever as to Ahmadinejad's unfitness as a leader.

Equally troubling were the almost immediate reports coming from Tehran and elsewhere around Iran that there were deep flaws in this election. Elections do not equal democracy, nor do they guarantee that the will of the people will be reflected in their government. But this was not a free and fair election from the start.

In Iranian Presidential elections, only a select group of candidates approved by a 12-person Council of Guardians are eligible to run. The Iranian regime, headed by Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, continues to severely restrict civil liberties including freedom of speech, expression, assembly, and association. Freedom to discuss ideas without threat of oppression is a fundamental human right that is essential to a government truly reflecting the will of its people. This freedom is absent in Iran. Typically, Iranian elections and public expressions are

carefully monitored and manipulated by the ruling regime to prevent challenges to their authority.

The last few days seem somewhat different. The tens of thousands of people lining the streets of Tehran—in an incredible rebuttal to the ruling powers—want to know that the votes they did cast are counted properly. The deliberate lack of transparency in the vote tabulation and the blatant attempts to block mass communications among citizens, particularly youth, are too glaring to ignore. Even Supreme Leader Khamenei has been forced to backtrack on his immediate approval of the results and has called for at least the appearance of a recount in some disputed areas.

Americans know something about wanting to have their votes counted accurately. The difference between our two nations: when the results of a U.S. election were in dispute, the world spotlight shined bright on the process and the people involved in resolving the conflict—peacefully. Transparency and openness is not a hallmark of Iranian elections.

Even before the presidential election took place, Iran's totalitarian regime blocked personal communications like texting and access to the Internet. Media have been confined to Tehran, if they haven't been asked to leave the country. The regime's ongoing attempts to curtail communication and silence protests—often with brutal force—demonstrate the regime's fear of losing a grip on power.

Allegations of a fraudulent vote count are a symptom of a regime that has survived by an authoritarian power structure that oppresses its people. On June 12, the people of Iran did not vote for the Supreme Leader of their country. Under the current system, the Supreme Leader and his supporters will continue to dictate policy to the President of Iran, regardless of who that president is and whatever policy decisions the president is authorized to make.

The people of Iran want their voices to be heard and they should be assured that the world is listening. I urge those in power in Iran also to listen and implement the reforms necessary to allow the will of the people to be expressed.

I look forward to a future when the people of Iran have an opportunity for a free and fair election of leaders of their choosing. It is my sincere hope that one day this vision will be realized, and the voice of the Iranian people will truly be heard.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAITI REFORESTATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in December 2008, Senator BINGAMAN, Congressman MEEK, and I visited Haiti. We went to see the public health, economic, environmental, and political situation in that impoverished Caribbean nation.

We traveled for hours into rural Haiti to the town of Cange to observe the incredible work being done by Partners in Health providing AIDS treatment and teaching mothers with newborns how to purify water.

We visited a school in Cite de Solei—a teeming slum in the capital Port au Prince—where Father Hagan and the organization Hands Together is providing schooling and meals for some of Haiti's most vulnerable children.

Unfortunately, despite these programs and the efforts of U.N. peacekeeping forces to bring some measure of security, the living conditions for average Haitians remain desperate: It is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, with nearly 80 percent of its population out of work; one-half of its 8.2 million people live in extreme poverty; Haiti's infant mortality rate is the highest in our hemisphere; 1 in 10 children dies before the age of 5 due to malnutrition; the HIV/AIDS situation in Haiti is among the most frightening in the world; the average life expectancy of a citizen of Haiti is 61 years, the lowest in the region.

To add to these already desperate conditions, Haiti has been devastated in recent years by tropical storms and hurricanes. In 2004, Hurricane Jeanne struck Haiti, killing nearly 3,000 residents, and displacing over 200,000 more.

Last year, the island of Hispaniola, which Haiti shares with the Dominican Republic, was hit by four major storms. These storms caused massive flooding and landslides that cut off land routes and hampered the delivery of aid to its desperate citizens. Nearly 800 Haitians lost their lives and as many as 1 million were left homeless.

The world quickly responded to these catastrophes with millions of dollars worth of emergency food aid and disaster assistance. The United States alone provided \$29 million in aid. This assistance helped Haiti cope with these immediate challenges.

But one of the underlying causes of this devastation—and contributor to Haiti's larger challenge with poverty and disease—is the deforestation of the country's once plentiful tropical forests.

This satellite image provided by NASA shows the stark difference be-

tween the amount of forest cover in Haiti and the Dominican Republic—countries that share the same island.

The black line shows the border between the two nations. When you look at the lush green of the Dominican Republic and compare it to the stark desolation on Haiti's side of the border, it is easy to see why Haiti is so much more vulnerable than the Dominican Republic to the devastating effects of soil erosion, landslides, and flooding.

It was not always that way. In fact, 85 years ago Haiti's tropical forest covered 60 percent of the country. Today less than 2 percent of those forests remain. In the past 5 years, the deforestation rate has accelerated by more than 20 percent.

Some 30 million trees are cut down every year in Haiti. This staggering level of deforestation happens because 60 percent of the population of Haiti relies on charcoal produced from cutting down trees for cooking fuel and two-thirds rely on inefficient, small-scale subsistence farming for survival.

While understandable, this deforestation has had terrible, unintended consequences. The soil erosion that has resulted from cutting down all of these trees has had the perverse effect of substantially reducing Haiti's already scarce agricultural land and leaving what remains less productive.

This soil erosion also makes the island more vulnerable to floods and mudslides like the ones that devastated the country last year. The reality of this effect is that far more Haitians than Dominicans lost their lives and their homes during last year's storms.

Haiti's tropical forests, if protected and re-grown, would fight the destructive effects of soil erosion. Saving old and growing new tropical forests would help protect Haiti's freshwater sources from contaminants, safeguard Haiti's remaining irrigable land, and save lives during hurricane season. Helping Haiti deal with its deforestation is something we can help do.

Today, Senator BROWNBACK joins me in introducing the Haiti Reforestation Act of 2009 in an effort to attack this deforestation. The bill aims to end within 5 years deforestation in Haiti and restore within 30 years the extent of tropical forest cover in existence in Haiti in 1990.

While it is important to start putting trees in the ground, this bill is about more than just planting trees. Our government has tried that approach in the past and has failed miserably.

This bill brings the expertise of the both the US AID and the International Programs Office of the US Department of Agriculture's Forest Service to help Haiti manage in a measurable, verifiable, and reportable way its conservation and reforestation efforts. It does this in three ways.

First, the bill empowers these agencies to work with the Haitian Government to develop Haiti-appropriate forest-management ideas that can be implemented in an incremental way.

Second, the bill seeks to bring to Haiti market-based reforestation projects that have been successful in other regions of the world. These projects are successful because they share certain characteristics. They: secure the cooperation and engagement of local communities and organizations; provide incentives to protect trees through sustainable, yet income-generating growth; and provide hands-on management and oversight of replanting efforts.

Conservation groups such as Planting Empowerment, which is doing just this type of work in Panama, provide a model of success and this bill will encourage such groups to bring their efforts to Haiti.

Third, the bill expands the ability of conservation groups to work with the Haitian Government and international creditors to trade Haiti's international debt for revenue in what are known as debt-for-nature swaps.

Groups such as Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund, and The Nature Conservancy have successfully used this mechanism globally to save other tropical forests—this bill will encourage such groups to bring their efforts to Haiti.

Preservation of what remains of Haiti's tropical forest, and helping re-grow some of what has been lost, has numerous benefits for all of us, not just for Haiti. Tropical forests: play a critical role as carbon sinks to reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere; harbor a major portion of the Earth's biological and terrestrial resources; and provide habitats for an estimated 10 to 30 million plant and animal species, including species essential to medical research and agricultural productivity.

But attacking the desperate effect of deforestation in Haiti is the main purpose of this bill. As Haiti's Prime Minister, Michèle Pierre-Louis, recently said:

The whole country is facing an ecological disaster. We cannot keep going on like this. We are going to disappear one day. There will not be 400, 500 or 1,000 deaths [from hurricanes]. There are going to be a million deaths.

We must act to ensure that that day never comes. I urge my colleagues to support the Haiti Reforestation Act of 2009.

234TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, on June 14, we celebrate the 234th birthday of the U.S. Army. For more than two centuries, the Army has fought to preserve the principles of democracy both here in the United States and around the globe.

It was 234 years ago today that the U.S. Army was established to defend our Nation. From the Revolutionary War to operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, our soldiers have served with honor and a deep commitment to our Nation's core values and beliefs.

In 1946, during an Army Day speech in Chicago, GEN Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

This day of tribute to the men and women of the United States Army is a day of national rededication to the ideals they served so well. The Army believes in strength without arrogance; in firmness without discourtesy; in loyalty without servility. It lives with pride in its cherished traditions of service to our commander-in-chief and to the people to whom it belongs.

This quote is as true today as it was then. Our all-volunteer force has performed superbly during these challenging times and has lived up to and exceeded our greatest expectations.

This Army birthday is special because it is also the Year of the Non Commissioned Officer. Since 1775, the Army has set apart its NCOs from other enlisted soldiers by distinctive insignia of grade.

Throughout the Army's history, the noncommissioned officer corps has distinguished itself as the world's most accomplished group of military professionals. Historical and daily accounts of life as an NCO are exemplified by acts of courage and a dedication and a willingness to do whatever it takes to complete the mission.

I also pay tribute to the families of our Army soldiers who give so much of their lives for our Nation. The important role families play is vital to the Army's success. They have our Nation's deepest appreciation for the support and devotion they provide to our men and women in uniform.

Today I wish to celebrate the strength of our Nation and the strength of our Army by saluting our noncommissioned officer corps and the Army's soldiers, families and civilians by wishing them a happy 234th birthday!

THANKS TO BERMUDA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Thursday Bermuda welcomed to freedom four men who had been wrongly detained at Guantanamo Bay for more than 7 years. The men are ethnic Uighurs—a minority group from western China that has long suffered discrimination and oppression by China's Government. Their release is welcome news—our own Federal courts had cleared them for release, as did both the Bush and Obama administrations. Bermudian Prime Minister Dr. Ewart Brown and the Bermudian people have done a humanitarian service, and should be praised for it.

I strongly support President Obama's decision to close Guantanamo, which became a rallying cry for al-Qaida and other terrorist groups seeking recruits. I am disappointed that the United States did not find a way to resettle the Uighurs here, as there are Uighur communities in several States that would have welcomed them and helped them become productive members of society. It would also have been an important gesture to other countries that

we are asking to accept Guantanamo detainees. All the more reason that we should offer our sincere thanks to Bermuda for helping to put this sorry episode behind us.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COMMENDING THE GATTON ACADEMY OF MATH AND SCIENCE

• Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, I would like to take this time to congratulate the Gatton Academy of Math and Science in Bowling Green, KY.

Newsweek magazine recently published a list of schools recognized for challenging students. Separate from the top 1,500 public high schools in the country, Newsweek magazine published its list of 15 schools known as the Public Elites. The Gatton Academy of Math and Science was one of the distinguished 15 members of this list and marks the first time a school from Kentucky has earned a spot among the Public Elites.

The Gatton Academy of Math and Science is a selected group of high school juniors and seniors from around Kentucky who attend the Western Kentucky University. Their selection is based on test scores, grades, and submitted essays. Students in the program earn college credit at the Western Kentucky University in addition to completing their high school education.

As a supporter of education, I appreciate the opportunity to recognize the performance of this great educational facility.●

COMMENDING NORTH OLDHAM HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, I would like to take this time to congratulate North Oldham High School in Goshen, KY.

Newsweek magazine recently published a list of the top 1,500 public schools in the country. The 15 schools that made the list from Kentucky rank among the top 6 percent of public schools in the Nation. What is even more impressive is that Kentucky had three more schools ranked this year than in 2008, showing improvement in our State's schools. Placing as one of 15 schools from Kentucky on this list, North Oldham High School has earned national recognition for the fine performance of its students and faculty.

I am proud of the students of North Oldham High School. Their commitment to education is a fine example for the entire Commonwealth, and I take pride in recognizing them on the floor of the Senate.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF REVILLO, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Revillo, SD. Founded in 1884, the town of Revillo will celebrate its 125th anniversary this year.

Located in Grant County, Revillo possesses the strong sense of community that makes South Dakota such an outstanding place to live and work. Throughout its rich history, Revillo has continued to be a strong reflection of South Dakota's greatest values and traditions. The city of Revillo has much to be proud of and I am confident that Revillo's success will continue well into the future.

The town of Revillo will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding with celebrations held on June 19 thru June 21. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Revillo on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ELK POINT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Elk Point, SD. Founded in 1859, the city of Elk Point will celebrate its 150th anniversary this year.

Located in Union County, Elk Point serves as the county seat. The name Elk Point originates from the Lewis and Clark expedition campsite near present day Elk Point. As one of South Dakota's oldest communities, Elk Point possesses a rich history that continues to be a strong reflection of South Dakota's greatest values and traditions. The city of Elk Point has much to be proud of and I am confident that Elk Point's success will continue well into the future.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Elk Point on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF McLAUGHLIN, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize McLaughlin, SD. Founded in 1909, the city of McLaughlin will celebrate its 100th anniversary this year.

Named after COL James McLaughlin, the city of McLaughlin is located in Corson County. McLaughlin possesses the strong sense of community that makes South Dakota a great place to work and live. Throughout its rich history, McLaughlin has continued to be a strong reflection of South Dakota's greatest values and traditions. The city of McLaughlin has much to be proud of and I am confident that McLaughlin's success will continue well into the future.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of McLaughlin on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEBANON, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Lebanon, SD. Founded in

1884, the town of Lebanon will celebrate its 125th anniversary this year.

Located in Potter County, Lebanon possesses the strong sense of community that makes South Dakota such an outstanding place to live and work. Throughout its rich history, Lebanon has continued to be a strong reflection of South Dakota's greatest values and traditions. The city of Lebanon has much to be proud of and I am confident that Lebanon's success will continue well into the future.

The town of Lebanon will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding with celebrations held on June 20 and June 21. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Lebanon on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:14 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1256. An act to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make certain modifications in the Thrift Savings Plan, the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Federal Employees' Retirement System, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. REID).

At 2:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 729. An act to help keep students safe on school-run, overnight, off-premises field trips.

H.R. 2325. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Matamoros Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "Laredo Veterans Post Office".

H.R. 2422. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 2300 Scenic Drive in Georgetown, Texas, as the "Kile G. West Post Office Building".

H.R. 2661. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for violations of section 119 (relating to protection of individuals performing certain official duties), and for other purposes.

H.R. 2765. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments and certain foreign judgments against the providers of interactive computer services.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 615. An act to provide additional personnel authorities for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 729. An act to help keep students safe on school-run, overnight, off-premises field trips; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2325. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Matamoros Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "Laredo Veterans Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2422. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2300 Scenic Drive in Georgetown, Texas, as the "Kile G. West Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H. R. 2661. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for violations of section 119 (relating to protection of individuals performing certain official duties), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2765. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments and certain foreign judgments against the providers of interactive computer services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-47. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana urging Congress to take such actions as are necessary to maintain the current incentives for the exploration and production of domestic oil and natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas, Louisiana is a key energy state where over three hundred twenty thousand Louisianians are employed in the energy sector, and these jobs support over twelve billion dollars a year in household income; and

Whereas, these jobs are from numerous small businesses and include welders, pipe fitters, barge workers, and engineers, and an estimated fifty thousand indirect workers support the energy sector; and

Whereas, the current federal budget proposal includes eight separate tax hikes on the energy economy totaling over thirty billion dollars, new fees on energy leases in the Gulf of Mexico, excise taxes on Gulf production, and also repeals several important tax incentives for Louisiana energy producers; and

Whereas, ninety percent of domestic oil and natural gas wells are developed by small, independent businesses that would encounter a devastating impact from any change in policy to reduce incentives; and

Whereas, these tax increases also reduce our nation's energy security by discouraging new investment in domestic oil and natural gas production and refining capacity and pushing those investments abroad; and

Whereas, a reduction in incentives would reduce the amount of domestically produced natural gas and deprive the American people of a clean energy source. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to maintain the current incentives for the exploration and production of domestic oil and natural gas. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-48. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana urging Congress to take such actions as are necessary to appropriate funds specifically for the storm-proofing of interior pump stations in the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 51

Whereas, in 2006, the United States Congress, under the Flood Control and Coastal Emergency Act, appropriated two hundred fifty million dollars for storm-proofing interior pump stations in the Greater New Orleans area in order to ensure the operability of the stations during hurricanes, storms, and high water events; and

Whereas, four years after hurricanes Katrina and Rita, only pump stations in the parishes of Jefferson and Orleans have been storm-proofed pursuant to this appropriation; and

Whereas, it is the belief of the public that the pump stations in the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines have not been storm-proofed because the Corps of Engineers underestimated the cost of the storm-proofing and, therefore, interpreted the "Greater New Orleans area" to include only the parishes of Jefferson and Orleans; and

Whereas, storm-proofing interior pump stations in the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines is desperately needed in order to ensure the operability of the stations as well as to provide safe housing for personnel required to remain on duty to operate the pump stations during hurricanes, storms, and high water events. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to appropriate funds specifically for the storm-proofing of interior pump stations in the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. AKAKA, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 669. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under

which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes (Rept. No. 111-27).

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 153. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the restitution of or compensation for property seized during the Nazi and Communist eras.

S. Res. 182. A resolution recognizing the democratic accomplishments of the people of Albania and expressing the hope that the parliamentary elections on June 28, 2009, maintain and improve the transparency and fairness of democracy in Albania.

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals and objectives of the Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Andrew J. Shapiro, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs).

*Eric P. Schwartz, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

*Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Coordinator for Threat Reduction Programs.

*Ellen O. Tauscher, of California, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

*Kurt M. Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

*Eric P. Goosby, of California, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally.

Nominee: Eric Paul Goosby.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: Eric Goosby.

Spouse: Nancy Truelove.

US Congresswoman Barbara Lee, California: \$100 USD (2006) \$100 USD (2007) \$50 USD (2008) \$100 USD (2009)

Mayor Ron Dellums, Oakland, California: \$200 USD (2007)

Hillary R. Clinton Presidential Candidate: \$200 USD (2007-08) \$100 USD (2009—debt fund)

Barack Obama Presidential Candidate: \$300 USD (2008)

Woody Myers, MD Congressional Candidate, Indiana's 7th District: \$100 USD (2008)
US Congressman Jessie Jackson for Congress, Illinois: \$500 USD x 2 (est 2004-5)

2. Children: Eric N. Goosby; Zoe A. Goosby: no contributions.

3. Parents: Zuretti L. Goosby, Sr.: deceased 2000; no contributions.

Jackie I. Goosby—2005-2009 contributions: Jane Morrison for DCCC—\$100 USD (2005); Barack Obama—\$50 USD (2008); Eric Mar for San Francisco Supervisor—\$35 USD; Obama Victory Fund—\$250 USD (2008); San Francisco Democratic Party—\$100 USD (2006-07); Barbara Lee for Congress—\$100 USD (2007-08); John Burton Children Without Homes—\$50 USD (2005); Ursula Reed, San Leandro City Council—\$75 USD (2007); Washington DC, Martin Luther King Jr. National Memo-

rial; Project Foundation, Inc.—\$150 USD (2006-07); Friends of Barbara Boxer—\$200 USD (2008); Hillary R. Clinton Campaign—\$50 USD (2008); Nancy Pelosi—\$200 USD (2006-08); Maxwell for San Francisco Board of Supervisor—\$50 USD; Maxwell for San Francisco Board of Supervisors—\$50 USD; Jane Morrison for DCCC (SF City and County Community College Board—\$100 USD; Sue Bierman for DCCC (SF City and County Community College Board—\$100 USD; San Francisco Democratic Party—\$135 USD; Dianne Feinstein (Senator, California)—\$100 USD; John Burton (California State Senator) Children Without Homes Fund—\$50 USD; Kamala Harris for San Francisco District Attorney—\$100 USD; Tom Ammann—\$50 USD; Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman, San Francisco—\$300 USD; Hillary R. Clinton Debt Fund—\$50 USD; Obama Presidential Campaign—\$50 USD (2008); John Burton, Children Without Homes Fund—\$100 USD; Hillary R. Clinton Presidential Campaign—\$100 USD (2008).

Grandparents: maternal and paternal grandparents died: no contributions > 4 yrs. Paternal Grandfather: Felix Goosby, died 1966.

Paternal Grandmother: Eva Goosby, died 1978.

Maternal Grandmother: Nola Smith, died 1988 (est).

Maternal Grandfather: not known, died 1962 (est).

5. Brothers and Spouses: Kevin R. Goosby: No contributions > 4 yrs; Zuretti L. Goosby; Brenda Goosby (wife).

Obama Presidential Campaign < \$2Q0.00, estimate (2008); (they are on extended travel for the next 3 weeks and I am unable to confirm, but I do not think it is above \$200 USD going back to 2004)

6. Sisters: None

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Marvin F. Burgos and ending with Stephen Alan Cristina, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2009. (minus 1 nominee: Terence Jones)

By Mr. LIEBERMAN for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Jeffrey D. Zients, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1267. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide grants to establish or expand quality programs providing home visitation for low-income pregnant women and low-income families with young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the additional standard deduction for real property taxes for nonitemizers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1269. A bill to provide for enhanced foodborne illness surveillance and food safety capacity, to establish regional food safety centers of excellence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1270. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1271. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to add certain segments to the Rogue River designation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1272. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild or recreation rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1273. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of permanent national surveillance systems for multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases and disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1274. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to ensure that the prohibition on disclosure of maritime transportation security information is not used inappropriately to shield certain other information from public disclosure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1275. A bill to establish a National Foundation on Physical Fitness and Sports to carry out activities to support and supplement the mission of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1276. A bill to require investment advisers to private funds, including hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, and others to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Res. 185. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month and National Memory Screening Day, including the development of a national health policy on dementia screening and care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. Res. 186. A resolution condemning the murder of Army Private William Andrew "Andy" Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas on June 1, 2009; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Con. Res. 28. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals of Smart Irrigation Month, which recognizes the advances in irrigation technology and practices that help raise healthy plants and increase crop yields while using water resources more efficiently and encourages the adoption of smart irrigation practices throughout the United States to further improve water-use efficiency in agricultural, residential, and commercial activities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. Con. Res. 29. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that John Arthur "Jack" Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historic significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 148

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. KAUFMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to restore the rule that agreements between manufacturers and retailers, distributors, or wholesalers to set the minimum price below which the manufacturer's product or service cannot be sold violates the Sherman Act.

S. 211

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral on human services and volunteer services, and for other purposes.

S. 244

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 244, a bill to expand programs of early childhood home visitation that increase school readiness, child abuse and neglect prevention, and early identification of developmental and health delays, including potential mental health concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations,

statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 497, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize capitation grants to increase the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce cost-sharing under part D of such title for certain non-institutionalized full-benefit dual eligible individuals.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the manner in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is audited by the Comptroller General of the United States and the manner in which such audits are reported, and for other purposes.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for reimbursement of certified midwife services and to provide for more equitable reimbursement rates for certified nurse-midwife services.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 663, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Merchant Mariner Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II.

S. 686

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to advise Congress and the Secretary of

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with the profession of social work, to authorize the Secretary to make grants to support recruitment for, and retention, research, and reinvestment in, the profession, and for other purposes.

S. 750

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 750, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to attract and retain trained health care professionals and direct care workers dedicated to providing quality care to the growing population of older Americans.

S. 756

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to provide for prostate cancer imaging research and education.

S. 795

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 795, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to enhance the social security of the Nation by ensuring adequate public-private infrastructure and to resolve to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions.

S. 823

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. 823, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a 5-year carryback of operating losses, and for other purposes.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Muhammad Yunus, in recognition of his contributions to the fight against global poverty.

S. 908

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 962, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to promote an enhanced strategic partnership with Pakistan and its people, and for other purposes.

S. 984

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1023, a bill to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

S. 1026

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1026, a bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve procedures for the collection and delivery of marked absentee ballots of absent overseas uniformed service voters, and for other purposes.

S. 1052

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1052, a bill to amend the small, rural school achievement program and the rural and low-income school program under part B of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to provide for credit rating reforms, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into agreements with States to resolve outstanding claims for reimbursement under the Medicare program relating to the Special Disability Workload project.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools, including early learning facilities at the elementary schools.

S. 1131

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1131, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain high cost Medicare beneficiaries suffering from multiple chronic conditions with access to coordinated, primary care medical services in lower cost treatment settings, such as their residences, under a plan of care developed by a team of qualified and experienced health care professionals.

S. 1135

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to establish a voluntary program in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to encourage consumers to trade-in older vehicles for more fuel efficient vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to improve transit services, including in rural States.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to improve end-of-life care.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1153, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided health coverage for employees' spouses and dependent children to coverage provided to other eligible designated beneficiaries of employees.

S. 1155

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the position of Director of Physician Assistant Services within the office of the Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for health.

S. 1157

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1157, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program.

S. 1230

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1230, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a Federal income tax credit for certain home purchases.

S. 1235

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to amend the Public Health Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from holding ownership interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1244

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1244, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers, to provide for a performance standard for breast pumps, and to provide tax incentives to encourage breastfeeding.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1259

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1259, a bill to protect all patients by prohibiting the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny coverage of items or services under Federal health care programs and to ensure that comparative effectiveness research accounts for advancements in personalized medicine and differences in patient treatment response.

S. 1265

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mr. JOHANN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1265, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide members of the Armed Forces and their family members equal access to voter registration assistance, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 11

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 11, a concurrent resolution condemning all forms of anti-Semitism and reaffirming the support of Congress for the mandate of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. KERRY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 23, a concurrent resolution supporting the goals and objectives of the Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

S. CON. RES. 24

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 24, a concurrent resolution to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place a marker in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center which acknowledges the role that slave labor played in the construction of the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 25, a concurrent resolution recognizing the value and benefits that community health centers provide as health care homes for over 18,000,000 individuals, and the importance of enabling health centers and other safety net providers to continue to offer accessible, affordable, and continuous care to their current patients and to every American who lacks access to preventive and primary care services.

S. CON. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator

from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 26, a concurrent resolution apologizing for the enslavement and racial segregation of African Americans.

S. RES. 153

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 153, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the restitution of or compensation for property seized during the Nazi and Communist eras.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1270. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, part of my job as a Senator from a beautiful State like Oregon is to keep that beauty protected for the next generation of Oregonians. Today it is my pleasure to introduce three bills to add environmental protections for three of Oregon's special natural resources. I have introduced two of these bills before. The Oregon Caves National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009 and the Lower Rogue Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 2009 were introduced in 2008 but unfortunately there was not an opportunity to move them beyond the Energy Committee. This year, I look forward to moving these two bills forward to final passage, along with a third bill, the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Act of 2009. I am pleased to introduce two of these bills with my colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY. My colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative DEFAZIO, will also be introducing companion legislation today, joined by Representatives Blumenauer and Wu.

The first bill I am introducing, S. 1270, the Oregon Caves National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009, will expand the boundary of the National Park Service land to create the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve. Under this bill, the stunning majesty of both the underground and the above-ground treasures found at this National Monument site will be protected for future generations.

Established by a Presidential Proclamation in 1909, the Oregon Caves National Monument is a 480-acre natural wonder located in the botanically-rich Siskiyou Mountains. It was originally set aside because of its unusual scientific interest and importance. Oregon Caves has a unique geologic history and is particularly known as the longest marble cave open to the public west of the Continental Divide.

A perennial stream, the “River Styx”—an underground portion of Cave Creek—flows through part of the cave and is one of the dynamic natural forces at work in the National Monument. The cave ecosystem provides habitat for numerous plants and animals, including some state-sensitive species such as Townsend’s big-eared bats and several cave-adapted species of arthropods found only in one place on Earth: the Oregon Caves. The caves possess a significant collection of Pleistocene aged fossils, including jaguar and grizzly bear. In 1995, grizzly bear bones found in the cave were estimated to be at least 50,000 years old, the oldest known from either North or South America.

Today, I am proposing legislation that will enhance the protection for treasures such as these found within the Oregon Caves National Monument and that will increase public recreation opportunities by adding surrounding lands to the National Park Service site. My bill would expand the park site by 4,084 acres to include the entire Cave Creek Watershed, and transfer management of the land from the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service. The newly acquired lands will be designated as a Preserve so that hunters can still use them. In addition, my legislation would designate at least 9.6 miles of rivers and tributaries as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational, under the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, including the first subterranean Wild and Scenic River, the River Styx. This bill would also authorize the retirement of existing grazing allotments.

When the Oregon Caves National Monument was established in 1909, the focus was on the unique subsurface resources, and the small rectangular boundary was thought to be adequate to protect the cave. Through the years, however, scientific research and technology have provided new information about the cave’s ecology, and the impacts from the surface environment and the related hydrological processes. The current 480-acre boundary simply cannot adequately protect this cave system. The National Park Service has formally proposed a boundary modification numerous times, first in 1939, again in 1949, and most recently in 2000. Today, I am happy to again propose legislation to enact that boundary adjustment into law.

The Oregon Caves National Monument makes a unique contribution to Southern Oregon’s economy and to the national heritage. The Monument receives over 80,000 visitors annually and a larger Monument boundary will help showcase more fully the recreational opportunities on the above-ground lands within the proposed Monument boundary. The Monument’s above-ground lands in the Siskiyou Mountains possess a beauty and diversity that is unique in America, and indeed the world. The Oregon Caves National Monument’s approximately 500 plants, 5,000 animals, 2,000 fungi, and over a

million bacteria per acre that make the spot have one of the highest concentrations of biological diversity anywhere.

Expanding the Monument’s boundary will also preserve the caves’ resources by protecting the water that enters the cave. By granting the National Park Service the ability to safeguard these resources, and by providing for a voluntary donation of grazing permits, my legislation will be able to better protect these resources. Over the decades, the number of allowed livestock has diminished, but the livestock still has an impact on the drinking water supply and the water quality of this natural gem. The current grazing permittee, Phil Krouse’s family, has had the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment, 19,703 acres, since 1937. Mr. Krouse has publicly stated that he would look favorably upon retirement with private compensation for his allotment, which my legislation will allow to proceed.

The second bill I am introducing is, 1271, the Lower Rogue Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 2009, which expands the Wild and Scenic River protections to Oregon’s iconic Rogue River and its tributaries.

The Rogue River is one of our nation’s premier recreation destinations, famous for its free flowing waters and the many rafting and fishing opportunities it offers. The headwaters of this great river start in one of Oregon’s other great gems—Crater Lake National Park—and ultimately empty into the Pacific Ocean near Gold Beach on the southwest Oregon coast. Along that stretch, the Rogue River flows through one of the most spectacular canyons and diverse natural areas in the U.S. The river is home to runs of coho, spring and fall chinook, winter and summer steelhead, and has the special distinction of being one of only a few rivers in the country with runs of green sturgeon.

The Rogue River received its first protections in the original Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in 1968. A narrow stretch of land was protected along the river banks. Since that time, a great deal has been learned about the importance of protecting the tributaries that feed into the main stem of the Rogue. Protecting the Wild and Scenic tributaries to the Rogue River is essential to protecting the backbone of one of Oregon’s most important sport and commercial fisheries.

In 2008, American Rivers named the Rogue and its tributaries as the second most endangered river in the U.S. I’m hoping to change that today by introducing legislation to protect 143 miles of Wild and Scenic tributaries that feed the Rogue River with cold clean water. The protected tributaries would include Galice Creek, Little Windy Creek, Jenny Creek, Long Gulch—and 36 other tributaries of the Rogue.

By protecting the tributaries that feed this mighty river, I hope that future generations can enjoy the Rogue River as Oregonians and visitors to our State do today.

The third bill I am introducing is, 1272, the Devil’s Staircase Wilderness Act of 2009, which designates approximately 29,650 acres surrounding the Wasson Creek area as Wilderness.

Devil’s Staircase personifies what Wilderness in Oregon is all about. It is rugged, wild, pristine and remote. So rugged, in fact, that land managers have repeatedly withdrawn this landslide-prone forest from all timbering activity and intrepid hikers must follow elk and deer trails and keep a sharp eye on a compass. The proposed Devil’s Staircase Wilderness is the finest old-growth forest remaining in Oregon’s Coast Range, boasting huge Douglas fir, cedar and hemlock and a wealth of threatened and endangered species. Wildlife include threatened marbled murrelets and the highest density of Northern Spotted Owls in the coastal mountains.

My proposal would not only protect the forests surrounding Wasson Creek but would also designate approximately 4.5 miles of Franklin Creek and approximately 10.1 miles of Wasson Creek as Wild and Scenic Rivers. Franklin Creek, a critically important tributary to the Umpqua River, is one of the best examples of pristine salmon habitat left in Oregon. Together with Wasson Creek, these two streams in the Devil’s Staircase area deserve Wild and Scenic River designation by Congress.

The ecological significance of this treasure is apparent. The land is protected as a Late-Successional Reserve by the Northwest Forest Plan, as critical habitat for the northern spotted owl, and as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern by the Bureau of Land Management. Preserving these majestic forests as Wilderness for their wildlife and spectacular scenery matches the goals of the existing land management plans. I look forward to protecting this gem for future generations.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to the conservation, recreation and business communities of southern and coastal Oregon, and Phil Krouse for his strong conservation ethic. All of them have worked diligently to protect these special places. I look forward to working with Senator MERKLEY, Representative DEFAZIO, and my House colleagues and the bill’s other supporters to keep up the fight for these unique places in Oregon and get these pieces of legislation to the President’s desk for his signature.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1276. A bill to require investment advisers to private funds, including hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, and others to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Private Fund Transparency Act of 2009, which requires investment advisers to private funds, including hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, and others, to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC.

The current financial crisis has reinvigorated my long-held concern that the regulation of hedge funds and other pooled investment vehicles should be improved to provide more information to regulators to help them address fraud and prevent systemic risk in our capital markets.

Hedge funds and other private investment funds generally operate under exemptions in federal securities laws that recognize that not all investment pools require the same close scrutiny demanded of retail investment products like mutual funds. Hedge funds generally cater to more sophisticated investors who are responsible for ensuring the integrity of their own investments, and as a result are permitted to pursue somewhat riskier investment strategies. Indeed, these funds play an important role in enhancing liquidity and efficiency in the market, and subjecting them to fewer limitations on their activities has been and continues to be a reasonable policy choice.

However, the existing regulatory regime for these funds has enabled them to operate largely outside the framework of the financial regulatory system even as they have become increasingly interwoven with the rest of the country's financial markets. As a result, there is no data on the number and nature of these firms or ability to calculate the risks they pose to America's broader economy. Over the past decade the SEC has recognized there are risks to our capital markets posed by some of these entities, and it has attempted to require at a minimum that advisers to these funds register under the Investment Advisers Act so that SEC staff can collect basic information from and examine these private pools of capital. The SEC's rulemaking in this area, however, was rejected by a federal court in 2006. As a result, without statutory changes, the SEC is currently unable to examine private funds' books and records or to take sufficient action when it suspects fraud. In addition, no regulator is currently able to collect information on the size and nature of hedge funds or other funds to identify and act on systemic risks that may be created by these pools of capital.

The bill I introduce today is crafted carefully to eliminate these regulatory gaps without unnecessarily limiting the beneficial aspects of such pools. It would require all hedge fund and other investment pool advisers that manage more than \$30 million in assets to register as investment advisers with the SEC. It would also provide the SEC with the authority to collect information from these entities, including information about the risks they may

pose to the financial system. Finally, it authorizes the SEC to require hedge funds and other investment pools to maintain and share with other Federal agencies any information necessary for the calculation of systemic risk.

The financial crisis is a stark reminder that transparency and disclosure are essential in today's marketplace. Improving oversight of hedge funds and other private funds is vital to their sustainability and to our economy's stability. These statutory changes will help modernize our outdated financial regulatory system, protect investors, and prevent fraud. I hope my colleagues will join me in improving the oversight of hedge funds and other private pools of capital by cosponsoring this legislation and supporting its passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1276

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Private Fund Transparency Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF FOREIGN PRIVATE ADVISERS.

Section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(29) The term 'foreign private adviser' means any investment adviser who—

"(A) has no place of business in the United States;

"(B) during the preceding 12 months has had—

"(i) fewer than 15 clients in the United States; and

"(ii) assets under management attributable to clients in the United States of less than \$25,000,000, or such higher amount as the Commission may, by rule, deem appropriate in accordance with the purposes of this title; and

"(C) neither holds itself out generally to the public in the United States as an investment adviser, nor acts as an investment adviser to any investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, or a company which has elected to be a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, and has not withdrawn its election."

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE ADVISER EXEMPTION; LIMITED EXEMPTION FOR FOREIGN PRIVATE ADVISERS.

Section 203(b)(3) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) any investment adviser that is a foreign private adviser;"

SEC. 4. COLLECTION OF SYSTEMIC RISK DATA; ANNUAL AND OTHER REPORTS.

Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: "The Commission is authorized to require any investment adviser registered under this title to maintain such records and submit such reports as are necessary or appropriate in the public interest for the supervision of systemic risk by any Federal department or agency, and to provide or make available to such department

or agency those reports or records or the information contained therein. The records of any company that, but for section 3(c)(1) or 3(c)(7) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, would be an investment company, to which any such investment adviser provides investment advice, shall be deemed to be the records of the investment adviser if such company is sponsored by the investment adviser or any affiliated person of the investment adviser or the investment adviser or any affiliated person of the investment adviser acts as underwriter, distributor, placement agent, finder, or in a similar capacity for such company.";

(2) adding at the end the following:

"(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF REPORTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall not be compelled to disclose any supervisory report or information contained therein required to be filed with the Commission under subsection (a). Nothing in this subsection shall authorize the Commission to withhold information from Congress or prevent the Commission from complying with a request for information from any other Federal department or agency or any self-regulatory organization requesting the report or information for purposes within the scope of its jurisdiction, or complying with an order of a court of the United States in an action brought by the United States or the Commission. For purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, this subsection shall be considered a statute described in subsection (b)(3)(B) of such section 552."

SEC. 5. ELIMINATION OF PROVISION.

Section 210 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-10) is amended by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Section 211(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11) is amended—

(1) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting the following: "including rules and regulations defining technical, trade, and other terms used in this title. For the purposes of its rules and regulations, the Commission may—

"(1) classify persons and matters within its jurisdiction and prescribe different requirements for different classes of persons or matters; and

"(2) ascribe different meanings to terms (including the term 'client') used in different sections of this title as the Commission determines necessary to effect the purposes of this title."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL MEMORY SCREENING DAY, INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY ON DEMENTIA SCREENING AND CARE

Mr. WARNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 185

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is a slow, progressive disorder of the brain that results in loss of memory and other cognitive function and, eventually, death;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and currently affects an estimated 2,400,000 to 4,500,000 people in the United States;

Whereas the stigma associated with the disease results in a delay of diagnosis, in some cases up to 6 years;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease takes an enormous toll on family members, with an estimated 1 in 4 people in the United States acting as caregivers for each individual with the disease;

Whereas caregivers for individuals with Alzheimer's disease suffer more stress, depression, and health problems than caregivers of people with other illnesses;

Whereas recent advancements in scientific research have demonstrated the benefits of early medical treatment for individuals with Alzheimer's disease, as well as the benefits of early access to counseling and other support services for their caregivers;

Whereas with early diagnosis, individuals with the disease can avoid or correct contributing medical problems, commence available therapy, organize current and future care, and enhance self-determination, and caregivers can identify and embrace community support services;

Whereas in direct response to research breakthroughs, National Memory Screening Day was established by the Alzheimer's Foundation of America ("AFA") as a collaborative effort with local organizations and health care professionals across the country to promote awareness, early detection, and early diagnosis of memory impairment, so that individuals can obtain proper medical treatment, social services, and other resources related to their condition;

Whereas National Memory Screening Day is held by AFA each November in recognition of National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month and on this day, qualified health care professionals administer free, confidential, face-to-face memory screenings at thousands of sites throughout the United States;

Whereas memory screening is not used to diagnose any illness but is used as an indicator to determine whether a person might benefit from further examination by a qualified health care provider;

Whereas memory screenings are a safe and cost-effective intervention to direct at-risk individuals to appropriate clinical resources, thus reducing the costs of long-term care or hospitalization resulting from undiagnosed complications; and

Whereas screenings also greatly benefit those with normal scores, by checking their memory, allaying fears, and promoting chronic disease prevention and successful aging: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the seriousness of Alzheimer's disease and the toll it takes on individuals with the disease and their caregivers;

(2) acknowledges that more outreach and education is needed to eliminate the stigma associated with the disease and assist individuals and their caregivers in identifying available screenings, treatments and support;

(3) encourages all people in the United States with memory concerns or who want to check their memory to have annual memory screenings at National Memory Screening Day sites or by other qualified health care professionals;

(4) congratulates State and local organizations representing individuals with memory problems, caregivers, and health care professionals for their commitment to improve the quality of life of individuals and families confronting dementia by providing optimal care and services; and

(5) supports the goals and ideals of National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month

and National Memory Screening Day, including the development of a national health policy on dementia screening and care.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution in support of the goals and ideals of National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month and National Memory Screening Day, including the development of a national health policy on dementia screening and care.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, and as someone with a mother who has been diagnosed with disease, I strongly believe that our health care system needs to do a much better job of promoting early detection of dementia and other memory problems. Events such as National Memory Screening Day are a meaningful step in raising the awareness needed to move us in that direction.

The National Institute on Aging, NIA, estimates that between 2.4 million and 4.5 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease—a progressive degenerative disorder that attacks the brain's nerve cells, resulting in loss of memory, thinking and language skill, behavioral changes, and ultimately, death. Alzheimer's disease is not a normal part of aging; however, age is the greatest known risk factor with the incidence doubling for every, 5 year interval beyond age 65.

Alzheimer's disease exacts a huge toll on caregivers. Nearly 60 percent of individuals with the disease live at home under the care of family members. Caregivers of individuals with Alzheimer's disease face a variety of challenges and spend more time providing assistance than caregivers of people with other types of diseases, from helping loved ones with bathing and dressing to managing their legal and financial affairs.

Alzheimer's disease drains more than \$148 billion from the nation's economy each year. If the prevalence of Alzheimer's disease continues to increase as expected, the \$91 billion spent in 2005 on Medicare costs for care of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and dementia patients is projected to increase to \$189 billion by 2015.

There are serious deficiencies in our current healthcare system related to diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias. A 2006 editorial in the *Journal of the American Geriatric Society* estimated that missed diagnoses represent greater than 25 percent of the dementia cases and may be as high as 90 percent. This precludes many from getting early treatment which most researchers agree leads to optimal therapy with available and emerging medications.

Screening is a simple and safe evaluation tool that assesses memory and other intellectual functions to determine whether additional testing is necessary. Memory screening can be done in a medical environment, e.g. dementia clinic, physician's office, or in a community setting, e.g. senior center,

pharmacy. Such screenings are not a diagnosis, but can indicate whether a complete medical evaluation would be beneficial. Memory can be affected by a number of factors, ranging from stress, lack of sleep, vitamin deficiencies, depression and thyroid problems, to such illnesses as Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia. In general, the earlier the diagnosis, the easier it is to treat these conditions.

Memory screenings are one of the major focal points of the Alzheimer's Foundation of America's, AFA, national initiatives. Since 2003, AFA has sponsored National Memory Screening Day, NMSD, annually in collaboration with community organizations to promote early detection of memory problems as well as Alzheimer's disease and related illnesses, and encourage appropriate intervention. It has been held each November to coincide with National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month. On November 18, 2008, qualified health care professionals at nearly 2,200 sites nationwide offered free confidential memory screenings to an estimated 54,000 participants, as well as follow-up resources and educational materials about dementia and successful aging. In 2009, AFA will hold National Memory Screening Day on November 17.

Most people are not inclined to discuss memory concerns with their health care providers. A survey conducted during AFA's 2007 National Memory Screening Day found that 68 percent of respondents had concerns about their memory. However, while more than 44 percent had visited their primary care physician within the last 6 months, fewer than one in four of those with self-identified memory problems had discussed the issue with their physician. Primary care providers might be more likely to recommend further evaluation if individuals presented their abnormal memory screening results from events like National Memory Screening Day. Community screenings such as National Memory Screening Day generally educate participants about questions to ask their health care providers and empower them to begin a dialogue.

With this resolution I hope we can draw attention to these efforts and further this important cause. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month and National Memory Screening Day by cosponsoring this measure.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF ARMY PRIVATE WILLIAM ANDREW "ANDY" LONG AND THE WOUNDING OF ARMY PRIVATE QUINTON EZEAGWULA, WHO WERE SHOT OUTSIDE THE ARMY-NAVY CAREER CENTER IN LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS ON JUNE 1, 2009

Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted

the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 186

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private William Andrew "Andy" Long, aged 23, of Conway, Arkansas, was murdered outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private Quinton Ezeagwula, aged 18, of Jacksonville, Arkansas, was wounded by gunfire outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas there are more than 1,400,000 active component and more than 1,200,000 reserve component members of the Armed Forces protecting the United States;

Whereas there are more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters serving at more than 1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Europe;

Whereas the men and women of the Armed Forces risk their lives every day to preserve the freedoms cherished by people in the United States;

Whereas service in the Armed Forces demands extraordinary sacrifices from service members and their families and often places service members in harm's way;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are the targets of violence not only abroad but in the United States as well; and

Whereas such violence is reprehensible and must not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its condolences to the family of Private William Andrew "Andy" Long;

(2) hopes for a full recovery for Private Quinton Ezeagwula;

(3) urges swift prosecution to the fullest extent of the law of the perpetrator or perpetrators of this senseless shooting;

(4) urges the people of the United States to join the Senate in condemning acts of violence; and

(5) honors the service and sacrifice of all men and women in the Armed Services who protect and defend our freedom every day.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 28—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF SMART IRRIGATION MONTH, WHICH RECOGNIZES THE ADVANCES IN IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGY AND PRACTICES THAT HELP RAISE HEALTHY PLANTS AND INCREASE CROP YIELDS WHILE USING WATER RESOURCES MORE EFFICIENTLY AND ENCOURAGES THE ADOPTION OF SMART IRRIGATION PRACTICES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES TO FURTHER IMPROVE WATER-USE EFFICIENCY IN AGRICULTURAL, RESIDENTIAL, AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 28

Whereas water is a finite resource that is vital to human life;

Whereas growing populations and changing climate mean increased pressure on limited water supplies;

Whereas well-maintained green spaces are important to the health and well-being of communities and individuals;

Whereas abundant supplies of affordable food and fiber raise the standard of living for all people of the United States;

Whereas appropriate irrigation technology, combined with best practices, can significantly improve water-use efficiency and reduce runoff while achieving greater agricultural yields per acre-foot of water used;

Whereas appropriate irrigation technology, combined with best practices, can significantly reduce water usage and runoff while creating healthy lawns, landscaping, and sports turf; and

Whereas because July is a peak month for the use of water for irrigation, July has been selected as Smart Irrigation Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress supports the goals of Smart Irrigation Month, which are—

(1) to recognize the advances in irrigation technology and practices that help raise healthy plants and increase crop yields while using water resources more efficiently; and

(2) to encourage the adoption of smart irrigation practices throughout the United States to further improve water-use efficiency in agricultural, residential, and commercial activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 29—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT JOHN ARTHUR "JACK" JOHNSON SHOULD RECEIVE A POSTHUMOUS PARDON FOR THE RACIALLY MOTIVATED CONVICTION IN 1913 THAT DIMINISHED THE ATHLETIC, CULTURAL, AND HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF JACK JOHNSON AND UNDULY TARNISHED HIS REPUTATION

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 29

Whereas John Arthur "Jack" Johnson was a flamboyant, defiant, and controversial figure in the history of the United States who challenged racial biases;

Whereas Jack Johnson was born in Galveston, Texas, in 1878 to parents who were former slaves;

Whereas Jack Johnson became a professional boxer and traveled throughout the United States, fighting white and African American heavyweights;

Whereas, after being denied (on purely racial grounds) the opportunity to fight 2 white champions, in 1908, Jack Johnson was granted an opportunity by an Australian promoter to fight the reigning white titleholder, Tommy Burns;

Whereas Jack Johnson defeated Tommy Burns to become the first African American to hold the title of Heavyweight Champion of the World;

Whereas, the victory by Jack Johnson over Tommy Burns prompted a search for a white boxer who could beat Jack Johnson, a recruitment effort that was dubbed the search for the "great white hope";

Whereas, in 1910, a white former champion named Jim Jeffries left retirement to fight Jack Johnson in Reno, Nevada;

Whereas Jim Jeffries lost to Jack Johnson in what was deemed the "Battle of the Century";

Whereas the defeat of Jim Jeffries by Jack Johnson led to rioting, aggression against African Americans, and the racially-moti-

vated murder of African Americans nationwide;

Whereas the relationships of Jack Johnson with white women compounded the resentment felt toward him by many whites;

Whereas, between 1901 and 1910, 754 African Americans were lynched, some for simply for being "too familiar" with white women;

Whereas, in 1910, Congress passed the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the "White Slave Traffic Act" or the "Mann Act") (18 U.S.C. 2421 et seq.), which outlawed the transportation of women in interstate or foreign commerce "for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose";

Whereas, in October 1912, Jack Johnson became involved with a white woman whose mother disapproved of their relationship and sought action from the Department of Justice, claiming that Jack Johnson had abducted her daughter;

Whereas Jack Johnson was arrested by Federal marshals on October 18, 1912, for transporting the woman across State lines for an "immoral purpose" in violation of the Mann Act;

Whereas the Mann Act charges against Jack Johnson were dropped when the woman refused to cooperate with Federal authorities, and then married Jack Johnson;

Whereas, Federal authorities persisted and summoned a white woman named Belle Schreiber, who testified that Jack Johnson had transported her across State lines for the purpose of "prostitution and debauchery";

Whereas, in 1913, Jack Johnson was convicted of violating the Mann Act and sentenced to 1 year and 1 day in Federal prison;

Whereas Jack Johnson fled the United States to Canada and various European and South American countries;

Whereas Jack Johnson lost the Heavyweight Championship title to Jess Willard in Cuba in 1915;

Whereas Jack Johnson returned to the United States in July 1920, surrendered to authorities, and served nearly a year in the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas;

Whereas Jack Johnson subsequently fought in boxing matches, but never regained the Heavyweight Championship title;

Whereas Jack Johnson served his country during World War II by encouraging citizens to buy war bonds and participating in exhibition boxing matches to promote the war bond cause;

Whereas Jack Johnson died in an automobile accident in 1946; and

Whereas, in 1954, Jack Johnson was inducted into the Boxing Hall of Fame: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that Jack Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon—

(1) to expunge a racially motivated abuse of the prosecutorial authority of the Federal Government from the annals of criminal justice in the United States; and

(2) in recognition of the athletic and cultural contributions of Jack Johnson to society.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1303. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1304. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1305. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1306. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, of Florida, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1307. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1308. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1309. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1310. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1311. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1312. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1313. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1314. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1315. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1316. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1317. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1318. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1319. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1320. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1303. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which

was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

“(b) REPORT ON TOURISM AND RURAL COMMUNITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Travel and Tourism Industries, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture, shall report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on developing the tourism potential of rural communities.

“(2) CONTENT OF THE REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) identify existing Federal programs that provide assistance to rural small businesses in developing tourism marketing and promotion plans relating to tourism in rural areas;

“(B) identify existing Federal programs that assist rural small business concerns in obtaining capital for starting or expanding businesses primarily serving tourists; and

“(C) include recommendations, if any, for improving existing programs or creating new Federal programs that may benefit tourism in rural communities.

SA 1304. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . ENERGY MARKET MANIPULATION PREVENTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in 1974, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (referred to in this Act as the “Commission”) was established as an independent agency with a mandate—

(A) to enforce and administer the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.);

(B) to ensure market integrity;

(C) to protect market users from fraud and abusive trading practices; and

(D) to prevent and prosecute manipulation of the price of any covered commodity in interstate commerce;

(2) Congress has given the Commission authority under the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) to take necessary actions to address market emergencies;

(3) the Commission may use the emergency authority of the Commission with respect to any major market disturbance that prevents the market from accurately reflecting the forces of supply and demand for a covered commodity;

(4) in section 4a(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6a(a)), Congress has declared that excessive speculation imposes an undue and unnecessary burden on interstate commerce;

(5) in May 2009, crude oil inventories in the United States were at the highest level of crude oil inventories on record;

(6) in May 2009, demand for oil in the United States dropped to the lowest level of demand in more than a decade;

(7) the national average price of a gallon of gasoline has jumped from \$1.64 per gallon in late December of 2008 to over \$2.61 per gallon as of June 8, 2009;

(8) crude oil prices have increased by over 70 percent since the middle of January 2009; and

(9) in May 2009, the International Energy Agency predicted that global demand for oil will decrease in 2009 to the lowest level of demand since 1981.

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall use the authority of the Commission, including the emergency authority of the Commission—

(1) to curb immediately the role of excessive speculation in any contract market—

(A) that is within the jurisdiction and control of the Commission; and

(B) on or through which energy futures or swaps are traded;

(2) to eliminate excessive speculation, price distortion, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in prices, or other unlawful activity that causes major market disturbances that prevent the market from accurately reflecting the forces of supply and demand for energy commodities;

(3) to classify immediately each bank holding company that engages in energy futures trading as a noncommercial participant, and subject the bank holding company to strict position limits;

(4) to require immediately that each hedge fund engaged in the trading of energy futures for the hedge fund, or on behalf of a client of the hedge fund—

(A) to register with the Commission as a noncommercial participant; and

(B) to be subject to strict speculation limits;

(5) to eliminate conflicts of interest that may arise in situations during which 1 entity owns or controls a unit that is—

(A) designed to predict the future price of oil;

(B) engaged in the operations of oil assets, including pipelines and storage facilities; and

(C) engaged in the buying or selling of energy derivatives for the unit, or on behalf of a client of the unit; and

(6) to revoke immediately each staff no-action letter that covers a foreign board of trade that has established trading terminals in the United States for the purpose of trading United States commodities to United States investors.

SA 1305. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF CERTAIN TARP EXPENDITURES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any provision of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, on and after May 29, 2009, no funds may be disbursed or otherwise obligated under that Act to any entity, if such disbursement would result in the Federal Government acquiring any ownership of the common or preferred stock of the entity receiving such funds, unless the Congress first approves of such disbursement or obligation.

SA 1306. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Ms. SNOWE)

submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REIMBURSEMENT OF AUTOMOBILE DISTRIBUTORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds provided by the United States Government, or any agency, department, or subdivision thereof, to an automobile manufacturer or a distributor thereof as credit, loans, financing, advances, or by any other agreement in connection with such automobile manufacturer's or distributor's proceeding as a debtor under title 11, United States Code, shall be conditioned upon use of such funds to fully reimburse all dealers of such automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor for—

(1) the cost incurred by such dealers during the 9-month period preceding the date on which the proceeding under title 11, United States Code, by or against the automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor is commenced, in acquisition of all parts and inventory in the dealer's possession on the same basis as if the dealers were terminating pursuant to existing franchise agreements or dealer agreements; and

(2) all other obligations owed by such automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor under any other agreement between the dealers and the automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor arising during that 9-month period, including, without limitation, franchise agreement or dealer agreements.

(b) **INCLUSION IN TERMS.**—Any note, security agreement, loan agreement, or other agreement between an automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor and the Government (or any agency, department, or subdivision thereof) shall expressly provide for the use of such funds as required by this section. A bankruptcy court may not authorize the automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor to obtain credit under section 364 of title 11, United States Code, unless the credit agreement or agreements expressly provided for the use of funds as required by this section.

(c) **EFFECTIVENESS OF REJECTION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any rejection by an automobile manufacturer or manufacturer's distributor that is a debtor in a proceeding under title 11, United States Code, of a franchise agreement or dealer agreement pursuant to section 365 of that title, shall not be effective until at least 180 days after the date on which such rejection is otherwise approved by a bankruptcy court.

SA 1307. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION FOR ALIENS.

Subsection (b) of section 401 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking "11-year" and inserting "17-year".

SA 1308. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION FOR ALIENS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Protecting American Workers Act of 2009".

(b) **PILOT PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION.**—Subsection (b) of section 401 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking "Unless" and all that follows.

(c) **RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—None of the funds made available in the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-343; 122 Stat. 3765) or the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 115) may be used to enter into a contract with a person that does not participate in the pilot program described in section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

(d) **REQUIRED PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES CONTRACTORS.**—The head of each agency or department of the United States that enters into a contract shall require, as a condition of the contract, that the contractor participate in the pilot program described in 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-209; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) to verify the employment eligibility of—

(1) all individuals hired during the term of the contract by the contractor to perform employment duties within the United States; and

(2) all individuals assigned by the contractor to perform work within the United States under such contract.

(e) REDESIGNATION OF BASIC PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) **REDESIGNATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Sections 401(c)(1), 403(a), 403(b)(1), 403(c)(1), and 405(b)(2) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) are amended by striking "basic pilot program" each place that term appears and inserting "E-Verify Program".

(B) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended in the heading by striking "BASIC PILOT" and inserting "E-VERIFY".

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Paragraph (1) of section 404(h) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking "under a pilot program" and inserting "under this subtitle".

(f) **CHECKING THE IMMIGRATION STATUS OF EMPLOYEES.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 403(a)(3) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended—

(1) by striking "The person" and inserting the following:

"(i) UPON HIRING.—The person"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) **EXISTING EMPLOYEES.**—An employer that elects to verify the employment eligibility of existing employees shall verify the employment eligibility of all such employees not later than 10 days after notifying the Secretary of Homeland Security of such election.

"(iii) **REQUIRED PARTICIPATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security may require any employer or class of employers to participate in the E-Verify Program with respect to individuals employed as of, or hired after, the date of the enactment of the Protecting American Workers Act of 2009 if the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that the employer has engaged in material violations of section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a)."

(g) **REVERIFICATION.**—Subsection (a) of section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-08; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) **REVERIFICATION.**—Each employer participating in the E-Verify Program shall use the confirmation system to reverify the work authorization of any individual not later than 3 days after the date on which such individual's employment authorization is scheduled to expire, as indicated by the documents that the individual provided to the employer pursuant to section 274A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(b)), in accordance with the procedures otherwise applicable to the verification of a newly hired employee under this subsection."

SA 1309. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 25, line 10, and insert the following:

SEC. 5. ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.

(a) **TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEES.**—Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) **FEES.**—

"(i) **IN GENERAL.**—No later than September 30, 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a fee for the use of the System and begin assessment and collection of that fee. The initial fee shall be the sum of—

"(I) \$10 per travel authorization; and

"(II) an amount that will at least ensure recovery of the full costs of providing and administering the System, as determined by the Secretary.

"(ii) **DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED.**—From the amounts collected under clause (i)(I), \$100,000,000 shall be credited to the Travel Promotion Fund established under section 4 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and any additional amounts shall be used by the Secretary for travel security programs authorized under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), including the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA) and the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT). Amounts collected under clause (i)(II) shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury and made available to pay the costs incurred to administer the System.

“(iii) SUNSET OF TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEE.—The Secretary may not collect the fee authorized by clause (i)(I) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014.”.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) STRATEGIC PLAN.—

“(i) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prepare and submit a strategic plan to the recipients listed under clause (ii) that describes how the full implementation of the System will ensure that all individuals traveling by airplane to the United States from a program country have their travel authorization verified before boarding the airplane.

“(ii) RECIPIENTS.—The strategic plan prepared under clause (i) shall be submitted to—

“(I) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(II) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(III) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate

“(IV) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

“(V) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

“(VI) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(VII) the Comptroller General of the United States.

“(iii) MILESTONES.—The strategic plan prepared under clause (i) shall include a detailed timeline that describes the specific actions that will be taken to achieve the following milestones:

“(I) Enrollment of all travelers from program countries into the System.

“(II) Incorporation of the airlines into the System.

“(III) Deployment of the technology of the System in all airports located in program countries, either through the use of stand-alone kiosks or through the participation of the airlines.

“(IV) Verification of travel authorizations of all aliens described in subsection (a) before they board an airplane bound for the United States.

“(V) Administration of the System solely with fees collected under subparagraph (B)(i)(II).

“(iv) COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY.—The strategic plan prepared under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) an analysis of the System’s communications strategy; and

“(II) recommendation for improving the communications strategy to ensure that all travelers to the United States from program countries are informed of the requirements under this section.”.

(2) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a copy of the strategic plan under section 217(h)(3)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall complete a review of the plan to determine whether the plan addresses the main security risks associated with the Electronic System for Travel Authorization in an efficient, cost effective, and timely manner.

(c) FUNDING LIMITATION.—None of the amounts made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security under section 217(h)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a), to carry out the Electronic System for Travel Authorization authorized under section 217(h)(3) of such Act may be expended until the Secretary submits the strategic plan required by section 217(h)(3)(E) of such Act.

SEC. 6. ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Corporation may impose an annual assessment on United States members of the international travel and tourism industry (other than those described in section 2(b)(1)(C) or (H)) represented on the Board in proportion to their share of the aggregate international travel and tourism revenue of the industry. The Corporation shall be responsible for verifying, implementing, and collecting the assessment authorized by this section.

(b) INITIAL ASSESSMENT LIMITED.—The Corporation may establish the initial assessment after the date of enactment of the Travel and Tourism Promotion Act at no greater, in the aggregate, than \$20,000,000.

(c) REFERENDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may not impose an annual assessment unless—

(A) the Corporation submits the proposed annual assessment to members of the industry in a referendum; and

(B) the assessment is approved by a majority of those voting in the referendum.

(2) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting a referendum under this subsection, the Corporation shall—

(A) provide written or electronic notice not less than 60 days before the date of the referendum;

(B) describe the proposed assessment or increase and explain the reasons for the referendum in the notice; and

(C) determine the results of the referendum on the basis of weighted voting apportioned according to each business entity’s relative share of the aggregate annual United States international travel and tourism revenue for the industry per business entity, treating all related entities as a single entity.

(d) COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall establish a means of collecting the assessment that it finds to be efficient and effective. The Corporation may establish a late payment charge and rate of interest to be imposed on any person who fails to remit or pay to the Corporation any amount assessed by the Corporation under this Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Corporation may bring suit in Federal court to compel compliance with an assessment levied by the Corporation under this Act.

(e) INVESTMENT OF FUNDS.—Pending disbursement pursuant to a program, plan, or project, the Corporation may invest funds collected through assessments, and any other funds received by the Corporation, only in obligations of the United States or any agency thereof, in general obligations of any State or any political subdivision thereof, in any interest-bearing account or certificate of deposit of a bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System, or in obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

SEC. 7. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

Title II of the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 201 the following:

“SEC. 202. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

“(a) OFFICE ESTABLISHED.—There is established within the Department of Commerce an office to be known as the Office of Travel Promotion.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—

“(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director shall be a citizen of the United States and have experience in a field directly related to the promotion of travel to and within the United States.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(A) report to the Secretary;

“(B) ensure that the Office is effectively carrying out its functions; and

“(C) perform a purely advisory role relating to any responsibilities described in subsection (c) that are related to functions carried out by the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of State.

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to override the preeminent role of the Secretary of Homeland Security in setting policies relating to the Nation’s ports of entry and the processes through which individuals are admitted into the United States.

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall—

“(1) serve as liaison to the Corporation for Travel Promotion established by section 2 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 and support and encourage the development of programs to increase the number of international visitors to the United States for business, leisure, educational, medical, exchange, and other purposes;

“(2) work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security—

“(A) to disseminate information more effectively to potential international visitors about documentation and procedures required for admission to the United States as a visitor;

“(B) to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on ways to improve the experience of incoming international passengers and to provide these passengers with more accurate information;

“(C) to collect accurate data on the total number of international visitors that visit each State; and

“(D) to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on ways to enhance the entry and departure experience for international visitors through the use of advertising, signage, and customer service; and

“(3) support State, regional, and private sector initiatives to promote travel to and within the United States.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, which describes the Office’s work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out subsection (c)(2).”.

SA 1310. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 25, line 10, and insert the following:

“(ii) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED.—From the amounts collected under clause (i)(I), \$100,000,000 shall be credited to the

Travel Promotion Fund established under section 4 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and any additional amounts shall be used by the Secretary for travel security programs authorized under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), including the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA) and the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT). Amounts collected under clause (i)(II) shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury and made available to pay the costs incurred to administer the System.

“(iii) SUNSET OF TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEE.—The Secretary may not collect the fee authorized by clause (i)(I) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014.”

SEC. 6. ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Corporation may impose an annual assessment on United States members of the international travel and tourism industry (other than those described in section 2(b)(1)(C) or (H)) represented on the Board in proportion to their share of the aggregate international travel and tourism revenue of the industry. The Corporation shall be responsible for verifying, implementing, and collecting the assessment authorized by this section.

(b) INITIAL ASSESSMENT LIMITED.—The Corporation may establish the initial assessment after the date of enactment of the Travel and Tourism Promotion Act at no greater, in the aggregate, than \$20,000,000.

(c) REFERENDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may not impose an annual assessment unless—

(A) the Corporation submits the proposed annual assessment to members of the industry in a referendum; and

(B) the assessment is approved by a majority of those voting in the referendum.

(2) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting a referendum under this subsection, the Corporation shall—

(A) provide written or electronic notice not less than 60 days before the date of the referendum;

(B) describe the proposed assessment or increase and explain the reasons for the referendum in the notice; and

(C) determine the results of the referendum on the basis of weighted voting apportioned according to each business entity's relative share of the aggregate annual United States international travel and tourism revenue for the industry per business entity, treating all related entities as a single entity.

(d) COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall establish a means of collecting the assessment that it finds to be efficient and effective. The Corporation may establish a late payment charge and rate of interest to be imposed on any person who fails to remit or pay to the Corporation any amount assessed by the Corporation under this Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Corporation may bring suit in Federal court to compel compliance with an assessment levied by the Corporation under this Act.

(e) INVESTMENT OF FUNDS.—Pending disbursement pursuant to a program, plan, or project, the Corporation may invest funds collected through assessments, and any other funds received by the Corporation, only in obligations of the United States or any agency thereof, in general obligations of any State or any political subdivision thereof, in any interest-bearing account or certificate of deposit of a bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System, or in obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

SEC. 7. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

Title II of the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 201 the following:

“SEC. 202. OFFICE OF TRAVEL PROMOTION.

“(a) OFFICE ESTABLISHED.—There is established within the Department of Commerce an office to be known as the Office of Travel Promotion.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—

“(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director shall be a citizen of the United States and have experience in a field directly related to the promotion of travel to and within the United States.

“(3) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(A) report to the Secretary;

“(B) ensure that the Office is effectively carrying out its functions; and

“(C) perform a purely advisory role relating to any responsibilities described in subsection (c) that are related to functions carried out by the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of State.

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to override the preeminent role of the Secretary of Homeland Security in setting policies relating to the Nation's ports of entry and the processes through which individuals are admitted into the United States.

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall—

“(1) serve as liaison to the Corporation for Travel Promotion established by section 2 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 and support and encourage the development of programs to increase the number of international visitors to the United States for business, leisure, educational, medical, exchange, and other purposes;

“(2) work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security—

“(A) to disseminate information more effectively to potential international visitors about documentation and procedures required for admission to the United States as a visitor;

“(B) to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on ways to improve the experience of incoming international passengers and to provide these passengers with more accurate information;

“(C) to collect accurate data on the total number of international visitors that visit each State; and

“(D) to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on ways to enhance the entry and departure experience for international visitors through the use of advertising, signage, and customer service; and

“(3) support State, regional, and private sector initiatives to promote travel to and within the United States.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, which describes the Office's work with the Corporation, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out subsection (c)(2).”

SA 1311. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(4) REVIEW OF INFORMATION.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—The Corporation shall submit all information relating to United States Government travel and visa requirements proposed to be disseminated to foreign travelers under paragraphs (1)(A) and (3) to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Homeland Security for review in order to ensure that the travel promotion campaigns funded through the Travel Promotion Fund are factually accurate.

(B) REVIEW AND FEEDBACK.—Not later than 10 business days after receiving information from the Corporation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall each—

(i) complete a review of the factual content of the information submitted by the Corporation under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) correct any factual errors discovered in such information.

(C) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall limit their review under this paragraph to the factual content of the information that the Corporation is proposing to disseminate.

(D) CHANGES.—The Corporation shall make all reasonable changes to the factual content of the information it proposes to disseminate to foreign travelers based on the feedback received from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security to ensure that such information is accurate.

(E) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RESPOND.—If the Corporation does not receive a response from the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security within 10 business days after the receipt of the information submitted under subparagraph (A), the factual content of the proposed information campaign shall be deemed to have been authorized by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SA 1312. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLBRAND, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 20, and all that follows through page 3, line 7, and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall have a board of directors of 12 members with knowledge of international travel promotion and marketing, broadly representing various regions of the United States, who are United States citizens. Members of the board shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce (after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State), as follows:

(A) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience in the agritourism sector;

SA 1313. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS,

Mr. KYL, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. RESTRICTIONS ON TARP EXPENDITURES FOR AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS; FIDUCIARY DUTY TO TAXPAYERS; REQUIRED ISSUANCE OF COMMON STOCK TO TAXPAYERS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Auto Stock for Every Taxpayer Act”.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON FURTHER TARP FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any provision of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-343), or any other provision of law, the Secretary may not expend or obligate any funds made available under that Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any designated automobile manufacturer.

(c) **FIDUCIARY DUTY TO SHAREHOLDERS.**—With respect to any designated automobile manufacturer, the Secretary, and the designee of the Secretary who is responsible for the exercise of shareholder voting rights with respect to a designated automobile manufacturer pursuant to assistance provided under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, shall have a fiduciary duty to the American taxpayer for the maximization of the return on the investment of the taxpayer under that Act, in the same manner, and to the same extent that any director of an issuer of securities has with respect to its shareholders under the securities laws and all applicable provisions of State law.

(d) **REQUIRED ISSUANCE OF COMMON STOCK TO ELIGIBLE TAXPAYERS.**—Not later than 1 year after the emergence of any designated automobile manufacturer from bankruptcy protection described in subsection (f)(1)(B), the Secretary shall direct the designated automobile manufacturer to issue through the Secretary a certificate of common stock to each eligible taxpayer, which shall represent such taxpayer’s per capita share of the aggregate common stock holdings of the United States Government in the designated automobile manufacturer on such date.

(e) **CIVIL ACTIONS AUTHORIZED.**—A person who is aggrieved of a violation of the fiduciary duty established under subsection (c) may bring a civil action in an appropriate United States district court to obtain injunctive or other equitable relief relating to the violation.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section—

(1) the term “designated automobile manufacturer” means an entity organized under the laws of a State, the primary business of which is the manufacture of automobiles, and any affiliate thereof, if such automobile manufacturer—

(A) has received funds under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-343), or funds were obligated under that Act, before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) has filed for bankruptcy protection under chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, during the 90-day period preceding the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) the term “eligible taxpayer” means any individual taxpayer who filed a Federal taxable return for taxable year 2008 (including any joint return) not later than the due date for such return (including any extension);

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the designee of the Secretary; and

(4) the terms “director”, “issuer”, “securities”, and “securities laws” have the same meanings as in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

SA 1314. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE I—COMMISSIONS ON WARTIME TREATMENT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Wartime Treatment Study Act”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) During World War II, the United States Government deemed as “enemy aliens” more than 600,000 Italian-born and 300,000 German-born United States resident aliens and their families, requiring them to carry Certificates of Identification and limiting their travel and personal property rights. At that time, these groups were the two largest foreign-born groups in the United States.

(2) During World War II, the United States Government arrested, interned, or otherwise detained thousands of European Americans, some remaining in custody for years after cessation of World War II hostilities, and repatriated, exchanged, or deported European Americans, including American-born children, to European Axis nations, many to be exchanged for Americans held in those nations.

(3) Pursuant to a policy coordinated by the United States with Latin American nations, thousands of European Latin Americans, including German and Austrian Jews, were arrested, relocated to the United States, and interned. Many were later repatriated or deported to European Axis nations during World War II and exchanged for Americans and Latin Americans held in those nations.

(4) Millions of European Americans served in the Armed Forces and thousands sacrificed their lives in defense of the United States.

(5) The wartime policies of the United States Government were devastating to the German American and Italian American communities, individuals, and their families. The detrimental effects are still being experienced.

(6) Prior to and during World War II, the United States restricted the entry of Jewish refugees who were fleeing persecution or genocide and sought safety in the United States. During the 1930s and 1940s, the quota system, immigration regulations, visa requirements, and the time required to process visa applications affected the number of Jewish refugees, particularly those from Germany and Austria, who could gain admittance to the United States.

(7) The United States Government should conduct an independent review to fully assess and acknowledge these actions. Congress has previously reviewed the United States Government’s wartime treatment of Japanese Americans through the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. An independent review of the treatment of German Americans and Italian Americans and of Jewish refugees fleeing persecution and genocide has not yet been undertaken.

(8) Time is of the essence for the establishment of commissions, because of the increasing danger of destruction and loss of relevant documents, the advanced age of potential witnesses and, most importantly, the advanced age of those affected by the United States Government’s policies. Many who suffered have already passed away and will never know of this effort.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **DURING WORLD WAR II.**—The term “during World War II” refers to the period between September 1, 1939, through December 31, 1948.

(2) **EUROPEAN AMERICANS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “European Americans” refers to United States citizens and resident aliens of European ancestry, including Italian Americans, German Americans, Hungarian Americans, Romanian Americans, and Bulgarian Americans.

(B) **GERMAN AMERICANS.**—The term “German Americans” refers to United States citizens and resident aliens of German ancestry.

(C) **ITALIAN AMERICANS.**—The term “Italian Americans” refers to United States citizens and resident aliens of Italian ancestry.

(3) **EUROPEAN LATIN AMERICANS.**—The term “European Latin Americans” refers to persons of European ancestry, including German or Italian ancestry, residing in a Latin American nation during World War II.

(4) **LATIN AMERICAN NATION.**—The term “Latin American nation” refers to any nation in Central America, South America, or the Caribbean.

Subtitle A—Commission on Wartime Treatment of European Americans

SEC. 111. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF EUROPEAN AMERICANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Commission on Wartime Treatment of European Americans (referred to in this subtitle as the “European American Commission”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The European American Commission shall be composed of 7 members, who shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader.

(3) Two members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader.

(c) **TERMS.**—The term of office for members shall be for the life of the European American Commission. A vacancy in the European American Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) **REPRESENTATION.**—The European American Commission shall include 2 members representing the interests of Italian Americans and two members representing the interests of German Americans.

(e) **MEETINGS.**—The President shall call the first meeting of the European American Commission not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) **QUORUM.**—Four members of the European American Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(g) **CHAIRMAN.**—The European American Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members. The term of office of each shall be for the life of the European American Commission.

(h) **COMPENSATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Members of the European American Commission shall serve without pay.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—All members of the European American Commission shall be reimbursed for reasonable travel and subsistence, and other reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 112. DUTIES OF THE EUROPEAN AMERICAN COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the European American Commission to review the United States Government's wartime treatment of European Americans and European Latin Americans as provided in subsection (b).

(b) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The European American Commission's review shall include the following:

(1) A comprehensive review of the facts and circumstances surrounding United States Government action during World War II with respect to European Americans and European Latin Americans pursuant to United States laws and directives, including the Alien Enemies Acts (50 U.S.C. 21 et seq.), Presidential Proclamations 2526, 2527, 2655, 2662, and 2685, Executive Orders 9066 and 9095, and any directive of the United States Government pursuant to these and other pertinent laws, proclamations, or executive orders, including registration requirements, travel and property restrictions, establishment of restricted areas, raids, arrests, internment, exclusion, policies relating to the families and property that excludees and internees were forced to abandon, internee employment by American companies (including a list of such companies and the terms and type of employment), exchange, repatriation, and deportation, and the immediate and long-term effect of such actions, particularly internment, on the lives of those affected. This review shall also include a list of—

(A) all temporary detention and long-term internment facilities in the United States and Latin American nations that were used to detain or intern European Americans and European Latin Americans during World War II (in this paragraph referred to as "World War II detention facilities");

(B) the names of European Americans and European Latin Americans who died while in World War II detention facilities and where they were buried;

(C) the names of children of European Americans and European Latin Americans who were born in World War II detention facilities and where they were born; and

(D) the nations from which European Latin Americans were brought to the United States, the ships that transported them to the United States and their departure and disembarkation ports, the locations where European Americans and European Latin Americans were exchanged for persons held in European Axis nations, and the ships that transported them to Europe and their departure and disembarkation ports.

(2) An assessment of the underlying rationale of the decision of the United States Government to develop the programs and policies described in paragraph (1), the information the United States Government received or acquired suggesting these programs and policies were necessary, the perceived benefit of enacting such programs and policies, and the immediate and long-term impact of such programs and policies on European Americans and European Latin Americans and their communities.

(3) A brief review of the participation by European Americans in the United States Armed Forces, including the participation of European Americans whose families were excluded, interned, repatriated, or exchanged.

(4) A recommendation of appropriate remedies, including public education programs and the creation of a comprehensive online

database by the National Archives and Records Administration of documents related to the United States Government's wartime treatment of European Americans and European Latin Americans during World War II.

(c) FIELD HEARINGS.—The European American Commission shall hold public hearings in such cities of the United States as it deems appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—The European American Commission shall submit a written report of its findings and recommendations to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the first meeting called pursuant to section 111(e).

SEC. 113. POWERS OF THE EUROPEAN AMERICAN COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The European American Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subtitle, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and request the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandum, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. The European American Commission may request the Attorney General to invoke the aid of an appropriate United States district court to require, by subpoena or otherwise, such attendance, testimony, or production.

(b) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND COOPERATION.—The European American Commission may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, independent instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government, available information that the European American Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities, or other authorities of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the European American Commission and furnish all information requested by the European American Commission to the extent permitted by law, including information collected under the Commission on Wartime and Internment of Civilians Act (Public Law 96-317; 50 U.S.C. App. 1981 note) and the Wartime Violation of Italian Americans Civil Liberties Act (Public Law 106-451; 50 U.S.C. App. 1981 note). For purposes of section 552a(b)(9) of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Privacy Act of 1974"), the European American Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of jurisdiction.

SEC. 114. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The European American Commission is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the compensation of any employee of the Commission may not exceed a rate equivalent to the rate payable under GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of such title;

(3) obtain the detail of any Federal Government employee, and such detail shall be without reimbursement or interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege;

(4) enter into agreements with the Administrator of General Services for procurement of necessary financial and administrative

services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator;

(5) procure supplies, services, and property by contract in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and agencies for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of the duties of the Commission, to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 115. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$600,000 to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 116. SUNSET.

The European American Commission shall terminate 60 days after it submits its report to Congress.

Subtitle B—Commission on Wartime Treatment of Jewish Refugees

SEC. 121. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME TREATMENT OF JEWISH REFUGEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Commission on Wartime Treatment of Jewish Refugees (referred to in this subtitle as the "Jewish Refugee Commission").

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall be composed of 7 members, who shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) Three members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader.

(3) Two members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader.

(c) TERMS.—The term of office for members shall be for the life of the Jewish Refugee Commission. A vacancy in the Jewish Refugee Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) REPRESENTATION.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall include two members representing the interests of Jewish refugees.

(e) MEETINGS.—The President shall call the first meeting of the Jewish Refugee Commission not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) QUORUM.—Four members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(g) CHAIRMAN.—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members. The term of office of each shall be for the life of the Jewish Refugee Commission.

(h) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall serve without pay.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—All members of the Jewish Refugee Commission shall be reimbursed for reasonable travel and subsistence, and other reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 122. DUTIES OF THE JEWISH REFUGEE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Jewish Refugee Commission to review the United States Government's refusal to allow Jewish and other refugees fleeing persecution or genocide in Europe entry to the United States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Jewish Refugee Commission's review shall cover the period

between January 1, 1933, through December 31, 1945, and shall include, to the greatest extent practicable, the following:

(1) A review of the United States Government's decision to deny Jewish and other refugees fleeing persecution or genocide entry to the United States, including a review of the underlying rationale of the United States Government's decision to refuse the Jewish and other refugees entry, the information the United States Government received or acquired suggesting such refusal was necessary, the perceived benefit of such refusal, and the impact of such refusal on the refugees.

(2) A review of Federal refugee law and policy relating to those fleeing persecution or genocide, including recommendations for making it easier in the future for victims of persecution or genocide to obtain refuge in the United States.

(c) **FIELD HEARINGS.**—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall hold public hearings in such cities of the United States as it deems appropriate.

(d) **REPORT.**—The Jewish Refugee Commission shall submit a written report of its findings and recommendations to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the first meeting called pursuant to section 121(e).

SEC. 123. POWERS OF THE JEWISH REFUGEE COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Jewish Refugee Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subtitle, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and request the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandum, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. The Jewish Refugee Commission may request the Attorney General to invoke the aid of an appropriate United States district court to require, by subpoena or otherwise, such attendance, testimony, or production.

(b) **GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND COOPERATION.**—The Jewish Refugee Commission may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, independent instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government, available information that the Jewish Refugee Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities, or other authorities of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the Jewish Refugee Commission and furnish all information requested by the Jewish Refugee Commission to the extent permitted by law. For purposes of section 552a(b)(9) of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Privacy Act of 1974"), the Jewish Refugee Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of jurisdiction.

SEC. 124. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The Jewish Refugee Commission is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the compensation of any employee of the Commission may not exceed a rate equivalent to the rate payable under GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of such title;

(3) obtain the detail of any Federal Government employee, and such detail shall be without reimbursement or interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege;

(4) enter into agreements with the Administrator of General Services for procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator;

(5) procure supplies, services, and property by contract in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and agencies for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of the duties of the Commission, to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 125. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$600,000 to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 126. SUNSET.

The Jewish Refugee Commission shall terminate 60 days after it submits its report to Congress.

Subtitle C—Funding Source

SEC. 131. FUNDING SOURCE.

Of the funds made available for the Department of Justice by the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 110-329), \$1,200,000 is hereby rescinded.

SA 1315. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, after line 20, add the following:

SEC. 9. DETAINEE PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORDS PROTECTION.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Detainee Photographic Records Protection Act of 2009".

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED RECORD.**—The term "covered record" means any record—

(A) that is a photograph that—

(i) was taken during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, through January 22, 2009; and

(ii) relates to the treatment of individuals engaged, captured, or detained after September 11, 2001, by the Armed Forces of the United States in operations outside of the United States; and

(B) for which a certification by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (c) is in effect.

(2) **PHOTOGRAPH.**—The term "photograph" encompasses all photographic images, whether originals or copies, including still photographs, negatives, digital images, films, video tapes, and motion pictures.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For any photograph described under subsection (b)(1)(A), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a certification to the President, if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that the disclosure of that photograph would endanger—

(A) citizens of the United States; or

(B) members of the Armed Forces or employees of the United States Government deployed outside the United States.

(2) **CERTIFICATION EXPIRATION.**—A certification submitted under paragraph (1) and a renewal of a certification submitted under paragraph (3) shall expire 3 years after the date on which the certification or renewal, as the case may be, is submitted to the President.

(3) **CERTIFICATION RENEWAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may submit to the President—

(A) a renewal of a certification in accordance with paragraph (1) at any time; and

(B) more than 1 renewal of a certification.

(4) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—A timely notice of the Secretary's certification shall be submitted to Congress.

(d) **NONDISCLOSURE OF DETAINEE RECORDS.**—A covered record shall not be subject to—

(1) disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act); or

(2) disclosure under any proceeding under that section.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the voluntary disclosure of a covered record.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to any photograph created before, on, or after that date that is a covered record.

SA 1316. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

Section 120 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5230) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by striking "(a) TERMINATION.—".

SA 1317. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. TERMINATION OF TARP.

Section 120(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5230(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary";

(2) by inserting before the first period the following: " , unless there is enacted by Congress, not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of such certification, a joint resolution of disapproval, as described in paragraph (2)"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) **JOINT RESOLUTION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution—

"(A) that is introduced not later than 3 calendar days after the date on which the

certification of the Secretary referred to in paragraph (1) is received by Congress;

“(B) which does not have a preamble;

“(C) the title of which is as follows: ‘Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the extension of authority under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008’; and

“(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves of the extension of the authorities described in section 120(a) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.’.

“(3) FAST TRACK.—The provisions of subsections (d) through (f) of section 115 shall apply to a resolution of disapproval for purposes of this of subsection.”.

SA 1318. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . . . TERMINATION OF TARP.

Section 120 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5230) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (b); and
- (2) by striking “(a) TERMINATION.—”.

SA 1319. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. PASSPORT CARD TRAVEL ENHANCEMENT.

(a) PASSPORT CARD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “passport card” means the document—

- (1) known as a passport card that is issued to a national of the United States on the same basis as a regular passport; and
- (2) that the Secretary of State began issuing during 2008.

(b) PASSPORT CARDS FOR AIR TRAVEL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT PASSPORT CARDS FOR AIR TRAVEL.—Notwithstanding any regulation issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State shall permit a passport card issued to a national of the United States to serve as proof of identity and citizenship of such national if such national is departing from or entering the United States through an air port of entry for travel that terminates or originates in—

- (A) Bermuda;
- (B) Canada;
- (C) a foreign country located in the Caribbean; or
- (D) Mexico.

(2) FEES FOR PASSPORT CARDS.—Neither the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security may increase, or propose an increase to, the fee for issuance of a passport card as a result of the requirements of paragraph (1).

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland shall issue final regulations to implement this section.

SA 1320. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 12 through 14 and insert the following:

(C) 1 shall have appropriate expertise and experience—

(i) with small business concerns (as that term is used in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) or associations that represent small business concerns; and

(ii) in the retail sector or in associations representing that sector;

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 14, 2009, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 796, Hardrock Mining and Reclamation Act of 2009 and S. 140, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Act of 2009.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Gina_Weinstock@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Patty Beneke at (202) 224-5451 or Gina Weinstock at (202) 224-5684.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, June 17, 2009, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 409, to secure Federal ownership and management of significant natural, scenic, and recreational resources; S. 782, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; S. 874, to establish El Rio Grande Del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico; S. 1139, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon; and S. 1140, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Anna_fox@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224-9863 or Anna Fox at (202) 224-1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2009, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Greener Communities, Greater Opportunities: New Ideas for Sustainable Development and Economic Growth.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, from 10:15-11 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 10 a.m. in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Climate Change Legislation: Tax Considerations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Cell Phone Text Messaging Rate Increases and the State of Competition in the Wireless Market."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "Protecting Our Employees: Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and the Federal Workforce."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, June 16, 2009, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jonathan Kolikant and Matthew Long of Senator BINGAMAN's office be granted the privilege of the floor for the pendency of the Travel Promotion bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF PRIVATE WILLIAM ANDREW "ANDY" LONG AND THE WOUNDING OF PRIVATE QUINTON EZEAGWULA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 186 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 186) condemning the murder of Army Private William Andrew "Andy" Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas on June 1, 2009.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a young man, Army PVT William Andrew Long, of Conway, AR. Last week, he was laid

to rest at the Arkansas Veterans Cemetery in North Little Rock. He was buried with full military honors and was awarded the Army Commendation Medal and the Army Good Conduct Medal.

Private Long was a loving son, brother, and friend whose life was tragically cut short on June 1 in a senseless attack outside of an Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, AR. PVT Quinton Ezeagwula was also injured in the attack. Our thoughts and prayers are with him, and we hope he makes a very speedy recovery.

Private Long had recently finished Army training and was set to deploy to South Korea. He had been appointed to the Army's Hometown Recruiter Assistance Program in Little Rock and was at the Army recruiting office on that fateful day because he had volunteered to tell others about his experience in the U.S. military.

Known to his friends and family as Andy, Private Long will always be remembered by all of us and all of them for his boundless energy, his keen intelligence, his infectious smile, and his great sense of humor. His country and all Arkansans will remember him as a hero with the courage to serve his Nation during a time of war. He will also be remembered as a young man whose life was ended way too soon.

Private Long hailed from a fiercely patriotic family, with four generations of uniformed service to the United States. Andy's great grandfather and grandfather served. Both of his parents served, and his brother, PFC Triston Long, continues to serve today and will be deployed to Iraq later this summer. On behalf of my colleagues in the Senate and the people of Arkansas, I wish to take this moment to thank the Long family for their extraordinary dedication and service to our Nation.

On that tragic day, Andy was targeted in what I view as an act of terrorism because of the uniform he wore—a uniform that stands as a symbol of this great country.

Ours is a nation where we resolve our differences through debate and democratic elections, not through violence. This is a country where freedom is cherished and liberty is recognized as an inalienable right for all people.

Terrorism has absolutely no place in this country, and as elected representatives of the people, it is our duty to ensure we are doing everything we can to combat terrorism, bring justice to its perpetrators, and protect our communities and our families. That is why I stand here today to put forth a resolution condemning the murder of Private Long and condemning the use of violence to achieve political ends. Additionally, I call for the swift prosecution, to the fullest extent of the law, of the perpetrators of this senseless shooting.

The men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces risk their lives every day, both overseas and here on our own soil in the United States. Let it be

known that their resolve will not and cannot be shattered. The ideals represented by the uniform worn by Andy Long, his parents, and the generations of brave American men and women before them, still serve to represent liberty and justice for all, and no act of terrorism can diminish that. It can only strengthen our resolve and reaffirm our commitment to America's most basic ideals and values.

Our country owes a great debt to Private Long for his service, as well as to the brave men and women in the Armed Forces who protect and defend the freedoms we cherish as Americans each and every day. Our thoughts and prayers go out to Private Long's family and to all of those who knew and loved him. We are a grateful nation for incredible individuals like Private Andy Long.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 186

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private William Andrew "Andy" Long, aged 23, of Conway, Arkansas, was murdered outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas on June 1, 2009, Private Quinton Ezeagwula, aged 18, of Jacksonville, Arkansas, was wounded by gunfire outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas there are more than 1,400,000 active component and more than 1,200,000 reserve component members of the Armed Forces protecting the United States;

Whereas there are more than 8,000 Army and Army Reserve recruiters and more than 7,000 Navy recruiters serving at more than 1,500 military recruiting stations and centers in United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Europe;

Whereas the men and women of the Armed Forces risk their lives every day to preserve the freedoms cherished by people in the United States;

Whereas service in the Armed Forces demands extraordinary sacrifices from service members and their families and often places service members in harm's way;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are the targets of violence not only abroad but in the United States as well; and

Whereas such violence is reprehensible and must not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers its condolences to the family of Private William Andrew "Andy" Long;

(2) hopes for a full recovery for Private Quinton Ezeagwula;

(3) urges swift prosecution to the fullest extent of the law of the perpetrator or perpetrators of this senseless shooting;

(4) urges the people of the United States to join the Senate in condemning acts of violence; and

(5) honors the service and sacrifice of all men and women in the Armed Services who protect and defend our freedom every day.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 111-3

Mr. REID. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on June 16, 2009, by the President of the United States:

Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with New Zealand, Treaty Document 111-3.

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and New Zealand for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion With Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on December 1, 2008, at Washington (the "proposed Protocol"). I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Department of State, which includes an Overview of the proposed Protocol.

The proposed Protocol provides for the elimination of withholding taxes on certain cross-border direct dividend payments and on cross-border interest payments to certain financial enterprises. The proposed Protocol reduces the existing Convention's 10-percent limit on withholding taxes on cross-border payments of royalties to 5 percent.

The proposed Protocol contains a comprehensive provision designed to prevent "treaty shopping," which is the inappropriate use of a tax treaty by third-country residents. The proposed Protocol also provides for the exchange of information between tax authorities of the two countries to facilitate the administration of each country's tax laws.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the proposed Protocol and give its advice and consent to ratification.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 2009.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2009

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 17, at 9:30 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the

time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Further, I ask that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1023, the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and that the time during any adjournment or period of morning business count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. If we are required to use the full 30 hours of postcloture debate time, the Senate would proceed to the bill at approximately 6:15 tomorrow evening. As I have stated previously, we expect to turn to the consideration of the supplemental conference report when it becomes available.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:02 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 17, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NICOLE A. AVANT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS.

HOWARD W. GUTMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELGIUM.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT AS A PERMANENT COMMISSIONED REGULAR OFFICER IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 211(A)(3):

To be lieutenant

CHRISTOPHER G. BUCKLEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

IRA S. EADIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES C. EWALD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PHILIP M. CHANDLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ALAN K. UEOKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MARTIN W. KINNISON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

- MATTHEW J. BELLAIR
- JAY D. BIJEAU
- DANIEL E. CHARLTON
- JOSHUA A. CHISHOLM
- BRYAN J. CHRISTIANSEN
- ERIK D. COPLIN
- ROBERT P. CROCETTA II
- JASON N. GLAB
- JOSHUA A. HOOPS
- EVAN J. LAFRANCE
- KIMBERLY E. LEONARD
- JESSE H. NICE
- TIMOTHY M. PRATT
- DAVID J. RUSSELL
- MICHAEL K. SIMS
- JOSEPH D. SINGER
- DAVID J. TULOWIECKI
- JUSTIN W. WESTFALL

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to an order of the Senate of 03/10/2005 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JO ELLEN DARCY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House agreed to the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2346, Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009.

House ordered reported the National Defense Authorization Act for 2010.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6611–S6667

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1267–1276, S. Res. 185–186, and S. Con. Res. 28–29.

Pages S6649–50

Measures Reported:

S. 669, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes. (S. Rept. No. 111–27)

S. Res. 153, expressing the sense of the Senate on the restitution of or compensation for property seized during the Nazi and Communist eras.

S. Res. 182, recognizing the democratic accomplishments of the people of Albania and expressing the hope that the parliamentary elections on June 28, 2009, maintain and improve the transparency and fairness of democracy in Albania.

S. Con. Res. 23, supporting the goals and objectives of the Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets.

Page S6649

Measures Passed:

Condemning Shootings at Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas: Senate agreed to S. Res. 186, condemning the murder of Army Private William Andrew “Andy” Long and the wounding of Army Private Quinton Ezeagwula, who were shot outside the Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas on June 1, 2009.

Pages S6665–66

Measures Considered:

Travel Promotion Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1023, to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise

promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

Pages S6620–21, S6628–40

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 90 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 208), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Pages S6628–29

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 17, 2009, and that the time during any adjournment or period of morning business count post-cloture.

Page S6666

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaty:

Protocol Amending Tax Convention with New Zealand (Treaty Doc. No. 111–3).

The treaty was transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

Page S6666

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Nicole A. Avant, of California, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Howard W. Gutman, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Belgium.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Navy.

Pages S6666–67

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination was discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Jo-Ellen Darcy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was sent to the Senate

on April 2, 2009, from the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. **Page S6667**

Messages from the House: **Page S6648**

Measures Referred: **Page S6648**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S6648–49**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6649**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6650–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6652–56**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6647–48**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6656–64**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S6664**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6664–65**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6665**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—208) **Pages S6628–29**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:02 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17, 2009. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6666.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2010 for the Small Business Administration and the General Services Administration, after receiving testimony from Karen Mills, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Paul F. Prouty, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration; and Joseph Bataillon, Chief Judge, United States District Court, District of Nebraska, and Chair, Space and Facilities Committee, Judicial Conference of the United States.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2010 and the Future Years Defense Program for ballistic missile defense programs, after receiving testimony from William J. Lynn, Deputy Secretary of Defense, General James Cartwright, USMC, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Lieutenant General Patrick J. O'Reilly, USA,

Director, Missile Defense Agency, all of the Department of Defense.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS BUDGET

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2010 and the Future Years Defense Program for Navy shipbuilding programs, after receiving testimony from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisitions, and Vice Admiral Bernard J. McCullough, III, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources, both of the Department of Defense.

ARMY MODERNIZATION AND MANAGEMENT BUDGET

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2010 and the Future Years Defense Program for Army modernization and management of the Future Combat Systems Program, after receiving testimony from General Peter W. Chiarelli, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Lieutenant General N. Ross Thompson III, Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, and Director for Acquisition Career Management, and David G. Ahern, Director of Portfolio Systems Acquisition, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, all of the Department of Defense; and Paul L. Francis, Managing Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine new ideas for sustainable development and economic growth relative to greener communities, after receiving testimony from Ray LaHood, Secretary of Transportation; Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Inez Moore Tenenbaum, of South Carolina, to be Commissioner and Chairman, of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Graham and DeMint, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Julius Genachowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, and Robert Malcolm McDowell, of Virginia, to be a Member, both of the Federal Communications Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the National Park Service and proposed expenditures under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, after receiving testimony from Daniel N. Wenk, Acting Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

LOUISIANA HURRICANE AND FLOOD PREVENTION STATUS AND PROGRESS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the status and progress of New Orleans hurricane and flood prevention and coastal Louisiana restoration, after receiving testimony from Senator Landrieu; Brigadier General Michael Walsh, Commander, Mississippi Valley Division, United States Army Corps of Engineers; Jeffrey Jacobs, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Committee on New Orleans Regional Hurricane Protection Projects; Steven Peyronnin, Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, and Robert R. Twilley, Louisiana State University Research and Economic Development, both of Baton Rouge; and Joseph M. Rault, Pump to the River Jefferson/Orleans, and Thomas L. Jackson, Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority, both of Metairie, Louisiana.

CLIMATE CHANGE LEGISLATION

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine climate change legislation, focusing on tax considerations, after receiving testimony from Gary Hufbauer, Peterson Institute for International Economics, and Mark Price, KPMG LLP, both of Washington, D.C.; and Keith G. Butler, Duke Energy Corporation, Charlotte, North Carolina.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 962, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to promote an enhanced strategic partnership with Pakistan and its people, with amendments;

S. Res. 182, recognizing the democratic accomplishments of the people of Albania and expressing the hope that the parliamentary elections on June 28, 2009, maintain and improve the transparency and fairness of democracy in Albania;

S. Con. Res. 23, supporting the goals and objectives of the Prague Conference on Holocaust Era Assets;

S. Res. 153, expressing the sense of the Senate on the restitution of or compensation for property seized during the Nazi and Communist eras; and

The nominations of Eric P. Schwartz, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Population, Refugees, and Migration, Andrew J. Shapiro, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Ellen O. Tauscher, of California, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Kurt M. Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Eric P. Goosby, of California, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Coordinator for Threat Reduction Programs, and a promotion list in the Foreign Service.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Nancy J. Powell, of Iowa, to be Director General of the Foreign Service, Patricia A. Butenis, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, and Christopher William Dell, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PANDEMIC INFLUENZA PREPAREDNESS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine pandemic influenza preparedness and the federal workforce, after receiving testimony from Elaine C. Duke, Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management; Nancy H. Kichak, Associate Director for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management; Rear Admiral W. Craig Vanderwagen, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Preparedness and Response; Bernice Steinhardt, Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; T.J. Bonner, American Federation of Government Employees AFL-CIO, San

Diego, California; and Maureen Gilman, National Treasury Employees Union, Washington, DC.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Jeffrey D. Zients, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

CELL PHONE TEXT MESSAGING RATE INCREASES AND WIRELESS MARKET

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine cell phone text mes-

saging rate increases and the state of competition in the wireless market, after receiving testimony from Randal S. Milch, Verizon Communications, Inc., and Joel Kelsey, Consumers Union, both of New York, New York; Wayne Watts, AT&T Inc., Dallas, Texas; Laurie Itkin, Cricket Communications, Inc., San Diego, California; and Srinivasan Keshav, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 2882–2891, 2893–2907; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 549–551 were introduced.

Pages H6902–03

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H6903–05

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2892, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 (H. Rept. 111–157).

H. Res. 552, providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 (H. Rept. 111–158).

Page H6902

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Perlmutter to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today.

Page H6815

Recess: The House recessed at 11:19 a.m. and reconvened at noon.

Page H6820

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 548, providing for the election of certain minority members to a standing committee: Committee on Armed Services: Representatives McKeon, to rank before Representative Bartlett; Representative Platts.

Page H6829

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress: Agreed by unanimous consent that the proceedings of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress Annual Report to Congress be printed in the Congressional Record and

that all Members and former Members who spoke have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

Pages H6820–28, H6832

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act Amendments of 2009: H.R. 1674, to amend the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act to allow for the treatment of the nonprofit corporation affiliate of the Bank as a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994;

Pages H6832–33

Homes for Heroes Act of 2009: H.R. 403, to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ recorded vote of 417 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 344;

Pages H6833–40, H6849–50

Awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (“WASP”): S. 614, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (“WASP”); and

Pages H6840–43

Recognizing the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI) and expressing support for designation of 2010 through 2020 as the “Decade of Vision”: H. Res. 366, to recognize the 40th anniversary of the National Eye Institute (NEI) and to express support for designation of 2010 through 2020 as the “Decade of Vision”, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 349.

Pages H6843–45, H6885–86

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following

measures which were debated on Monday, June 15th:

Lieutenant Commander Roy H. Boehm Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 2470, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19190 Cochran Boulevard FRNT in Port Charlotte, Florida, as the “Lieutenant Commander Roy H. Boehm Post Office Building”, by a 2/3 ye-and-nay vote of 417 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 340; **Pages H6845–46**

Student Internet Safety Act of 2009: H.R. 780, amended, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote the safe use of the Internet by students, by a 2/3 ye-and-nay vote of 416 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 341; and **Pages H6846–47**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To promote the safe use of the Internet by students, and for other purposes.”. **Page H6847**

Congressional Review Act Improvement Act: H.R. 2247, amended, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, enacted by the Congressional Review Act, by a 2/3 ye-and-nay vote of 414 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 343. **Page H6849**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Bishop (UT) announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Page H6847**

Question of Privilege: The Chair ruled that the resolution offered by Representative Bishop (UT) did not constitute a question of the privileges of the House. Agreed to the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair by a ye-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 171 nays, Roll No. 342. **Pages H6847–49**

Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009—Conference Report: The House agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2346, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, by a ye-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 348. **Pages H6850–54, H6865–85**

H. Res. 545, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report, was agreed to by a ye-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 345, after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H6862–63**

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010: The House began consideration of H.R. 2847, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010. Further consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 17th.

Pages H6854–64, H6886–98, H6900

Agreed to:

Mollohan amendment (No. 11 printed in the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009) that increases funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program by \$100,000,000 and **Pages H6895–96**

Schock amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009) that increases the appropriation to the International Trade Administration by \$500,000 and decreases the appropriation for the Bureau of the Census by \$500,000. **Pages H6896–97**

Agreed to the Mollohan motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 179 yeas to 124 noes, Roll No. 350. **Pages H6897–98**

H. Res. 544, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by ye-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 347, after agreeing to order the previous question by a ye-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 346. **Pages H6863–64**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:20 p.m. and reconvened at 2:50 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17th.

Page H6900

Quorum Calls—Votes: Nine ye-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6845–46, H6846–47, H6848–49, H6849, H6849–50, H6863, H6863–64, H6864, H6884–85, H6885–86, H6898. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 2:52 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17th.

Committee Meetings

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies approved for full Committee action the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies appropriations for Fiscal Year 2010.

FAA BUDGET AND NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Committee on Appropriation: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies continued hearings on FAA: FY 2010 Budget and Next Generation Air Transportation System. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FAA, Department of Transportation: J. Randolph Babbitt, Administrator; Henry P. Krakowski, Chief Operating Officer, Air Traffic Organization; Margaret Gilligan, Associate Administrator, Aviation Safety; Victoria Cox, Senior Vice President, NextGen and Operations Planning; and

Nancy LoBue, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Aviation Policy, Planning and Environment.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/ SHIPBUILDING—AVIATION PLAN

Committee on Armed Services: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 2647, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010; H.R. 477, Federal Efficiency and Performance Act of 2009; and H.R. 478, Federal Agency Performance Review and Efficiency Act.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Committee on Education and Labor: Held a hearing on The Future of Learning: How Technology is Transforming Public Schools. Testimony was heard from Aneesh Chopra, Chief Technology Officer, Office of Science and Technology Policy; and public witnesses.

SATELLITE TV LOCAL BROADCASTING TERMINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology and the Internet held a hearing on draft legislation to reauthorize the Satellite Home Viewer Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEALTH INSURANCE POLICY TERMINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Terminations of Individual Health Policies by Insurance Companies." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SYSTEMIC RISK AND INSURANCE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled "Systemic Risk and Insurance." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

GREEN ACT OF 2009

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 2336, GREEN Act of 2009, Testimony was heard from Ron Sims, Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ADMINISTRATION'S EUROPE POLICIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe held a hearing on Strengthening the Transatlantic Alliance: An Overview of the Obama Administration's Policies in Europe. Testimony was heard from Philip Gordon, Assistant Secretary, European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State.

UIGHUR NATIONALISM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight held a hearing on Exploring the Nature of Uighur Nationalism: Freedom Fighters or Terrorists? Testimony was heard from Randall G. Schriver, former Deputy Assistant Secretary, East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; Shirley Kan, Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 2009

Committee on Homeland Security: Held a hearing on H.R. 2868, Chemical Facility Antiterrorism Act of 2009. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Sue Armstrong, Director, Infrastructure Security Compliance Division, Office of Infrastructure Protection; and Philip Reiting, Deputy Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate; Paul Baldauf, Assistant Director, Radiation Protection and Release Prevention, Department of Environmental Protection, State of New Jersey; and public witnesses.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP NEEDS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on Bankruptcy Judgeship Needs. Testimony was heard from Barbara M.G. Lynn, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas; David S. Kennedy, U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Tennessee, William Jenkins, GAO; and a public witness.

PACIFIC SALMON/FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2055, Pacific Salmon Stronghold Conservation Act of 2009; and H.R. 2565, National Fish Habitat Conservation Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Thompson of California; James Balsiger, Acting Assistant Administrator, Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Department of Commerce; Gary Frazier, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Sara Laborde, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife, State of Washington; Eric Schwaab, Deputy Secretary, Department of Natural Resources, State of Maryland; and public witnesses.

MOUNTAIN PINE BEETLE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forest and Public Lands, and the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a joint oversight hearing entitled “Mountain Pine Beetle: Strategies for Protecting the West.” Testimony was heard from Representatives Rehberg, Salazar, Markey of Colorado, Minnick, Polis and Scanlan; the following officials of the Forest Service, USDA: Barbara Bentz, Research Entomologist, Rocky Mountain Research Station; and Rick Cables, Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region; Herbert C. Frost, Associate Director, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Ronald Turley, Special Programs Manager, Western Area Power Administration, Department of the Energy; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL CONTRACTING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization and Procurement held a hearing entitled “The State of Federal Contracting: Opportunities and Challenges for Strengthening Government Procurement and Acquisition Policies.” Testimony was heard from Shay Assad, Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense; David A. Drabkin, Acting Chief Acquisition Officer, GSA; and public witnesses.

PAKISTAN’S HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs held a hearing entitled “U.S. Contributions to the Response to Pakistan’s Humanitarian Crisis: The Situation and the Stakes.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a record vote of 7–3, a rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2847) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, under a structured rule. The rule provides no further general debate.

The rule provides that no further amendments shall be in order except: (1) amendments numbered 3, 6, 19, 22, 25, 31, 35, 41, 59, 60, 62, 63, 69, 71, 93, 96, 97, 98, 100, 102, 111, 114, and 118 printed in the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009, which may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee; and (2) not to exceed 10 of the following amendments if of-

fered by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee: amendments numbered 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108 printed in the Congressional Record of June 15, 2009.

The rule provides that each amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against such amendments except that amendments may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading. It provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule provides that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate. Such amendment may be repeated, but only after consideration of an amendment listed in the first section of this rule.

Finally, the rule provides that the Chair may entertain a motion that the committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII). Testimony was heard from Chairman Obey and Representatives Mollohan, Wolf, Burton, Flake, King (IA), Nunes, Rogers (AL), Gohmert, Price (GA), Jordon (OH) and Broun (GA).

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 2693, amended, Federal Oil Spill Research Program Act; H.R. 2729, amended, to authorize the designation of National Environmental Research Parks by the Secretary of Energy; and H.R. 1622, To provide for a program of research, development, and demonstration on natural gas vehicles.

CYBERSPACE POLICY REVIEW

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, and the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a joint hearing on Agency Response to Cyberspace Policy Review. Testimony was heard from Cita Furkani, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Jeannette Wing, Assistant Director, Directorate for Computer and Information Science and Engineering, NSF; Robert F. Leheny, Acting

Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense; and Peter Fonash, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Cyber Security Communications, Department of Homeland Security.

WATER/ENVIRONMENT AGENCY BUDGETS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment continued hearings on Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2010. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army: Terrance C. Salt, Acting Assistant Secretary, Civil Works; and LTG Robet L. Vantwerp, USA, Chief of Engineers; Howard Frumkin, M.D., Director, National Center, Environmental Health, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; and a public witness.

VA ENDOSCOPY PROCEDURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Endoscopy Procedures at the VA: What Happened, What Has Changed? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: John D. Daigh, Jr., M.D., Assistant Inspector General, Healthcare Inspections, Office of Inspector General; and William E. Duncan, M.D., Associate Deputy Under Secretary, Health, Quality and Safety, Veterans Health Administration.

Joint Meetings

INSTABILITY IN NORTHERN CAUCASUS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine instability in the Northern Caucasus in Russia, after receiving testimony from Svetlana Gannushkina, Civic Assistance Committee for Refugees, Alexei Malashenko, Carnegie Endowment, and Elena Milashina, *Novaya Gazeta*, all of Moscow, Russia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2009

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security, business meeting to markup proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2010 for Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill, 2 p.m., SD-192.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2010 and the Future Years Defense Program for military con-

struction, environmental, and base closure programs, 3 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine aviation safety, focusing on the role and responsibility of commercial air carriers and employees, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the consumer wireless experience, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider pending energy legislation, 9 a.m., SD-366.

Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 409, to secure Federal ownership and management of significant natural, scenic, and recreational resources, to provide for the protection of cultural resources, to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, S. 782, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System, S. 874, to establish El Rio Grande Del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, S. 1139, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, and S. 1140, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon, 1:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider Affordable Health Choices Act, subcommittee assignments, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine Social Security in the 21st Century, 2 p.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, to mark up appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, 9 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1984, 401(k) Fair Disclosure for Retirement Security Act of 2009; and H.R. 1988, Conflicted Investment Advice Prohibition Act of 2009, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to mark up H.R. 2749, Food Safety Enhancement Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, joint hearing on North Korea's Nuclear and Missile Tests and the Six-Party Talks: Where Do We Go from Here? 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on TV Marti: A Station in Search of an Audience? 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census and National

Archives, hearing entitled “Identity Theft: Victims Bills of Rights,” 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, hearing on Advancing Technology for Nuclear Fuel Recycling: What Should Our Research, Development and Demonstration Strategy Be? 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, to continue hearings on Independent Assessment of the Na-

tional Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Legislative Initiatives to Strengthen and Modernize the SBIR and STTR Programs, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, to mark up H.R. 2701, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, 11 a.m., 304–HVC,

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 17

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1023, Travel Promotion Act.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2847—Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.